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Abstract

This thesis utilises feminist economics theory to investigate gender and tourism development by exploring the economic relations associated with the services that maintain human life. Often, tourism development programs with a gender focus attempt to promote women’s involvement with tourism by encouraging them to produce handicrafts for tourism retail. However, female tourism entrepreneurs face unique challenges such as seasonality and 14-hour days which affect how they negotiate the activities needed to reproduce human life on a daily basis, and inter-generationally, which include household duties. These activities, referred to in political economy literature collectively as ‘social reproduction’, are used here as a lens through which to examine the relationship between entrepreneurship and gender roles and relations within tourism development. This relationship is investigated using participant observation and interviews held with tourism handicraft entrepreneurs in Greece from June to December 2012 and thus in the context of a macro-scare economic crisis.

Thematic analysis shows that the type of tourism development affects entrepreneurship bringing to the fore the importance of time in gender role negotiations as collective entrepreneurs re-distribute time amongst themselves rather than intra-generationally, thus prompting for less gender role negotiation than individual entrepreneurs. Indeed tourism-induced time scarcity adds value to social reproductive activities, whilst women use ‘domestic inaction’ as a negotiation tool to achieve an equal distribution of economic activities. The identification of a liminal gender renegotiation period at the end and beginning of the season that prompts seasonal gender role negotiations adds an interesting dimension to the perceived impacts of seasonality. In addition, the economic crisis is prompting women to ‘recruit’ their husbands into handicraft tourism entrepreneurship as a solution to male unemployment, the gender implications for which are discussed.

Future research could benefit from investigating men’s and children’s roles in tourism entrepreneurship and how these act upon negotiations of gender roles. Finally, this study raises methodological questions regarding the knowledge constructed in participant observation that includes a pedagogical element.
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Chapter One

1 Introduction

Greece features in the news headlines as being one of the hardest hit countries in the Eurozone from the 2010 economic crisis; the effects of which reverberated around the world, making discussion of the ‘economy’ a subject of everyday conversation amongst many people. This increased interest in economic activities gives rise to my questioning of what the ‘economy’ actually is and how it operates. Indeed, according to critics, we are now living in an economy characterised by a capitalist structure that acts like a “zombie system, seemingly dead when it comes to achieving human goals and responding to human feelings, but capable of sudden spurts of activity that cause chaos all around” (Harman, 2010, p. 12).

Living and breathing (sometimes with difficulty due to the tear-gas police employed close to my work-place to repel demonstrators) the economic crisis in Athens was one of the things that aroused my interest in investigating what the economy is and how it operates. However, a more personal element also fuelled my interest to investigate the topic this dissertation covers; my passion for handicrafts. Being a female who engages with handicraft entrepreneurship, travelling extensively in Europe and Asia and having an academic background in eco-tourism, has led to me questioning the various apparent gender inequalities within tourism handicraft entrepreneurship. One of my initial questions was why are women who make handicrafts so poorly paid for their skilled work? Working for a financial consultancy whilst engaging in handicraft entrepreneurship myself, the disparity between what is valued in contemporary capitalist society and what I was producing became especially marked.

Arising from this internal questioning, the central themes that guide this research are questions of gender roles and relations, conceptualisations of how economic relations are valued and perceived, and how the two (gender and the economy) relate and interact with each other. Turning to consider the side of the economy that is often overlooked, and almost always undervalued, I examine the usefulness of using social reproduction as a social conceptualisation to investigate economic processes. As we are situated in a system that places value on individuals as economic agents, rather than interconnected social beings embedded in relationships, this raises concerns regarding social reproduction’s depletion (Rai and Thomas, 2011, Rai et al., 2013). In view of the looming depletion of social reproduction, I question how social reproductive gender roles and relations act to shape what is constituted as valuable and how the economic agents themselves
perceive value. Hence, based on feminist economic theory that questions the applicability of neoclassical economic theorising, my study questions the applicability of current economic theories to describe people’s economic realities, using empirical information arising from in-depth immersion into these people’s lives (Folbre, 2006).

Guided by an ontological position that social reality is the product of social actors, the need for empirical research becomes apparent, which leads to the use of qualitative methods within this study to find out what can be known about the guiding themes of tourism entrepreneurship and gender roles (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). Critical theory is of significant value in conceptualising how entrepreneurship and gender roles could be different if the world was different, and also in fulfilling this study’s aim for emancipation from “crude forms of economic determinism” (Tribe, 2008, p. 246). Indeed, this study is responding to a recent call for more subjective research that challenges hegemonies and effects social change within tourism (Ren et al., 2010).

Feminism is particularly suited to this study as it allows for the critical deconstruction of dominant economic conceptualisations using the powerful analytical ‘tool’ of gender and thus unpacks how ‘reality’ may be constructed to oppress people (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). As both the author’s origins and the ethnographic site where empirical research is conducted for this study are situated within Greece, a western feminist stance is considered the most appropriate for this thesis. Critiques of a western feminist stance are acknowledged in Section 4.1.1. Taking tourism entrepreneurship as an example of an economic activity that is governed by gendered structures, recent literature on female entrepreneurship reveals how male hegemony permeates entrepreneurial ideals, creating a dissonance between these ideals and how women actually experience entrepreneurship (Ahl and Marlow, 2012, Marlow and McAdam, 2013). Choosing tourism entrepreneurs as this study’s research participants is instigated by the realisation that tourism processes exhibit high levels of gendering, ranging from the sexualised images used to promote tourism destinations (Pritchard and Morgan, 2000) to tourism labour, where women occupy positions such as maids, cooks, hosts and cleaners which they are ‘naturally’ good at (Swain, 1995, Sinclair, 1997).

With regards to the location where the empirical research takes place, besides the crisis issues affecting Greece, my Greek language skills and Greek cultural background were instrumental in the decision to carry out research activity in Greece, thus constituting me as a ‘partial insider’, which is discussed in more detail in Chapter Four.
I now proceed to outline what the research objectives are and what gaps in knowledge this current study aims to contribute to, by introducing the study’s main and supplementary research questions.

1.1 Research objectives

Motivated by the author’s life experiences, personal world-view and the gaps in literature as described in more detail below, a principal, guiding, research question was devised in order to explore gendered economic relations within tourism, focusing on the specific context of tourism handicraft entrepreneurs in areas of Crete and Epirus in Greece:

‘What is the relationship between female tourism handicraft entrepreneurship and gender roles and relations in rural Greece?’

In addition to this central question upon which all the study’s elements ‘hang’, a number of supplementary questions were devised to focus on specific aims within the broader question and to inform the research process of exploring the topic.

- How is tourism handicraft entrepreneurship enacted and conceptualised by this study’s male and female participants?
- Within the tourism communities of Crete and Epirus, where the study was situated, how is social reproduction defined?
- How does gender permeate performances of the economic in the study’s context?
- What can this study tell us about the political economy of tourism and female entrepreneurship?

The supplementary questions are used to frame this study’s scope and encourage a focus on the primary research question by effectively breaking it down into its constituent elements. Building on recent academic progress in the area of female entrepreneurship, the research objectives are influenced by feminism and have as their primary goal to interrogate and be critical of dominant economic theories surrounding entrepreneurship.
1.2 Research contribution

It is pertinent to expand on how this study aims to add to what can be known and thus how it is an original and unique piece of research, contributing to knowledge. Locating a gap in the academic literature on the interaction between the productive and the social reproductive spheres of the economy, this study aims to produce knowledge on what this relationship is, by drawing together literature on gender and development, tourism, female entrepreneurship and political economy. Whilst Chapter Two and Chapter Three explore the literatures surrounding the study’s research topic in more detail, what follows pinpoints the gaps in the literature which this study aims to fill.

1.2.1 Political economy angle on tourism entrepreneurship

One of the primary attributes of this research is that it is one of the few investigations into how gender operates within tourism, analysed from a feminist political economy angle. Incorporating political (e.g. welfare policies), economic (e.g. grants given to promote female entrepreneurship) and socio-cultural structures (e.g. the cultural control mechanism of ‘shame and honour’) into an analysis of how tourism constitutes a very dynamic and inclusive way of finding out what can be known about gender’s role within tourism. Whilst the material inequalities inherent in tourism development have been researched by Ferguson (2010b), who uses a political economy approach to analyse empirical data from Costa Rican female tourism workers, the current study aims to add to this literature by investigating how material structures and social reproduction gender roles are related and interactional. Hence the concept of social reproduction is used to represent the activities needed to maintain “life on a daily basis and intergenerationally” (Laslett and Brenner, 1989, p. 382).

1.2.2 Female entrepreneurship conceptualisations

Indeed, another unique contribution which this study aims to make is to progress knowledge in the area of female entrepreneurship by providing an empirical analysis of how entrepreneurship is conceptualised and how gendered structures morph these conceptualisations. Although there is discussion of how gender permeates entrepreneurship theory and the need for new theorisations of entrepreneurship has been highlighted, few researchers investigate how female entrepreneurs experience entrepreneurship by collecting empirical evidence (Brush, 2006, De Bruin et al., 2007, Ahl, 2006). In this respect, the current study will be building upon knowledge on how entrepreneurs ‘do’ gender and ‘do’ entrepreneurship, as researched by Bruni, Gherardi and Poggio (2005) in their ethnographic approach to gender and entrepreneurship.
1.2.3 The various meanings of ‘gender’ within tourism development

An established body of literature exists on ‘gender and development’, the majority of which looks at how women’s well-being is bettered, or how women are being ‘empowered’ (Rowlands, 1997) and how the development approaches that are used to achieve women’s empowerment are frequently embedded in gendered discourses (Chant, 2006a, Ferguson, 2010a). However, there is little discussion on how tourism development programs may perpetuate gendered discourses by viewing women only as productive entities. Although gender and development literature e.g. (Strier and Abdeen, 2009) deals with development programs, such as those encouraging women’s engagement in tourism micro entrepreneurship (Singh, 2007), reports on the extent to which women’s emancipation has been achieved rarely examine the gendered structures that underlie the perceived failure or success. Kabeer (2007, 2005, 1999) highlights the importance of taking into account that women do not necessarily have shared realities, thus illustrating how gender roles are context-specific.

1.2.4 Conceptualisation of ‘gender’

It is important to note that as the term ‘gender’ is a social product, it is context-bound and this means it constantly changes according to the way society uses it and what knowledge it produces (Bruni et al., 2005). In this study, rather than viewing gendered subjectivities as opposing and clearly differentiated, masculinities and femininities are depicted as “blurred and muddied, as each polluting and infecting each other” which allows us to conceptualise gender roles as shifting and temporary rather than fixed and connected to one’s sex (Cameron, 1998, p. 294).

‘Gender’ encapsulates all the cultural markers a society uses to account for biological difference, however gender’s meaning goes beyond this. It is not exactly something that someone is or something that a person has, it is the mechanism by which notions of what constitutes masculine and feminine are produced and normalised. Enacting or “doing” gender is the act of performing complex “socially guided...micropolitical activities” (Bruni et al., 2005, p. 37) that are taken as expressions of what is seen as gender-related natural behaviours.

So, gender is not a static element and by being “something that is done” rather than something that simply “is” (Hughes and Jennings, 2012, p. 431), gender is constantly changing both itself and its surroundings. Gender roles are roles people play that are socially constructed and ultimately “something that is ... performed rather than something that is” (Ahl, 2006, p. 597). Hence, gender roles involve behaviours that are repeated over time, thus becoming internalised as a natural
way of being (Beauvoir et al., 2000). Indeed, looking at gender roles and relations is important as they are the product of how gender is performed.

Gender can indeed be considered society’s “most pervasive organising principle” (Ahl and Nelson, 2010, p. 7) as it is a form of social power, and thus crucial to investigate in social studies of tourism such as this one. Entrepreneurship can be a particularly pertinent place to look at gender roles and relations, as work is a key discursive site for the enactment of gender (Bruni et al., 2004). The gender relations that evolve from enacting gender within the domestic sphere are particularly interesting as this is where gender relations are “precariously constituted” (Cupples, 2005). Butler (1999) highlights the importance of culture in gender role construction by saying that “not biology, but culture becomes destiny” (p.8). So in fact, it can be argued that gender should be viewed as a “result of upbringing and social interaction” (Ahl, 2006, p. 597), rather than as a “synonym for women” (Peterson, 2005, p. 500).

As gender roles and relations are influenced by cultural factors, it is important to look at gender roles in each context separately. To this extent, various studies, including Tucker and Boonabaana’s (2011) work on female entrepreneurs in Turkey and Africa, and Ferguson’s (2010a) study of the World Bank’s approach to gender, stress the importance of considering gender-related pressures on entrepreneurship in a context-specific manner. An understanding of current gender roles is important in creating policy and promoting development that has a positive effect on people. Building on the existing knowledge of how gender operates within tourism development and how tourism development reconfigures gender roles and relations, the current study aims to examine how gender influences the operation of socio-cultural and politico-economic power relations within a specific form of development: tourism micro-entrepreneurship; and within a specific context: Greek tourism.

1.2.5 Greek gender roles

Another way in which this research contributes to knowledge regards the current state of gender roles and relations in Greece, as since Dubisch’s (1986a), Herzfeld’s(1991a) and Loizos and Papataxiarches’ (1991) in-depth research on Greek gender roles and relations, there has been little literature that discusses Greek gender roles and relations. Lazaridis (2009) considers how gender roles are played out within the Cretan context, but the majority of participants did not work in tourism. The present study aims to build on Lazaridis’ contribution regarding Greek gender roles and relations and fill the gap in knowledge regarding how gender roles and relations operate within tourism there.
1.2.6 Economic crisis and seasonality

In addition to the above, two influences on the relationship between tourism handicraft entrepreneurship and gender roles and relations add further nuances and originality to this study. One of these influences is the recent economic crisis and the other is a common characteristic of tourism, seasonality.

Whilst recent literature covers some of the Greek economic crisis’s effects on tourism, most focus on the fiscal and capital impacts, analysing the effects from a tourism-demand perspective (Papatheodorou et al., 2010, Stylidis and Terzidou, 2014). However, political economy literature on economic crises points out how crises affect social structures because, as welfare spending is cut, families end up acting as the “safety net of last resort” (Elson, 2012, p. 67). This increased pressure on family units adds another dimension to the study of economic activities at the productive and household levels, which has not been investigated in the context of tourism. Although a recent study (Karamessini, 2013) assessed the Greek crisis’s impact on the gender division of labour, there are no studies that look at how the social reproductive economy has been affected which is where the current study aims to add knowledge regarding the social impacts that an economic crisis has on tourism.

Seasonality within tourism has been the focus of much tourism literature, due to its disrupting effect on economic transactions at the site of production (Andriotis, 2005) with solutions for the creation of all-season destinations being proposed (Higham and Hinch, 2002). However, less literature has looked at the social effects of seasonality, which is where this study can contribute by investigating how gender roles related to social reproduction are renegotiated at the beginning and end of each season when tourism entrepreneurs re-adjust to new time-demand realities.

1.3 Thesis outline

This presentation of my thesis is organised into nine chapters, each of which covers a different component of the study, and collectively providing the reader with a comprehensive account of the research journey, the findings and resulting conclusions.

This first chapter provides a summarised comprehensive guide to the rationale for undertaking this research, answering the questions “who, how and why?”, whereas Chapters Two and Three identify the gaps in the literature that this study aims to fill. Chapter Two focuses on describing the ‘economy’ by providing a critical appraisal of how gender permeates classical economic theories and
policies. Hence, Chapter Two suggests conceptualising economics as the provisioning of human life rather than as choice under scarcity and thus argues for the importance of investigating the social reproductive economy, identifying where this study can contribute to knowledge in this subject. Chapter Three continues to question how economic structures are gendered, turning the focus to how gender operates and is renegotiated within the context of tourism entrepreneurship. The chapter argues that tourism development programs often encourage women to enter tourism entrepreneurship and more specifically handicraft entrepreneurship, to fulfil the requirement to include ‘gender’ in their agenda without considering how gendered structures may affect their involvement. Indeed, within this chapter, I identify gaps in knowledge surrounding what entrepreneurship means to the people practising it and what effect seasonality has on negotiations of economic activities and gender roles.

Chapter Four presents the constructivist ontology and feminist standpoint epistemology that guides this research and explains the belief that knowledge about female tourism handicraft entrepreneurs can be achieved by co-constructing knowledge through interactions with participants, using tools such as inter-views and participant observation. In addition to describing how critical feminist ethnography as a method and methodology can help construct ‘truths’ surrounding economic activities and gender roles, Chapter Four also introduces the locations where the fieldwork took place in Greece in terms of tourism development there. Chapter Five is a pre-analysis chapter and introduces the reader to the context that this study is situated in by describing the prevalent tourism development structures in Greece, the formation of Greek gender roles and how gender permeates politico-economic and socio-cultural structures in Greece.

The main body of empirical research is presented in Chapters Six, Seven and Eight where thematic analysis of the semi-structured interviews, fieldnotes and participant observation experiences, forms the material for these chapters. Chapter Six focuses on how gender and economic relations operate within the productive economy and introduces the tourism handicraft entrepreneurs who participated in this study, grouping them into the business structures they find themselves in, which include a handicraft school and a women’s cooperative. The majority of entrepreneurs who own their own shops and produce their own handicrafts are referred to collectively as ‘owner-producers’ and ways in which the members of this non-homogenous group entered entrepreneurship are discussed in terms of gendered socio-economic structures. Questions of how gender operates regarding entrepreneurs’ visibility are posed, and contemporary entrepreneurship theory’s focus on individualism being an essential component of entrepreneurship is challenged as participants create their own interpretations of what entrepreneurship means to
them, showing that collective pursuits often outweigh selfish motives intended to maximise personal economic gain.

Chapter Seven comprises an analysis of how gender permeates economic relations within the social reproductive economy. Based on participants’ definitions of social reproduction, this analysis explores how participants’ conceptualisations link with, or differ from, theoretical underpinnings of how gendered socio-economic structures operate within the social reproductive economy. Perceiving each analysis to be context-bound, this chapter relates context to entrepreneurial conceptualisations of social reproduction, revealing how these are influenced by available social resources such as grandparental childcare. The under-investigated role of men and children within social reproduction is touched upon in Chapter Seven, bringing to the fore some unexpected realisations about these groups’ roles, as well as suggesting how tourism contributes to men and children’s involvement in social reproduction.

In the final analysis chapter, Chapter Eight, the ways in which the productive and reproductive parts of the economy interact and interrelate are analysed. Interlacing related theory from welfare policy and socio-cultural mechanisms, in Chapter Eight I investigate how hegemonic articulations surrounding work, femininity and masculinity are restructured in tourism entrepreneurship. I investigate how participant-entrepreneurs’ negotiations of social reproduction gender roles relate to their entrepreneurial experience, and thus seek to unravel the myth surrounding the dominance of male hegemony so often presented in entrepreneurial theorisations. By questioning how altruism, temporality and inaction function within feminine conceptualisations of entrepreneurship, this analysis explores how novel interpretations of tourism entrepreneurship are being created. The role seasonality plays within tourism is also looked at from a fresh perspective by questioning both the economic and social impacts seasonality has on tourism producers. Taking into account that this study is situated in the midst of an economic crisis, I investigate how gender interacts with entrepreneurship under these conditions and how new social reproductive gender roles and entrepreneurial situations, such as women recruiting their husbands to help them with entrepreneurial ventures, are evolving.

I present my conclusions in Chapter Nine, drawing together results from all analysis chapters. Arguing that empirical evidence combined with theoretical advances in the areas of female entrepreneurship and feminist political economy challenge current entrepreneurship theory, I suggest here possible ways in which entrepreneurship theory can be made more gender-neutral. Lastly, Chapter Nine suggests possible avenues for further research and highlights questions that
have come up while completing this project; questions which could be answered by subsequent research projects expanding on my work.
Chapter Two

2 Gendered economic relations

The area of interest that this study engages with relates to the relationship between female tourism entrepreneurship and gender roles and relations. Influenced by a recent call for the transition to economic practices based on ethics of care, gender justice and a focus on social reproduction (Harcourt, 2013) I am interested in alternative conceptualisations of economics which focus on the provisioning of human life rather than on choice under scarcity. As economic agents such as entrepreneurs are conceptualised as socially embedded rather than separate selves (van Staveren, 2010), feminist economics allows for an investigation of the more social aspects of economics such as social provisioning to be taken into consideration within economic analyses. Using gender as a central analytical category, a feminist economic angle can bring to the fore the importance of social reproduction, which is a more inclusive term for the ‘caring’ economy. Furthermore, by looking at how gender permeates tourism development approaches that use entrepreneurship as a vehicle for women to get involved in paid activities, I intend to identify what research has already been done in this field and what opportunities exist to fill gaps in knowledge. Entrepreneurship is an interesting economic activity to investigate as it is seen both as a major driving force of economic development and as a panacea to promote women’s economic development globally (Robson et al., 2009). Looking at how literatures of female entrepreneurship are permeated by gendered politico-economic and socio-cultural structures, will help identify gaps in the theoretical underpinnings of female entrepreneurship definition and conceptualisation.

2.1 Feminist economics – a focus on social provisioning

“Economics – an arcane language used by its own cognoscenti for reviewing past events in the production and distribution of wealth. There are some who would define economics as a science rather than a language; but in the absence of any evidence that future events can be predicted by economists on the basis of fixed laws, this approach can hardly be supported…”

(humorous excerpt from “The Superior Person’s Book of Words” by P. Bowler)
Economics can be conceptualised as the study of the ways in which time and resources are allocated to various types of socioeconomic activity. The economic world is increasingly described by words such as “agile”, “fast”, indicating a change in type of economic knowledge as economic research is moving towards a connection to everyday life (Amin and Thrift, 2000). Furthermore, the feminist movement has brought about a focus on conceptualisations of economics in terms of social actors dynamically influencing interdependent economic processes, which is known as a turn towards a focus on ‘social provisioning’ (Power, 2013). Focusing on social provisioning in an economic context draws attention to instances of cooperation rather than individualism, how motivation does not have to be synonymous with self-interest and critiquing existing economic structures rather than taking them for granted. Hidden assumptions relating to gender such as overlooking the economy’s reproductive labour component, have long been part of mainstream economic theorising as have explanations of economic activity based on the “self-interested exchange between rational economic agents” (Barker and Kuiper, 2003, p. 3). This is why the concept of social provisioning is more useful in gaining a more holistic view of what this fluid and daunting concept of the ‘economy’ actually is and means to us as economic actors.

Capitalism is the name of the current mode of economic operation or the ‘economy’ and a description of this multifaceted, transformative structure shall be attempted by outlining how capitalism operates depending on socio-cultural and politico-economic context and how gender permeates its structures.

2.1.1 Capitalism

Capitalism is a unique social form that describes a mode of production governed by commodity accumulation. A Marxist definition of capitalism given within Gibson & Graham (1996) is: “a system of generalised commodity production structured by forces of production and exploitative production relations between capital and labour” (p. 3). Capitalism in its modern form was established at the beginnings of the 19th century. Historically, the economic system prior to capitalism was feudalism which was based on “the exploitative relationship between landowners and peasants” where the peasant’s surplus labour (either in rent, money or in kind) was transferred to the landowner (Quick, 2010, p. 162). The transition from feudalism to capitalism took place within patriarchal societies. So, from women being merely subordinated in feudal households, in capitalist households they became characterised as dependent on their husbands (Hamilton, 2012).

As a system “based on the premise of free wage labour”, capitalism is based on the human propensity to barter and exchange (Blank, 2011, p. 10). Capitalism is currently the dominant economic form in modern society, involves the production of commodities (where labour power is
also counted as a commodity) and is hailed as a “heroic transformative agent” (Gibson-Graham, 2006, p. 6). Indeed, capitalism is very dynamic in nature as it can alter society by transforming old oppressions and generating new ones (Harman, 2010). One of these oppressions regards the strong focus on the commodification of social life which comes with capitalism, that can also result in the transformation of social relations as they are replaced by commodity relations (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985). This transformation occurs partly because of the introduction of new value systems by capitalism. Within a capitalist society that is based on production for the market, the meaning of value changes and there comes to be a value “in use” and a value “in exchange” (Harman, 2010, p. 22). Commodities with ‘value in use’ often have little ‘value in exchange’ and vice versa, for example water vs. diamonds, thus creating an odd state of affairs where people strive to accumulate not what they actually need, but what is valuable in a capitalist sense (i.e. has an exchange value).

Capitalism’s push to commodify also resulted in the commodification of domestic tasks as women were encouraged to join the paid workforce. Thus, the spread of capitalism was initially thought to be a liberating force for women (Boserup, 2007), as the commodification of domestic tasks was perceived to free women from domestic subordination. However in practice, women continued to be held responsible for the completion of domestic tasks in addition to engaging in paid employment (Bakker and Silvey, 2008a). Thus, feminist economists propose a refashioning in the way we think about society, as they do not take capitalism to be “natural, inevitable and beneficial” (Barker, 2005, p. 2195) and thus question current economic theorising’s universal applicability and apparent ability to transcend gender roles, as shall be discussed next.

2.1.2 ‘Homo economicus’ and his mythical existence

Neoclassical economics theorising is based upon the concept of ‘rational man’ theory which is an essentially masculinist conception of an economically active individual being perceived as a separate self, unaffected by his surroundings, a type of person that Barker and Kuiper (2003) refer to as “homo economicus” (p. 2). Founding fathers of the economic discipline such as Adam Smith are found to distance themselves from associations with the feminine by conceiving economically active individuals as isolated and separate, which illustrates how gender historically permeates conceptualisations of economic theorising (Kuiper, 2003). However, the applicability of this rational1, separate self, active, economic agent model to women who are conceptualised as attached to their families, raises concern (Waylen, 2000). An oxymoronic situation seems to arise from societal representations of women as altruistic care-givers and classical economic discourses which attempt

1 Using the term ‘rational’ requires caution however as rationality is also socially constructed and women who act in contravention to their ‘natural’ roles as altruistic care-givers may be seen as irrational, rather than specifically acting against the laws of economic rationality (Pujol, 2003).
to construct all economically active bodies as rational, self-interested agents. The collision between these two opposite constructions of how women who work should act is inevitable, giving rise to entropic re-formulations of how ‘the economy’ is experienced by individuals.

Altruism within conceptualisations of how the economy operates is significant as feminine economic agents are assumed to perform household tasks within the family on an altruistic basis. Whilst the existence of true altruism is debatable, and perhaps the concept of ‘enlightened self-interest’ may offer a more concise description of the activities which people perform “with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare” (Batson, 2010, p. 3) and hence for the collective good with no obvious pecuniary gains, the term ‘altruism’ is used here as it is easily understood and widely used in economic literature (Draguns, 2013, De Waal, 2008). Altruistic behaviour is gendered and much feminist research points to how femininity is linked to performing domestic tasks for free and getting pleasure from doing so, which leads Federici (2012) to term this economic activity, somewhat ironically as “a labour of love” (p. 16). Indeed, the concept of altruism being a rule within the family, and being largely a feminine trait, talks to how the distribution of household tasks within a family is underpinned by assumptions regarding women’s ‘natural’ role as caregiver because of her role in the reproductive process. The dependence on concepts of female propensity for altruistic economic activity is also seen within development programs that take this assumption for granted by, for example, giving grants to women as they expected women to spend the money on their family, rather than on themselves (Brickell and Chant, 2010). However there are examples of male altruism that question the connection between femininity, the family and altruism. An example of this are the cases of ‘selective altruism’ when male colleagues join ranks to prevent women entering their occupations as described by England (2003).

Representations of working women as altruistic care-givers and self-interested economic agents come into opposition when attempting to apply the household bargaining model whereby ‘rational agents’ engaging in the productive economy have increased bargaining power to re-divide labour within the household. This concept sees individuals bargaining for the most economically favourable outcome. However, for women, this would mean bargaining for reduced care responsibilities in order to engage in paid employment (Bittman et al., 2003). By viewing all economic agents as gender-neutral, the household bargaining model ignores the fact that if women were to bargain for reduced caring responsibilities, they would represent an antithesis to societal norms that portray women as altruistic care-givers (Brickell and Chant, 2010).

Some feminist economists explain the arrangement of women being held responsible for economic activity within the domestic sphere as being because family members always strive to
achieve the most profitable arrangement (Folbre, 2006). So women who have been trained from a young age in tasks such as cooking and cleaning, are considered ‘specialised’ in these tasks by the time they become adults. Consequently, women are perceived as having a “comparative advantage” (Pujol, 2003, p. 29) in the completion of domestic tasks as they are more efficient at these activities, making the permanent delegation of these tasks to women more economically efficient for the family as a whole (Hewitson, 2003). According to this rationale, men that help out with housework are considered as deviants, an example of which is seen how in highly patriarchal societies such as Japan where women do 90% of housework, a father helping out in household tasks is associated with negative consequences. Social penalties for deviating from gender norms are often imposed, as North (2009) observes that in Japan, daughters may find it difficult to marry when their fathers’ adherence to masculinity is not stereotypical.

The importance of considering gender within economic theorising is also evident in utility approach theorising which suggests that household labour is allocated to household members to maximise the family’s utility in terms of commodity consumption (Hodgson, 2012). Taking ‘utility’ to be the basic relationship between scarcity and choice, a utility approach suggests that men specialise in producing income whereas women specialise in completing domestic labour (Akerlof and Kranton, 2000). Whilst this approach can be useful in conceptualising how value is instilled in the time spent completing an economic activity, which means that value can be seen in the time spent doing household tasks (Goodin et al., 2008), the utility approach has been criticised as lacking the insight that household dynamics are shaped by gender roles. Furthermore, according to feminist economic theorising, utility-maximising relies on individual choices rather than social organisation being responsible for the distribution of activities, as concepts of social provisioning posit (Power, 2013).

Another concept generated within classical economic theorising to explain how economic agents operate within the economy is that of ‘relational accommodation’. The concept of “relational accommodation” (Livingston, 2011, p. 5) is that individuals forgo their personal interests in favour of relationship-oriented interests. However, Gelfand et.al. (2006) point out that more women than men prefer to pursue collective interests as opposed to optimal economic outputs, indicating the role gender plays in what is perceived as an economic interest. That is, whilst women view collective interest as more important than individual interest, men seem to view personal interests as most important. Hence even though the concept of relational accommodation is useful as it acknowledges the importance of relationships and thus the unfeasibility of the separate-self theory, using a gender lens is essential in order to utilise this concept in explaining how economic agents operate within the economy. Hence, whilst striving to avoid stereotypical representations of men and women within this study, I am aware that a focus on gender inherently contains the danger of touching upon
stereotypical gender roles in order to discuss gender itself. Hence, I acknowledge that throughout the study I strive to maintain a balance between focusing on gender and avoiding stereotypical representations of men and women.

Many economists use the objects relations theory that theorises masculine and feminine genders as based on women’s mothering roles and men’s breadwinning roles to support the notion that people with feminine subjectivities are more capable to undertake caring labour than people with masculine identities (Hewitson, 2003). According to the object relations theory, men’s resistance to domestic and caring work is a strategy to maintain their masculinity and autonomous, non-feminine selves. Hence, men create themselves as separate-selves struggling to renounce identification with their mother, a concept of masculinity which is also related to the idea of ‘economic man’ who is radically separated from humans and nature (England, 1993). However, the problem with this theory is that it is socially essentialist in that it does not account for men who do care and carry out domestic work, labelling them biological deviants rather than including them in the theory. In addition, not all women seek to reproduce mothering and even if they do, they may not want to adhere to the sexual division of labour that their parents had.

It is important to note that economic models such as the ones described are often perceived as “abstract representations” (Bergeron, 2011, p. 154) that merely observe reality rather than explain it. In actuality, as Callon (1998) argues, prevailing economics discourses and models act to shape the economy rather than reflect reality, as economic agents are mobilised in pursuit of the economy’s goals. However, whilst various economic models exist, it is important to conceptualise what the ‘economy’ these models are based upon, is.

When talking about ‘the economy’, dominant discourses explain it as constituted of ‘productive’ economic activities, that is formal and regulated activities associated with primary, secondary and tertiary production (Peterson, 2005). Owing to the increased emphasis on the conceptualisation of the economy as constituted by these productive economic activities, it is this productive (paid) labour that is held to be more valuable than social reproductive (unpaid) labour by capitalist economists (Folbre, 2009). Even though social reproductive activities are presented by capitalist discourses as essential to the process of accumulation as women’s unpaid labour allows men to work for longer hours, these activities (e.g. domestic tasks) are often taken for granted as being a woman’s responsibility and so limited analysis of the economic models governing these activities is found in neoclassic economic literature (Harkness, 2008). This leads into discussion regarding how the ‘productive’ and ‘reproductive’ elements of the economy are constructed and if in fact there is a boundary between the two elements as suggested by the dichotomies apparent
between what is considered ‘public’ and ‘private’ work (Tucker, 2007). Indeed this leads economists to wonder if the reproductive economy has become “unhinged” (Katz, 2001, p. 710) from production.

2.1.3 The fluid boundaries between the productive and reproductive economy

Whilst feminist economists refer to the reproductive economy as being integral to development (Gibson-Graham, 2006), it is debateable to what extent mainstream economists value the reproductive economy’s importance as illustrated by their lack of focus on this aspect of the economy (Peck and Tickell, 2002, Lew et al., 2004). Historically, work within what is thought of as the reproductive economy was done within families and as the economy was based on household production, social reproduction and production as well as women and men, were all located in the “same world of daily experience” (Laslett and Brenner, 1989, p. 386). However, societal changes such as the introduction of a push for capital accumulation via capitalism, an example of which is industrialisation, created a conflict between demands of production and reproduction. This led to a change in household organisation with men becoming responsible for the productive activities contributing to familial survival and women becoming responsible solely for reproductive activities (Benería and Sen, 1981). Later on, new gender ideals were introduced via the increased push to accumulate and women began to engage in more productive activities whilst still being responsible for familial social reproduction. This summary of social reproduction’s historical progress, illustrates how outcomes of socially constructed divisions of labour shape the political, economic and ideological contours of society as whole.

Taking a feminist economics viewpoint, ‘the economy’ can be conceptualised as a combination of productive and reproductive economic structures which are constituted of coexisting sites through which power operates (Peterson, 2005). Similarly, Bakker and Silvey (2008a) stress the significance of viewing production and reproduction as having a co-constitutive relationship rather than being separate from each other. Cameron and Gibson-Graham (2003) reinforce this view in their article on envisioning alternative economies, by suggesting that viewing these two entities as separate from each other serves to lock in the subordinate of market/masculine vs. household/feminised. So by conceptualising the ‘productive’ and ‘reproductive’ economies as discursive constructs instead of distinct parts of the economy, a more inclusive investigation can be undertaken into how these economic constructs contribute to the transformation of social processes such as gender roles and relations, by acknowledging all “who produce, appropriate, distribute and consume in society” (Cameron and Gibson-Graham, 2003, p. 153).
Hence using feminist economics allows for a more inclusive representation of how ‘the economy’ operates by deconstructing how gender permeates performances of the economic. Furthermore, the positivist conceptualisation that the economy has a rationally static nature can be challenged by applying a feminist economics lens that helps conceptualise men and women as drawing on various gendered subjectivities when trying to make sense of everyday life’s complex and contradictory economic aspects, thus revealing the fluidity of economic interpretations.

Despite the increasing awareness within academic circles of the importance of reproductive economic activities to the economy’s smooth and efficient operation (Harcourt, 2013), relatively little literature has been written on this aspect, especially within tourism development literature (Ferguson, 2010b, Folbre, 2009). A lack of focus on the reproductive economy in tourism development literature is seen in research that focuses on how to increase women’s participation in the productive economy (for example by encouraging them to enter entrepreneurship), but fails to address the role gender plays and the politico-economic structures that underpin women’s low entry rates to tourism-related economic activities (Kabeer, 2007). Furthermore, tourism development literature often leaves the link between femininity and the social reproductive economy unquestioned as many tourism development programs are actually based on the presumption that women’s primary responsibility is to the family (Momsen, 2004). However, first a description of how the social reproductive economy is conceptualised within this paper is warranted with a focus on how gendered politico-economic structures interact to constitute the reproductive economy as feminised.

2.2 Social reproduction as the economy’s ‘feminised’ other

“Social reproduction is the glue that keeps households and societies together and active”
(Hoskyns and Rai, 2007, p. 297)

Social reproduction refers to the tasks involved in the “maintenance of life on a daily basis and intergenerationally” (Laslett and Brenner, 1989, p. 382) and is a dynamic, inclusive way of perceiving not only what feminists call the “care economy” (England and Folbre, 2003, p. 61) in which “caring labour” (Folbre, 2003, p. 214) is perceived as the activities that help meet the needs of others, but also wider questions of power and production (Bakker and Gill, 2003). By questioning the interplay between states, markets and the household in the reproduction of the labour force, the concept of social reproduction can help reveal the underlying hierarchy that distinguishes the economic from the “political and cultural superstructure” (Vosko, 2003, p. 331). One of the true strengths of using
the concept of social reproduction to investigate how gender structures social relations, is the opportunity to reveal the relationship between state policies, market strategies and the household, rather than just focusing on intra-household gender dynamics as ‘conventional’ feminists have done in the past (Luxton, 2006a). Indeed, recent feminist thought, places increased importance on the community’s role within social reproduction and suggests using the concept of the “care diamond” to include the community’s role in research that investigate the provision of social reproduction (Razavi, 2007, p. 20).

The social reproductive economy is frequently referred to as capitalism’s “feminised other” (Gibson-Graham, 2006, p. 7), perhaps because the majority of social reproductive economic activities are performed by women. Indicative of this is that in 2010, women in OECD countries spent at least twice the amount of time men spent, on caring (OECD, 2010). This gendered characterisation of social reproduction as feminised, brings with it perceptions of weakness, as weakness is often associated with femininity. Hence, the social reproductive economy is frequently seen as lacking efficiency and rationality by mainstream economists (Waylen, 2000). Accordingly, economic activities within the social reproductive economy, which are largely perceived of as a feminine responsibility, are deemed marginal to economic activities within the productive economy (Peterson, 2005). Furthermore, whilst the later activities are perceived of as belonging to the masculine domain, for most economists reproductive economic activities are perceived as feminine and often taken for granted (Hoskyns and Rai, 2007). Indeed Mies goes as far as to suggest that classical economists view reproductive economic activities as “free goods, like sunshine or water” (2007, p. 269). However, what is intriguing is that “marginal” economic practices such as the reproductive economy’s activities actually account for more hours worked than ‘productive’ sector activities (Gibson-Graham, 2008, p. 617).

Perceptions regarding the significance of social reproduction as a set of economic activities, are changing, as indicated in recent advancements in political economy literature. For example Ferguson’s (2010b) study of female tourism workers in Central America, pays attention to the reproductive economy’s significance in explaining the experiences of female entrepreneurs and how these roles are affected by gendered and politico-economic structures. More specifically, borrowing the term “social reproduction” (Bakker and Silvey, 2008b, p. 3) from political economy literature to describe the reproductive economy or what is known as the ‘economy’s feminised other’ can provide a nuanced lens through which to investigate how the reproductive economy and the productive economy interact.
In contrast to classical political economy which focuses on policies and monetised production, feminist political economy concentrates on gender and the reproductive side of the economy in constituting production and exchange relations (Bakker and Silvey, 2008a). Hence taking a political economy view is useful in conceptualising how economic activities, such as that of female entrepreneurship, operate within tourism by making links between women’s roles as producers and reproducers (Andrew, 2003). Indicative of the analytical strength that can be gained, by using the political economy concept of social reproduction within this study, is the potential to analyse “social relations as they relate to the economic system of production” (Bezanson and Luxton, 2006a, p. 12). This allows us to study society as an integrated whole rather than analysing the productive and reproductive spheres separately. Taking a political economy approach to this study can also reveal the power inherent in social relations, such as gender roles, within economic activities such as tourism entrepreneurship. Indeed there is a gap in political economy literature as it either focuses on issues of the household economy or theorisations of production relations, and rarely combines the two (LeBaron, 2010). This gap is where the current study can contribute, by adding to what can be known about the relationship between the productive and social reproductive elements of the economy.

Social reproduction focuses on the everyday by exploring the ways in which political economic events impact and are impacted by human beings’ daily life and so is particularly good for analysing gender relations which are the products of everyday social interactions (LeBaron, 2010). These delicate, everyday, social interactions often go unobserved by authors looking at life-changing events, but are fundamental to feminist analyses, such as this one, which are guided by the ontology that knowledge is situated in social interactions being reconstituted over time. Furthermore, a better picture of women’s role in today’s economic reality can be obtained if women are made empirically visible. This visibility can be achieved by investigating women’s gendered social reproduction roles. Making women visible within the economic reality is what Peterson (2005) refers to as an “indispensable project” (p. 501) as it reveals how politico-economic structures are gendered, encouraging us to question how structures such as entrepreneurship are embedded in masculine discourses and how these may impact upon women’s agency. This type of analysis is especially significant in a climate of economic crisis which can act to institutionalise women’s roles within social reproduction, as new poverty programs rely upon women’s altruism at the service of the state to ensure familial and community survival (Bedford and Rai, 2010).

When talking about economic realities, it is useful to conceptualise what activities social reproduction consists of. Social reproduction can be seen to include “the activities and attitudes, behaviours and emotions, responsibilities and relationships directly involved in the maintenance of
life on a daily basis and intergenerationally” (Laslett and Brenner, 1989, p. 382). Social reproduction is a process that involves education, emotional support, parenting, domestic tasks and other types of social care and also includes less tangible elements such as love, relationships, patience and solidarity which form particularly important cohesive social structures (Ferguson, 2010b).

So, social reproduction includes not only the physical tasks required for social provisioning such as, for example, cooking and cleaning, but also what Katz (2001) calls the “fleshy, messy, indeterminate stuff of everyday life” (p. 711). An example of this ‘stuff’ is the cultural reproduction via the assimilation of shared knowledge and values or the emotive and non-commodifiable activities, such as providing reassurance to worried partners. Whilst difficult to completely define due to its fluid nature, social reproduction is a very important part of the economy and indeed has been characterised as the global economy’s “invisible heart” (Kunz, 2010, p. 914). Radical feminists such as Federici (2012) argue that all these emotional and physical activities have been delegated to women through years of socialisation, transforming housework into “an act of love” (p. 17) by providing a female servant for the male worker who is ever-willing to perform emotive acts such as propping up one’s ego, altruistically. The perception that all social reproductive activities are performed ‘naturally’ by women is one of the reasons why less attention is paid to social reproduction’s more fluid elements which are however essential to society’s functioning. The other reason is because “the vast terrain of love, friendship, sleep and dreams, sickness and death as well as religious, scientific and artistic activity” (Caffentzis, 2002, p. 8) which make up social reproduction, are difficult to measure and are reproduced in a form that cannot be commodified and so of less importance to number-crunching classical economists (England and Folbre, 2003). However, from a feminist economics perspective, it is of significant value to consider all the activities included within social reproduction as they contribute to an understanding of how social relations operate to define the social organisation of labour.

Looking at literature dealing with social reproduction, to date, most studies have mainly focused on issues relating to privatisation, human trafficking and sex work, women and work, migration and labour, development programs for women and assisted reproductive technologies (Bakker and Silvey, 2008a). However scarce literature can be found on the role social reproduction plays within tourism processes. Indeed, addressing the relationship between social reproduction, gender roles and the productive economy is rarely looked into by any industry, despite the potential for a better insight into the structures supporting the economy and consequently a better

---

2 Social reproduction can be in fact considered a contradiction of terms as social relations are located in the realm of freedom, whereas reproduction is related to bonds of blood and hence compulsory relations (Caffentzis, 2002)
understanding of how the economy is affected by political and socio-economic factors. Few authors have addressed the issue of how shifts in gender roles brought on by tourism development relate to changes in social reproduction duties for female entrepreneurs, which is where this study aims to fill a gap in knowledge.

Initially, by considering one of the most common activities essential to tourism entrepreneurs’ social reproduction, cooking, I shall progress to show how gender, which operates to organise social relations, acts to organise the social reproductive labour practices of feeding the family. Next, I investigate how various components of social reproduction such as cooking and caring are governed by gendered ideologies; how social reproduction can be viewed as a commodity; and the issues associated with this. I will also provide a focus on how men and children experience their involvement in social reproduction and the role gender has in shaping these experiences and finally, how economic crises affect the social reproductive economy. Taking cooking as illustrative of an everyday social reproduction activity that is gendered, I delve into literature surrounding the discourses that perpetuate the connection between feminine subjectivities and cooking.

2.2.1 Cooking as a gendered social reproductive activity

The way in which gendered assumptions related to the social reproductive economy transgress into the productive economy is illustrated by the predominance of women working as cooks within tourism as seen in research in Belize (Gentry, 2007) and in China (Ling et al., 2013). Feeding the family as a social reproductive activity, besides providing the family with nutritional sustenance also requires the input of caring, sensitivity to needs and planning and so, essentially, cooking is a significant social reproductive activity (Cairns et al., 2010). However, this caring activity also operates as a way of doing gender as DeVault’s (1991) seminal studies on food and gender indicate, where women are assumed to have a natural inclination to maintain their family’s health. Indeed, there is a historical link between cooking and femininity which serves to reproduce gendered assumptions about women’s responsibility to undertake cooking within the family (Hook, 2010). For example, Pearson (2000) points out how in Nigeria, especially cooking, is considered as ‘women’s work’, not to be undertaken by men. One of the reasons that women are held responsible for this social reproductive task is based on gendered assumptions that women are ‘naturally’ better at this act as they have been trained from a young age how to cook.

Indeed ideals of what a good wife consists of are moulded by a woman’s ability to perform this social reproductive task, as seen in female tourism entrepreneurs in Mukono, studied by Boonabaana and Tucker (2011), who express this by saying: “if you don’t do that (cook for him, serve him), you are actually not like a wife” (p. 13). Furthermore, this social reproductive activity has a
generational dimension, as it tends to be more frequently older women who assume cooking as their responsibility, cooking both for their family and for extended family members. As Tucker (2007) observes in Goreme, Turkey this is why older women who also engage in tourism entrepreneurship express feeling a particularly increased workload, often devising innovative methods of combining working and cooking by, for example, getting up before sunrise to prepare food.

However, tourism is altering gendered expectations from female workers to provide cooked meals for their families. Looking at female tourism workers in Central America, Ferguson (2011b) suggests that tourism has meant a turn away from women’s labour-intensive preparation of meals, towards market-based consumptive practices such as ready-meals from supermarkets. Defining consumption as a set of social and material practices, including the purchase of food and the cooking of it, as well as less tangible activities such as attitudes towards money, Ferguson (2011b) argues that changes in consumption are occurring because tourism development brings an increased culture of consumerism which shapes social activities and consequently gender roles as well. Hence, as women become producers through working in tourism, consumption no longer represents a largely feminised ‘leisure’ occupation, but rather an activity necessary for survival, and it is this change in relations of consumption and production that is swaying gender relations (Ferguson, 2011b). As financial control has passed into the hands of women, they have more power, but at the same time, they are still held responsible for arranging the family’s daily sustenance, which means that social reproductive gender roles related to providing food for the family remain connected to femininity. So, from the example of female tourism workers in Central America, it is obvious that the gendered implications surrounding cooking gender roles, that arise from women’s involvement in tourism work, are complex.

Despite changing discourses regarding gender equality, feminist interrogations of this gendered social reproduction task find that even today, women continue to do the majority of cooking with men only having an assistant role (Aarseth and Olsen, 2008). The relationship between masculinity and food is described in terms of men helping out at special occasions or preparing food as a profession, whereas the link between a specific type of dietary element, meat, and masculinity is prominent within society (Neuhaus, 2003). This gendered nature of the social reproductive activity of cooking is also documented by other authors such as Fenstermaker and West (2013) who elaborate on the role of gender in cooking and how men’s roles are related to going to the butcher and taking on a helping role in providing the family’s cooked meals. The way in which women often support the limited role men play in cooking indicates how women are often “held hostage” (Legerski and Cornwall, 2010, p. 466) to their caring responsibilities by trying to preserve their husband’s masculinity as expressed through non-participation in the feminised social reproduction task of
cooking. For example in Legerski and Cornwall’s (2010) study, female participants praise their husbands’ help with cooking even though this is limited to occasionally grilling meat as one of her participants says: “...he likes to grill. He’ll grill for us, but we don’t have as much meat as we used to” (p. 466).

With regards to the state’s role in providing assistance in the social reproductive activity of cooking, limited assistance is provided, and then only to the very old, very young or disabled as they are the only ones considered ‘eligible’ for state social reproductive care as they are assumed unable to offer in a productive manner (Jochimsen, 2003). Accordingly, the elderly and disabled are sometimes beneficiaries of state-led ‘home help’ programs that, in Greece for example, provide poor elderly people who are disabled with a daily cooked meal, company and help with daily activities (City of Athens, 2013, Social cooperation of West Athens, 2013). Shifts in policies led by the neoliberal idea that each individual is capable of self-care, result in a focus on children rather than their caregivers’ well-being as observed in Canada by LeBaron (2010). This, however, overlooks the correlation between parental and child well-being (i.e. if the parents are poor, so will be the children) (Benjamin et al., 2009, Fox, 2006). This leads on to the next topic of interest within social reproduction literature that talks to how politico-economic and socio-cultural structures act to maintain gendered constructs within caring.

2.2.2 Caring from a politico-economic angle

Care of the elderly and children is a major element of social reproductive economic activities, for which women are primarily held responsible (Federici, 2012). The current trend for what Kunz (2010) terms the “re-privatisation” (p. 915) of social reproduction, that sees the state’s withdrawal from help with social reproductive activities such as eldercare and childcare, can result in the caring activities that formerly took place in public spaces such as day-care centres and elderly homes, being relocated back to the private sphere or outsourced to the market. However, caution should be exercised in applying this key argument in feminist political economy theorising across countries and cultures. As Kunz (2010) points in the context of rural Mexico, social reproduction has always been a private matter and help from the welfare state has been progressively withdrawn. Hence, there are various aspect of social reproduction that should be taken into consideration when theorising and it is important to keep in mind that all situations are context-bound. However, research shows that in general, women have disproportionately assumed the costs and responsibilities associated with these relocated tasks (Bezanson and Luxton, 2006a), which causes a dissonance with the increasing need for women to work since a double wage has become essential for familial survival within the economic climate in Europe. This raises the question of how women negotiate gendered social
reproductive responsibilities and what role the state and economic structures play in these negotiations.

One of the increasingly important caring responsibilities that women have to juggle with working commitments is that of caring for elderly relatives.

2.2.2.1 **Eldercare**

Throughout the developed world and especially in urban China which is rapidly developing (Liu et al., 2010), the combination of an increasingly aging population and women’s increased labour market participation has created important policy changes in caring for the elderly. This indicates how caring for the elderly as a social reproductive activity is still largely dependent on women for its completion, as when women enter the workplace, policy changes regarding how the elderly will be cared for, become necessary (Liu et al., 2010). Furthermore, studies that point to a negative correlation between female employment and the need to provide eldercare (Kotsadam, 2010), indicate how eldercare is perceived as a feminine occupation. In countries with minimal state provision for eldercare, such as in Greece, which has one of the lowest institutional provisions for eldercare in Europe, informal care-giving largely falls to close family members and friends and this is the most common method of completing this social reproductive task (Viitanen, 2010). Hence, the ways in which cultural and religious norms reinforce the connection between femininity and this type of social reproduction, also need to be considered.

In countries with highly ‘familistic’ cultures (Papadopoulos and Roumpakis, 2009) such as those of Southern European countries, the reliance on strong family bonds to provide eldercare often accounts for the perpetuation of entrenched gender norms regarding whose responsibility it is to care for the elderly. This cultural structure that relocates care onto female relatives also provides a springboard for policies to selectively ignore eldercare as a state responsibility. Cultural norms that expect women to undertake eldercare are connected to notions of feminine responsibility for caring and even women who work, are expected to continue taking care of their elderly relatives. For example, female entrepreneurs in Morocco, Turkey and the South Pacific islands who heavily rely on family bonds for the caring of elderly are all held responsible for their elderly relatives’ care (Essers and Benschop, 2007, Saffu, 2003). The assignment of this task to women is linked to notions of women having a ‘natural’ proclivity to care, whereas men who provide care are considered, even by women, as “terrific” and “fantastic” (Saffu, 2003, p. 278). This illustrates the extent to which gender norms are deeply embedded within discourses surrounding caring as seen in work on informal care-giving by Luxton (2006b).
In Lazaridis’ (2009) study of Cretan female artisan entrepreneurs, the mentality that eldercare should not be outsourced is evident as one participant laments: “...some, in the cities, put their relatives in geriatric institutions and leave them to rot. But this is unacceptable, it is cruel and shameful. Only heartless women do this” (p. 162). However, despite the prevailing attitudes that eldercare should not be outsourced, many Greek families choose an intermediate solution, that of hiring migrant labour to take care of elderly relatives in their houses. In this way they negotiate the need for outsourcing eldercare with cultural pressures for not outsourcing it, by choosing to outsource the care of their elderly relatives, ‘in-house’ (Catarino et al., 2013, Lyberaki, 2011).

Another type of social reproductive activity that is of significance is that of childcare, which shall now be examined in terms of the gendered politico-economic and socio-cultural frameworks it is situated within.

2.2.2.2 Childcare

To economists, childcare is important because it is the means of reproducing the next generation of labour power but also because it constitutes a basic human right. The later is officially recognised by policies such as the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child which stipulates that “The nation shall provide appropriate assistance to parents in child-raising” (Folbre, 2006, p. 190). Indeed, parents are obliged to provide adequate childcare for their children and are prosecuted if they fail to do so, entering a social contract of reciprocity when they decide to have children. However this contract is often based on gendered norms with men being expected to provide the income and women the childcare (England and Folbre, 2003).

Childcare, much like eldercare is performed largely by women, that is the dominant way in which this gendered distribution of social reproductive labour occurs, to such an extent that Federici (2012) comments that “the only true labour saving devices women have used in the ‘70s, have been contraceptives” (p. 47). The increase in unpaid labour performed by women when children are added to the familial equation is dramatic (Hewitson, 2003), whereas, interestingly, men’s contribution to the household is seen to decrease according to some studies (Astone et al., 2010). Historically, the exclusion of men from childcare is largely because of the increase in diversity of market skills required (i.e. no longer is it sufficient for fathers to teach children their skill) and the fathers’ increasing inability to provide children with property. Since these male roles within childcare have been removed due to economic structures that favour specialisation and render men unable to buy freehold property, the only way men can contribute, is by providing for the family so that the children can remain at home, not work and get years of formal education (Fox, 2006).
Whilst altering economic structures accounts to some extent for the feminisation of caring, religious structures can also reinforce the connection between femininity and childcare by exerting moral pressure on people to conform to these ideals. Religious institutions’ impact on gender roles is significant, as they reinforce patriarchal and economical values based on women’s primary role as caregiver (Inglehart and Norris, 2003). For example, according to Greek Orthodox religion, women are seen to be associated with both Eve and Mary (Du Boulay, 1986). When fulfilling their roles as mothers, women are likened to Mary, the mother of Christ and thus perceived in a positive light, whereas outside this role, they are likened to Eve and thus perceived as the ‘root of all evil’. This religious influence on gendered social reproductive roles is also linked to concepts of shame and honour and is seen within other religions such as Islam, where again, women are encouraged to perform their roles as mothers and wives to the exclusion of other ‘shameful’ roles such as entrepreneurs (Essers and Benschop, 2007). However where public welfare structures are present and women’s participation in the labour market is high, this seems to ameliorate religion’s influence on gender norms, indicating how religiosity is connected to political economic structures of social reproduction (Seguino, 2011).

When talking about the ‘family’ it is prudent to emphasise the problematic of conceptualising this as being a nuclear family, consisting of two heterosexual parents and children, as the social reproduction of families with alternative arrangements are pushed to the margin of analysis (Bergeron, 2011). Current childcare policies are largely geared towards nuclear families, thus exposing how childcare is welded to hetero-normative gender norms and how such welfare policies can act to perpetuate these gendered norms. However, as the empirical research for this study is undertaken in the context of Greek society, where nuclear families are largely the norm and is what the author herself, perceives as a ‘family’, the focus will be on nuclear family structures. These nuclear families consist of two heterosexual parents and children. Grandparents are located at close proximity of the periphery of the nuclear family, but rarely live in the same house as the nuclear family. Hence, when I refer to ‘families’ in this study, this is how they are perceived in this study.

Even though childcare is a social reproductive activity which has historically been done within the family, this is just one possible institution where it can be completed, with the market, the community and the state being the other institutions (Laslett and Brenner, 1989).

2.2.2.3 Families as ‘intensive’ care units

The way in which families distribute childcare amongst the market, the community and the state is of interest and relates both to state policies, market forces and cultural norms. Whilst these norms vary from family to family, the underlying current trend within developed countries is
underpinned by motherhood ideals that evolved in response to capitalist demands on the reorganisation of childcare to be a feminine responsibility (LeBaron, 2010). Increasingly within developed countries, for example in the US, motherhood ideals are veering towards what Fox (2006) terms “intensive mothering” (p. 237) which involves the constant nurturing of the child, putting the child’s needs before the mother’s and the belief that the child is priceless. Whilst this is increasingly prominent in Western societies, it is also related to class as staying at home all day with a child means that one income is enough. One expression of ‘intensive mothering’ demands, is illustrated in the proliferation of ‘shadow education’ which is often in the form of private after-school tutoring (Bray, 2010). This trend highlights how social reproductive needs relating to childcare are changing, with parents putting a premium on their children’s education with such an intensity that results in parents assuming “intensive education” (Davies, 2004, p. 238) ideals with regards to their parental duties.

The onus of responding to the intensive demands of performing according to these ‘intensive care’ ideals, largely falls on women, which is revealed in instances when women diverge from completing these social reproductive tasks. Even in some countries in the Global South where ‘intensive mothering’ ideals are less prominent, female tourism workers are often blamed for the decline in family life because their working commitments mean they cannot be constantly supervising their children (Ferguson, 2010b). It is interesting to note however, that in other contexts, such as that of post-revolutionary Nicaragua (Cupples, 2005), where poverty levels are high, motherhood ideals regarding childcare differ with female entrepreneurs being blamed for not economically providing for their children rather than for inadequately supervising them like in Ferguson’s (2010b) study of female workers in Central America.

2.2.2.4 How gender permeates state policies for childcare

Working women are reacting to these intensive social reproductive requirements on their time and energy in several ways, one of which is delaying marriage and having children. The rise in mean age of a mother at the birth of her first child is rising globally, as seen in research by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that states that in the 1970s women gave birth at around 20 years of age, where as in 2009, women gave birth at an average age of 29 (OECD, 2014). For example in Greece, women’s mean age at childbirth rose from 25 years old in 1970 to 28.8 years old in 2009 (Mathews and Hamilton, 2009), indicating how women prioritise work and study over adhering to primary caring roles. Indeed, some women are taking it to another level, as Kabeer (2007) points out that an increasing number of women opt to remain childless in response to the gendered nature of intensive economic demands. The state’s role in ameliorating this emerging crisis in social reproduction is crucial, as seen in how women who opt to remain childless are likely to be
persuaded to have a child if policy measures such as subsidised childcare and paid maternity leave are put in place. For example, Nordic countries with high percentages of welfare spending combine high levels both of fertility and female employment (Tanturri and Mencarini, 2005). In other instances, women choose single motherhood in reaction to the intense demands on their caring activities, as seen in international literature. In Nicaragua, female entrepreneurs choose single motherhood as opposed to having their unemployed husband who is unwilling to engage in reproductive work, to also care for (Cupps, 2005). Another way in which women raise their voices against the idea that childcare is an activity directly associated with feminine subjectivities is by collectively demanding childcare facilities from the state as the female artisan entrepreneurs in Kunz’s (2010) study did in an attempt to resolve the tension between productive and social reproductive demands.

For families who are not able to survive on one income, state solutions to social reproductive needs such as day-care centres can be called upon. Day-care centres are the result of policies aimed both at providing assistance with parental care but also encouraging more women to work. However issues of trust of daycentres which are compounded by the adherence to ‘intensive mothering’ ideals, often dissuade parents from sending their children to public daycare centres (Aassve et al., 2012). Indeed, in large cities where state provision of cheap daycare centres is insufficient, marketised solutions may not be feasible for lower income families. Furthermore, a lack of policy provision for children under three years old leaves a gap in the provision of state help for this social reproductive activity. Indicative of this type of policy is the EU childcare policy that says that “members-states should provide childcare for 90% of children between 3 years old and mandatory school age” (Stratigaki, 2004, p. 49). This gap in state provision of childcare is often filled by kinship structures such as grandparental care (Jappens and Van Bavel, 2012).

2.2.2.5 Grandma ‘power’ as a social reproductive resource

In Europe, grandparents are a social reproductive resource that many families rely upon for childcare, especially when both parents work (Jappens and Van Bavel, 2012). The number of families relying on grandparental childcare differs among various European states, depending on childcare policies such as parental leave and daycare centres, but also on cultural beliefs regarding whose responsibility it is to perform this task (European Commission, 2012). For example in 2004, in Greece, 43% of families relied on grandparental childcare in comparison to the average of 14% in Continental Europe (Lyberaki, 2011). The extent to which families rely on grandparents for the provision of this social reproductive duty also varies according to context, as highlighted by studies showing that grandparental childcare is relied upon as a more permanent solution in Mediterranean countries where familistic welfare systems are in place, rather than as a temporary solution as it is in Northern
European countries where the state has a more dominant role in welfare provision (Hank and Buber, 2009).

The motivations for grandparents undertaking this social reproductive activity vary from a desire to participate in their grandchildren’s lives, to supporting their children’s financial position, but are also embedded in perceptions that caring is something that should remain within the family. This perception is also linked to how much parents trust public childcare facilities, as seen in studies that posit a correlation between grandparents being more inclined to help out with childcare duties and a lack of trust of public daycare facilities (Aassve et al., 2012). Characteristics common of childcare labour such as staff high turnover rates, act to compound this feeling of distrust of state childcare solutions, such as daycare centres, as the high turnover rates of daycare workers are perceived to affect the delivery of emotional and truly caring services to children (Folbre, 2003). However, even within grandparental childcare there is an embedded gendered association between femininity and caring as more female grandparents take on childcare responsibilities than male grandparents which arguably perpetuates gendered assumptions regarding social reproductive childcare responsibilities (Hank and Buber, 2009).

The various ways in which social reproductive activities such as childcare are distributed, is the subject of much feminist questioning regarding economic processes as it relates to the value embedded in social reproductive activities (Bakker and Silvey, 2008b, Steans and Tepe, 2010). Taking the social reproductive activity of childcare as an example to illustrate this point, whilst childcare is essential to perpetuate the future labour producers (without which any economic structure would be defunct), the value of this social reproductive activity is not reflected in market prices, as care-givers who provide care as a commodified product, are poorly paid (England and Folbre, 2003). It is these gendered and economic implications of social reproduction’s commodification that will be discussed next.

2.2.3 Social reproduction as a commodity: value, temporality, migrants, culture and mobility

When discussing the value of social reproductive activities, it is prudent to provide the scale on which these activities feature in the market. According to rough estimates by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), unpaid activities (which are mainly social reproductive activities) account for 70% of the world’s total output if valued at prevailing wages, and 69% of these activities are completed by women (Beneria, 2003). Although the transfer of social reproductive elements such as care services, to the market, arguably makes these elements visible in terms of economic value, an interrogation of what is constituted as valuable within current economic discourses is warranted (Kilkey and Perrons, 2010).
The globalised economy’s structure, that rewards individuals working for their own self-interest rather than for collective interests or ‘altruistic’ care of others is one of the ways in which what is valuable, is construed in a market that does not elicit caring (Beneria et al., 2000). The reasoning regarding value is underpinned by discourses imbibed in gendered assumptions regarding feminine roles as primary carers. One of the central concepts behind feminists asking for “wages for housework” (Federici, 2012, p. 19) is to uncover and dispense of housework’s “more insidious character as femininity” (Federici, 2012, p. 19). The question of what value social reproduction currently has in the economy and how this relates to global service industries such as tourism, remains largely undefined (Ferguson, 2007a) thus making it an interesting subject to study from a feminist political economics perspective.

2.2.3.1 **The role of temporality in valuing social reproduction**

When interrogating social reproduction’s value, a feminist economics perspective reveals that activities largely completed by women are often undervalued simply because women’s time is construed as less valuable than men’s time (Folbre, 2003) and indeed construed by some neoclassical economists as “infinitely elastic” (Young, 2003, p. 113). Hence, perceiving economic activities’ value as the activity’s performativity in terms of time as suggested by Butler (1993), may be of more use in conceptualising the value attached to social reproduction. In corporate capitalism, the dynamism of time in conceptualising the value of economic activities speaks to the ability to value economic activities in terms of ability to restructure time rather than counting value in terms of ‘clock-time’ as in industrial capitalism when spatial separation of work-place and home were far more distinct than they are now (Adkins, 2009). Since the intensity with which women complete household tasks is greater than men’s, simply valuing economic activities in terms of labour time is not sufficient (Marazzi, 2007). However looking at how women’s time is transformed, is increasingly seen as a way in which to conceptualise how social reproductive activities are valued in a capitalist economy where value is increasingly based on immaterial and intellectual forms of capital rather than material assets (Grosz, 2000, Coleman, 2008).

The ways in which the temporal aspect of social reproductive activities’ value is gendered is illustrated in literature talking about ‘time poverty’, which is the lack of time to rest after working, being mainly experienced by women (Bardasi and Wodon, 2010). Furthermore, a growing body of literature on the correlation between well-being and the balance achieved between work and ‘free-time’ points to the increasing relevance of using concepts of temporality when trying to value economic activities (Goodin et al., 2008).
Time is of special significance to female tourism entrepreneurs as they often have exceedingly long work-days and trying to keep a balance between productive and social reproductive activities is difficult. Trying to keep a balance often gives rise to complex gender role negotiations amongst parents (Ferguson, 2010b) and to the re-structuring of social reproduction, with children taking on a more central role (Kunz, 2010). As modes of behaviour such as acting as a ‘rational agent’ or ‘caring mother’ are dependent on the time resources available, the type of market behaviour exhibited will arguably be modified by time (Himmelweit, 2003).

Adding the cultural context of each situation into considerations of time’s role in constructing discourses of value, is helpful in visualising how cultural specificities mould gendered conceptualisations of value. An example of this relates to how, in Greece, women are not supposed to have idle hours and are meant to appear constantly busy, which highlights how women’s time is devalued, as ‘sitting idle’ is related to power (and hence value) since it is a male prerogative (Herzfeld, 1991a). Hence when viewing social reproduction as a commodity with value, it is important to bear in mind that this value is intrinsically linked to the social contexts within which it is situated (Peterson, 2005). Instrumental to viewing social reproduction as a commodity with value is the trend for social reproduction to be privatised, which is a result of increased emphasis on individual responsibility for social reproduction, as states adopt increasingly popular neo-liberal ideologies (Jenson, 2004, Katz, 2001).

2.2.3.2 The privatisation of social reproduction and migrants’ role

As, especially within post-industrial countries such as Greece, new social contracts are adopted, governments increasingly opt-out of service provision, and welfare provision is contracted out to private businesses or individuals instead (Bakker and Silvey, 2008a). This increased encroachment of monetary relations into aspects of social reproduction causes a process of marketization of social reproduction to occur. Proliferation of research into the effects of the increased commodification and subsequent privatisation of social reproduction arises because of the increased realisation that economic analyses fail to include social reproduction activities as essential components of economic analyses (Hoskyns and Rai, 2007). This lack of inclusion of social reproduction as an economic activity is highlighted by an impending depletion of social reproduction (Rai and Thomas, 2011, Rai et al., 2013) in the face of diminishing capabilities of individuals to cope with combining both productive and social reproductive economic demands, despite the apparent availability of commodified care solutions.

In many post-industrial countries, migrants have been instrumental in taking up the slack that social welfare cuts have left in the provision of social reproductive assistance by becoming the cooks,
cleaners, nannies and elder-carers of the world’s affluent (Arat-Koc, 2006, Kabeer, 2007). The state plays a significant role in the facilitation of the continuing feminisation of responsibility. Introducing visa programs that ensure the supply of cheap domestic in the US and Canada (Katz, 2001) is an example of how the state contributes to the perpetuation of feminised poverty (Chant, 2007). So although the commodification of social reproduction is symbolically meant to signify the construction of new, empowered femininities as women are ‘free’ from domestic work, in effect they are just off-loading it to other, less affluent women, as commodified social reproductive labour remains largely feminised (Ehrenreich and Hochschild, 2003). This observation also reveals how class operates within social reproduction.

Off-loading social reproduction responsibilities from affluent women to poorer women does little to alter the gendered nature of distribution of social reproductive activities as women are still held responsible for organising domestic help arrangements (Kilkey and Perrons, 2010), thus effectively helping affluent men to continue avoiding responsibility for social reproductive activities. Empirical studies, such as Ferguson’s (2010b) study of Central American female workers, support the idea that commodification of social reproduction is more class-based, as turning to privatisation (i.e. getting paid help with domestic tasks) is a solution chosen by more affluent female entrepreneurs. So rather than acting as a way in which to relieve women’s ‘double burden’ and thus promoting greater gender equality, global chains of commodified care encourage increasing widening disparities in wages and living standards. This facilitates the ‘consumption’ of migrants who perform commodified social reproduction, for social status (Kabeer, 2007). So rather than solve the problem of inequality in the gendered distribution of social reproductive activities, in reality, the increased commodification of social reproduction acts to transform society by adding class and racial dimensions to social reproduction distribution patterns (LeBaron, 2010).

However, in order to get a more complete picture of the complex web of inter-related influences on how gender penetrates social reproduction, culture’s role within economic activities needs to be investigated.

2.2.3.3 Culture’s role within gendered economic activities

Social reproduction’s commodification on the gendered distribution and responsibilisation of social reproduction is not only affected by politico-economic structures, but also cultural beliefs surrounding care. In Greece, state policies encouraging the entry of women into the labour market, combined with relaxed policies regarding the entrance of immigrants into the country, saw the high influx of migrants into Greece to fulfil the growing demand for domestic help (Vaiou, 2006). However, as cultural mechanisms of ‘honour and shame’ maintain the link between femininity and
caring, this increase in availability of commodified social reproduction did not play an instrumental role in the re-negotiation of social reproductive gender roles and relations (Lyberaki, 2011).

Cultural beliefs add complexity to negotiations of social reproduction within the family as modern pressures to increase economic status clash with entrenched ideals of feminised caring, producing varied responses. Whilst many middleclass women in Greece and elsewhere (Fox, 2006) see hiring domestic help as a way of increasing their status, which is increasingly socially accepted, cultural perceptions regarding outsiders ‘polluting’ the family environment (Dubisch, 1993) persist, limiting the extent to which social reproduction is commodified. The idea of commodified social reproduction being an unwanted intrusion into family life is influenced by ‘honour and shame’ principles as well as the need to confine gossip outside the household (Tucker, 2010, Tucker and Boonabaana, 2011). Speaking specifically to the social reproductive element of eldercare, Lazaridis (2009) points out how female relatives are expected to care for elderly relatives at the risk of being labelled ‘ungrateful’ and ‘selfish’, rather than outsourcing the care by putting their elderly relatives in elderly people’s care homes. This indicates how cultural beliefs concerning social reproductive gender roles continue to exist and influence economic structures.

Apart from cultural factors, various industries have specific characteristics that influence how gender operates within social reproduction. Tourism, which is the industry this study is primarily interested in investigating, is characterised by mobility which brings its own nuances regarding how economically active individuals operate within the social reproductive sphere.

2.2.3.4 Mobile social reproduction and gender

There is an increasing body of literature that speaks to the implications mobility has for economic relations, mostly focusing on the relations of production (Duncan et al., 2013, Sheller and Urry, 2004). One effect that mobility within tourism has is to disrupt and destabilise both the accumulation process and the completion of social reproductive activities, as tourism workers often have to move in order to find work (Brenner and Theodore, 2002). An example of this mobility is seen in the way tourism employees frequently relocate to tourist sites in search of tourism-related work, thus making their accumulation process mobile by relocating the site of production. However, less has been written on the details of how social reproductive activities are completed when capitalism acts as an “unsettled, dissolute, irresponsible stalker of the world” (Katz, 2001, p. 709) by transferring tourism employees’ relocated social reproductive needs to the site of production.

Although keeping social reproduction at the place of production is significant in terms of economic consequences and is often a subject of political action to avoid spatial transfers of wealth
(Sevenhuijsen, 2003), rarely are interrogations made into the complex socio-cultural and politico-economic structures underlying it (Katz, 2001). Furthermore, whilst literature speaks to the connection between gender and mobility (Cresswell and Uteng, 2008), little research has been done to investigate the interplay between gendered mobilities, production and social reproduction.

Because of the lack of policies to deal with the disruption in social reproduction caused by tourism’s multifaceted nature, men and children’s roles in completing social reproduction, also alter.

2.2.4 Men’s roles within social reproduction

Both men’s and children’s roles within the social reproductive sphere of the economy are limited. One of reasons for men’s limited contribution to social reproductive economic activities is embedded in historical socio-economic structures. Whilst in the pre-industrial economy, women, men, children, production and social reproduction where all interrelated and interactional, industrialisation created a separation between production and social reproduction and male and feminine tasks (Laslett and Brenner, 1989). This created ideals for feminine completion of the majority of the family’s social reproduction, whereas the male partner was considered the ‘breadwinner’ and hence the family’s productive element. Much current literature explains men’s limited role in completing domestic tasks as being a consequence of men’s socialisation as primary breadwinners, an acculturation process which starts from a young age (Adams and Coltrane, 2005, Pinto and Coltrane, 2013). Indeed having breadwinner status is so closely associated with hegemonic masculinity and thus social identity and status that the intense inability to provide financially such as in economic crises when male unemployment peaks, has serious consequences, such as increased male suicide rates (Thébaud, 2010).

Although feminist writers such as Federici (2012) adamantly blame men as being solely responsible for their limited contribution to social reproductive tasks, women also perpetuate stereotypical notions of what a man is able to do. For example, women exclude men from social reproduction by considering them unable to complete such tasks (Salamone and Stanton, 1986). This attitude arises from the ‘intensive mothering’ ideals that Fox (2006) talks about where mothers exclude men from helping with social reproductive tasks by perceiving themselves to be the “best person for the job” (p. 237). Furthermore, women have a role in perpetuating the idea that men should be the primary breadwinners. Women’s role in maintaining the connection between masculinity and breadwinning (to the exclusion of a link between masculinity and social reproduction) is seen in Mannon’s (2006) participants who indicate that they are more irritated by their husbands’ inability to take on the main breadwinner role rather than at their husbands’ aversion to domestic roles.
However, men’s role in clinging to ideals of masculinity related to breadwinning to the exclusion of male ideals related to social reproduction should not be overlooked. In some countries, social reproduction is frequently considered a feminine occupation as seen in Pearson’s (2000) analysis of studies from Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Tanzania and Equador. Complexity arises regarding the reasons that justify men’s lack of involvement in ‘women’s work’. Lazaridis’s (2009) Greek female entrepreneur-participants refer to social reproduction being classified as ‘women’s work’ because men are unwilling to participate in domestic tasks, thus using agency to deny involvement. However Mannon (2006) argues that male non-participation in social reproduction tasks may be non-agentic as men attempt to preserve “the remaining vestiges of masculine identity” (p. 513), especially when men are unemployed and thus not engaging in productive work which they consider part of their masculine identity. Indeed, much development literature, e.g. Kabeer’s (2007), Brickell’s (2011) and Chant’s (2002) research supports the notion that men’s lack of affinity to social reproductive tasks is related to preserving their masculine identity in the face of their declining ability to fulfil breadwinner roles. These authors stress and that this is occurring because of the gendered social structures limiting men to certain pre-described roles, rather than men simply being unwilling or lazy.

However, masculine roles within social reproduction seem to be changing, with more men taking on at least ‘assistant’ social reproductive roles, especially when their financial contributions to the family are intact as in the case of men studied in the Philippines (Parreñas, 2005). This is an incremental change and perhaps not in line with women’s exponential increase in productive work. However, as Ferguson (2010b) observes, even though female tourism workers in Central America complain that their husbands are not involved in housework “in any substantive manner” (p. 881), they do indicate that men are at least now taking an assistant’s role within social reproduction. In the context of Vietnamese men whose wives have migrated in search of work and leave their husbands to care for the children, Hoang and Yeoh (2011) observe that there is now more flexibility in accepting men’s involvement in social reproductive activities connected with femininity such as childcare, indicating how changes in family structure and mobility can increase the fluidity of social reproductive gender roles.

Policies related to providing assistance with social reproduction and labour market conditions also play an essential role in the configuration of gendered social reproduction expectations from men. A recent EU report (European Commission, 2012) finds that men’s choices regarding engaging with social reproductive activities is largely influenced by the labour conditions that accept men’s care-giving roles. Taking childcare policies as an example to illustrate how policy can affect the gendering of social reproduction, the report notes that in Iceland, where paternity leave is the
highest in Europe, men have become much more involved in childcare than men in other European countries with lower levels of paternity leave allowance (European Commission, 2012).

Although childcare takes up a significant portion of social reproductive activities, children can also play a significant role in completing social reproductive activities and investigations into this aspect of social reproduction are becoming increasingly significant within political economy studies as illustrated by Kunz (2010).

2.2.5 Children’s expanding role within social reproduction

Children’s role within social reproduction is an emerging field of interest as most studies on children’s roles as economic actors have focused on their role within the productive economy. The concept of children as economic actors (either in the productive or the social reproductive sphere) comes into antithesis with global models (based on the UN Convention on the Right of the Child (United Nations Human Rights, 1989)) of childhood as being a care-free time when children spend most of their time in pursuit of education and recreation (Ansell, 2005, Katz, 2004). This care-free notion of childhood, has been reinforced by policies that outlaw under-age employment and make education compulsory until a certain age (Laslett and Brenner, 1989). Public policies, such as the UN Convention on the Right of the Child, stipulate that nations should provide assistance to parents in child-raising (Folbre, 2006). Whilst this protects children from exploitative relationships where children are viewed as easy-to-manipulate, low-paid workers, it also brings to the fore how Western interpretations of childhood view children as “marginal people whose activities matter less than adults” (Watson, 2004, p. 10). However in the face of global economic restructuring, one of the effects of which is the migration of women to become maids and child-carers of the affluent, children’s new roles as “nannies, workers, protectors and much more” (Kunz, 2010, p. 928) are challenging the care-free childhood models.

In research on Mexican children whose mothers have migrated (Kunz, 2010), children are seen to take a more central role in the completion of social reproductive activities. A comparable trend is observed in rural Vietnam where children left behind by migrant mothers (Thao and Agergaard, 2012), report completing more domestic tasks in their mother’s absence. This also prompts complex negotiations of social reproduction gender roles as mothers still retain responsibility for social reproduction but it is the children and the fathers who actually carry it out.

Drawing parallels between tourism’s time-engulfing effects on parents and the spatial relocation of migrant parents which results in a reduced availability of parental childcare time, it will be interesting to interrogate what effect tourism has on children’s roles within social reproduction.
and how children’s contributions may affect gendered interpretations of what constitutes ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ social reproductive activities, as there is little literature speaking to this. As parents and often the closest relatives who can help with social reproduction are also engaged in tourism, children’s contribution to social reproductive tasks could follow the trend of those children whose mothers have migrated. Despite children’s increased contributions to social reproduction, they occupy a weak household bargaining position and are rarely treated as equals to adults, which further complicates the question of what role children play in the negotiation of social reproductive gender roles within tourism.

Cultural expectations that children and families have reciprocal rights and responsibilities to provide care in times of need is a significant consideration to take into account when analysing how children’s contributions to social reproductive activities may affect social reproduction gender roles. For example in Greece (Lazaridis, 2009, Vanderbeck, 2007), children are embedded within this reciprocal agreement from a young age and hence children helping with domestic tasks defy global understandings of childhood, making this what Katz refers to as a “rescaling of childhood” (2001, p. 716). However, Katz’s focus on children is one of the few studies within political economy literature that focuses on children’s role within social reproduction. Most political economy literature either completely misses out children’s role (Balaam and Veseth, 2001), or refers to children’s role as producers, which often focuses on how children fall victims to exploitative relationships, making ‘child labour’ a stigmatised term (Stubbs and Underhill, 1999).

Literature discussing children’s role as producers, does give an indication of what children’s roles are within political economy. Culture’s role in children’s contribution to social reproduction is also significant because whilst Evans (2010) finds minimal gendering in the social reproductive tasks that African children carry out, in Greece social reproductive tasks delegated to children in farming families are gendered with the childcare of younger siblings being usually delegated to an elder female sibling (Du Boulay, 1986, Gidarakou, 1999, Kizos et al., 2011, Castelberg-Koulma, 2013). In Mexico, Kunz (2010) also finds that there is gendering regarding the social reproductive labour carried out by children, which acts to perpetuate entrenched gender norms regarding whose responsibility it is to complete specific domestic tasks. Women and children are placed within a similar category of analysis within political economy and are increasingly attached to the private sphere. As cities grow, in political terms, this withdrawal from public space equates to children’s positions becoming even more subordinate (Watson, 2004). Indeed, when considering what counts as knowledge and whose voice should be heard, children’s opinions on their position within the political economy are rarely heard, thus silencing their input into knowledge-making within political economy and diminishing their power as socio-economic actors. However, by focusing on children as
socio-economic actors, we can learn more about how society (which children are an integral part of) shapes social relations and experiences (James and Prout, 1995). Following Watson’s (2004) call for the wider inclusion of children within political economy studies, in Section 7.5 I discuss their roles as ‘replacement’-entrepreneurs and as domestic-helpers within the context of handicraft tourism entrepreneurship in this study’s ethnographic sites.

Various economic pressures challenge the carefree model of childhood and children’s role in providing social reproduction, one of which is the economic crisis, which shall be described next in terms of its effects on social reproduction.

2.2.6 Economic crisis and social reproduction

For most individuals, capitalism is simply “an immutable shell” (Weber, 2001, p. 13) into which one is born and is obliged to live in, rather than a human creation sustained by human labour-power. Whilst the shell seems ‘immutable’, it may crack, as is evident in financial crises. When this crack in the capitalist icing occurs, chaos prevails with an increase in unemployment rates, loss of income, cuts in investments and severe cuts in welfare spending e.g. health, social services and education (Karamessini and Rubery, 2013). As cuts in welfare provision and social services are the first to be actualised (Harman, 2010), it is often households that absorb the shock by providing more unpaid labour for the family to survive, thus effectively acting as a “safety net of last resort” (Elson, 2012, p. 67). As tourism has a voluntary nature and thus is considered a luxury by many, it is especially sensitive to economic crises and so the effects of the economic crises on the tourism industry and the households behind the industry are particularly intense (Cohen, 2012, Hall, 2010). Despite this, there is scant literature on what happens to the households behind the industry, with the majority of related research focusing on how economic crises affect tourism demand (Papatheodorou et al., 2010) or how the crisis affects local residents’ support for tourism development (Stylidis and Terzidou, 2014).

Hence, financial crises often serve to reconfigure social reproduction mechanisms. Although the majority of studies on financial crises have been largely silent about issues of social reproduction, Young (2003) in her study of financial crises in Argentina and Asia highlights the importance of looking at these issues. She points out, for example, how state strategies for dealing with financial crises and the corresponding crises in social reproduction act to reinforce stereotypical gender roles by assuming female responsibility for social reproduction. An example of this happening is the Korean government’s appeal for women to act as unemployed men’s “psychological cushion” (Young, 2003, p. 114) during the financial crisis, thus perpetuating traditional gender roles of the man as breadwinner and the woman as care-giver.
The ways in which welfare services are cut is mitigated in various ways. For example, in Greece, state spending on welfare has been slashed and replaced with “special support schemes” (Matsaganis, 2012, p. 414) offering one-off lump sums of money which have questionable effects on the fulfilment of peoples’ long-term social reproductive needs. This crisis-response mechanism of minimising state-spending on social reproduction, indicates how the state relies on families stepping-in to provide social reproduction either by hiring immigrants to complete social reproductive activities (Maroukis, 2013) or by turning to kin and the community (Matsaganis, 2011). However, as ‘real wages’ decrease during economic crises, because taxes and bills increase, this results in less ability to hire private social reproductive help. This is also observed by Elson (2012) in Chile, where during the crisis women dismissed domestic helpers and completed domestic work themselves, thus adding to the time spent engaging in economic activities. This shows how gender operates within the crisis as welfare cuts increase the time women spend engaging in economic activities.

Unemployment is one of the worst maladies of economic crises (Kretsos, 2012), indicative of which is the 27% unemployment rate that Greece had in early 2014 (Greek Statistical Board, 2014). As it is male-dominated industries such as manufacturing and construction that are the first to be affected by economic crises (Elson, 2010), men are disproportionately affected by economic crises. One way in which states respond to crises, is by supporting male employment, which does however reinforce stereotyped notions of male breadwinner roles, as is observed to be happening in the EU in the 2010 financial crisis (Karamessini, 2013). For example in Germany, crisis-related stimulus packages benefited 72% male workers to 28% female workers (ILO, 2012). This type of response to a crisis results in higher female unemployment, as for example in the Central American crisis (Espino, 2013) because men are thought to have “more right” (p. 206) to keep their jobs, which adds a distinct gender dimension to the crisis response mechanisms as Elson (2010) also observes. In general, the crisis has widened the gender gap in unemployment across regions and seen a reversal in the historically higher employment growth rates for women, partly because, especially in the EU, the cuts in public service jobs meant that many women also lost their jobs (ILO, 2012). For example in the UK, by 2017, the government is expected to cut 850,000 public service jobs, many of which in the health sector which is dominated by women (Leschke and Jepsen, 2011). However, overall, with over 85% of women being employed in services (rather than in industry) and especially in the health and education sectors, women have been less affected by the crisis than men who are concentrated in trade-dependent sectors and whose unemployment situation is characterised as ‘grim’ (Elsby, 2010). Indicatively, of the 29 million jobs that were lost globally due to the crisis, 16 million men became jobless in comparison to 13 million jobless women (ILO, 2012).
Despite some states responding to economic crises by trying to stimulate male employment, they are not always successful and this results in men’s decreased ability to adhere to breadwinner gender roles. Mannon’s (2006) ethnographic account of a Costa Rican family affected by neoliberal restructuring that has led to an increase in women’s economic activity and a decrease in men’s income-earning power, shows how male unemployment can influence gender roles. In her study, Mannon (2006) finds that the unemployed husband, stripped of his ability to identify as breadwinner, clings on to his masculinity by refusing to complete what he perceives to be feminine social reproductive tasks, sitting at home inactive and “rapidly achieving parasitic status” (p. 524).

Whilst some women accept this, allowing for their unemployed husbands to refrain from any productive contribution to the household in the form of social reproduction help, other women take more drastic measures to ensure their survival and choose single motherhood to avoid having to look after yet another family member (the unemployed husband) (Mannon, 2006). However, alternative male responses to crisis-generated unemployment are possible, as evident in Cambodia, where unemployed men studied by Brickell (2011) utilised their contribution to the household in order to maintain their ‘household head’ status, thus negotiating social reproductive gender role definitions.

Despite employment policies during the crisis favouring increases in men’s employment levels, often crisis-led policies also encourage women to become more economically active perhaps by assuming that women’s time is “infinitely elastic” (Young, 2003, p. 113). Indeed, state policies during financial crises often encourage women to work more hours by providing various incentives such as start-up grants for new female entrepreneurs (ESPA, 2013) thus burdening them even more (Utting et al., 2012). Hence in order to ‘cushion’ the crisis’ impact on household income it is yet again the women who work more hours in paid employment as their income is demanded with a historically unique intensity (Peterson, 2005). For example, in Argentina, female employment increased during the 2002 crisis but women reported experiencing severe time-pressures and ultimately decreased the amount of time spent on childcare (Espey et al., 2010). A crisis-induced increase in female labour participation because of male unemployment is termed as the ‘added worker’ effect and research into middle-income countries affected by the crisis, shows that women are experiencing a moderate ‘added worker’ effect (Cho and Newhouse, 2011). This ‘added worker’ effect results in complex gender role negotiations because women are increasingly encouraged to work more hours and simultaneously held responsible for the social reproductive activities dropped by state provisioning programs. This happens because social reproductive gender roles change at a slower rate than state policies that can be passed over-night.
As tourism already imposes demanding working hours, often concentrated over specific tourist season periods, the question of how economic crises affect gender roles within the context of tourism is a pertinent question but has been insufficiently addressed within current tourism literature (Legerski and Cornwall, 2010). The possibility of social reproduction being depleted under these crisis-induced time-competing conditions is a concern as exhausted women lose a sense of well-being and household sustainability is questioned (Rai and Thomas, 2011; Rai et al., 2013).

2.3 Chapter summary

This chapter has provided insight into the various gaps within relevant literature on economic analyses. More specifically, drawing on feminist economics literature, the concept of social provisioning as opposed to “a self-interested exchange between rational economic agents” (Barker and Kuiper, 2003, p. 3) is suggested as being a useful way of framing the angle which the current study takes. Hence, within this chapter I have adopted the angle that economic agents are socially embedded rather than separate selves (van Staveren, 2010) and hence affected by their social surroundings such as their family and culture.

Capitalism is the dominant economic system within which we are located and as such dictates economic agents to strive for commodity accumulation and can dynamically alter social life by commodifying social relations. Feminist economics, however, questions whether indeed capitalism is “natural, inevitable and beneficial” (Barker, 2005, p. 2195). Exploring the ways in which gender penetrates neoclassical economics conceptualisations of the economy reveals a masculine bias as economic theorising perceives economic individuals as distanced from the feminine (Kuiper, 2003). This however creates models of economic involvement which are arguably difficult to apply to women who are economically active. Indeed, as women are increasingly encouraged to become engaged in the productive economy, confusion arises as to how they can both be ‘altruistic’ caregivers and rational self-interested agents at the same time. Gender roles connecting femininity to altruistically caring for the family clash with economic roles that push individuals to bargain for the most economically favourable arrangement, which is how the ‘household bargaining’ model explains peoples’ engagement in the economy (Bittman et al., 2003). Looking at how gender permeates the various economic models such as the ‘utility approach’, ‘relational accommodation’ and the ‘objects relation theory’ (Hewitson, 2003), reveals serious flaws in the applicability of these models to female economic agents. Indeed, current economic discourses arguable act to shape current discourses rather than reflect reality (Callon, 1998).
This leads to the need to question what economic reality is and indeed what the ‘economy’ is. Looking at the economy as being constituted of both the productive economy and the reproductive economy where these two components have a co-constitutive relationship through which power operates, is the view many visionary economists (Peterson, 2005, Bakker and Silvey, 2008b, Cameron and Gibson-Graham, 2003) take and so does the author of this thesis. This is because viewing the productive and reproductive components of the economy as separate entities acts to lock in the subordinate of market/masculine vs. household/feminine. Despite the growing awareness of how reproductive economic activities contribute to the smooth running of the economy, few studies (Ferguson, 2010b, Folbre, 2009), especially within tourism, address this issue (Harcourt, 2013). Filling the gap in knowledge regarding how economically active agents operate within the reproductive economy and the subsequent interrelated effects on the productive economy and vice versa is hence one of this project’s aims.

Rather than use the term ‘reproductive’ to describe this part of the economy, that may evoke connection to solely the economic activities surrounding sexual reproduction, I borrow the term “social reproduction” (Bakker and Silvey, 2008b, p. 3) from political economy literature as a more inclusive term. Social reproduction refers to all the tasks involved in the “maintenance of life on a daily and intergenerational basis” (Laslett and Brenner, 1989, p. 382) and thus constitutes a dynamic and inclusive terms of perceiving this ‘part’ of the economy. Whilst caring and household work have been the subject of much feminist research (Federici, 2012), using a feminist political economy approach can facilitate the questioning of broader politico-economic structures framing social relations, such as gender roles and relations (Vosko, 2003, Bezanson and Luxton, 2006a). The questioning of these structures can then contribute to knowledge regarding the relationship between the productive and reproductive components of the economy.

However, until now, literature about how social reproduction operates has focused on how social reproduction has become privatised, human trafficking, sex work, assisted reproductive technologies and women who migrate in search of work (Bakker and Silvey, 2008a). However, few authors have questioned the role gender plays in the relationship between production and social reproduction in the context of tourism, which is where the current study aims to fill a gap in knowledge. In order to examine this relationship, an investigation into the core elements of social reproduction needs to be undertaken, as well as a detailed exploration of the core components of the productive economic processes within tourism which shall be the subject of Chapter Three. In order to illustrate how gender permeates even simple, everyday acts, which many of us take for granted, I bring the social reproductive task of cooking as an example of how feminine subjectivities are linked to certain social reproductive activities.
Cooking is only one of the caring activities associated with the social reproductive economy. Eldercare and childcare constitute two significant elements of social reproduction the gendering of which is related to the level of state support and cultural mechanisms. For example in Greece, outsourcing eldercare is considered to be shameful and only done by “heartless women” (Lazaridis, 2009, p. 162). Social pressures on women to perform according to ideals of intensive mothering not only responsibilises the parents rather than the state, by blaming women for being inadequate when trying to combine working and childcare (Ferguson, 2010b), but also reinforces gender norms connecting femininity to responsibility for childcare. Indeed, social pressures of this type have a variety of effects, one of which is to delay or even to abandon the idea of childbearing (Mathews and Hamilton, 2009).

When looking at how social reproduction is gendered, conceptualisations of how work is valued are useful in visualising how feminised work is de-valued. The commodification of care, which has occurred intensively since women were encouraged to join the labour force and outsourced care, has put a price on care to some extent. However, as caring is connected with an activity completed (by women) altruistically, this presents an uncomfortable fit within a market which does not elicit caring for others but rather encourages pursuing one’s individual interests at maximum economic advantage (Beneria, 2003). Indeed, one of the central concepts behind asking for “wages for housework” (Federici, 2012, p. 19) was to instigate a change in the way caring is valued. Looking at the value of caring from a temporality aspect by looking at how time is re-distributed and thus transformed, is a useful way of perceiving social reproductive activities’ value (Coleman, 2008, Adkins, 2009).

Another effect of privatising social reproductive tasks is the emergence of the phenomenon of ‘transnational motherhood’ (Arat-Koc, 2006) as migrants relocate to look after families of the affluent, leaving their own family behind. This reveals how class is significant within analyses of social reproduction as in fact it is only affluent men that are benefiting from this solution as gender roles surrounding feminine responsibility for social reproduction remain the same.

In a similar manner to which the link between femininity and primary responsibility is maintained by state, market and household forces, the link between masculinity and breadwinning is also maintained (Mannon, 2006). Indeed, state policies also reinforce stereotypical gender roles by offering limited support to men who want to pursue social reproductive roles, by offering minimal parental leave to men (European Commission, 2012).

In an economic context where both parents work and limited state support for social reproduction exists, children’s role within social reproduction is expanding. Especially within tourism
entrepreneur and ‘migrant-mother’ families, children are becoming economically active from an earlier age, challenging existing ideals that a carefree, economically inactive childhood is the norm (Kunz, 2010).

Finally, the consequences of economic crises are discussed, as together with high levels of unemployment and reductions in wages, comes a severe decrease in the amount of state spending on welfare, which primarily affects the social reproductive sphere. Exacerbated by state policies that encourage female employment, the amount of economic activities that are expected to be completed by women increase and as finances are too limited to outsource social reproduction, this results in interesting gender role negotiations as economic agents try to reshuffle their lives in order to survive (Karamessini and Rubery, 2013). Whilst various studies have dealt with the effect of economic crises on tourism, this has mainly been from a tourism demand perspective (Stylidis and Terzidou, 2014, Papatheodorou et al., 2010), with fewer studies concentrating on how economic crises prompt negotiations of gender roles.

In order however to more thoroughly question the ways in which politico-economic factors and social reproduction are related, it is necessary to gain a more in-depth analysis of how gender roles are constituted and how they operate within development efforts. More specifically, in Chapter Three, I discuss how economic processes within tourism, such as tourism development, can contribute to gendered inequalities by discussing the use of female entrepreneurship as a gendered development tool.
Chapter Three

3 Tourism and the ‘productive’ economy

Having expanded upon notions of the economy consisting of the interconnected and interacting, co-constitutive components of the productive and the social reproductive economy and given a detailed account of how gender permeates the social reproductive economic activities, I shall now progress to investigate how gender acts within the productive economy by looking at economic activities within tourism. In this chapter, I look at literature surrounding gender, tourism and development. I present literature speaking to one specific topic that is found at the intersection of these broad bodies of literature, that on tourism entrepreneurship. Small to medium enterprises are a very important part of the tourism industry as they comprise 80% of the tourism sector globally (ILO, 2013). However, when critically appraising discourses of tourism entrepreneurship, I find the masculine norm so deeply embedded within entrepreneurial discourse that it is virtually invisible, which leads me to question development policies aiming at gender equality that use entrepreneurship as a vehicle to increase women’s ‘empowerment’.

Investment in development policies that promote the creation of paid employment positions for women is often chosen by governing structures that want to tap into women’s ‘latent’ labour power, as seen in a recent report by the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO, 2011). However, these policies are often criticised as just wanting to add a ‘gender’ element to their poverty reduction agenda, as they rarely result in any alteration in the gendered structures surrounding one’s affinity to engage in certain economic activities (Ferguson, 2010a). Even though women make up 55% of the labour force within tourism at a global level and 70% at a regional level, women often occupy low-paid jobs in tourism and their majority representation does not mirror the managerial leadership women play in this sector (ILO, 2013). Tourism development programs can often perpetuate entrenched gender roles by taking advantage of existing gender inequalities (Ferguson, 2011a). Many tourism development programs in the EU for example (Pardo-del-Val and Ribeiro-Soriano, 2007), focus on promoting female entrepreneurship as a vehicle of women’s ‘empowerment’ without however taking into account the gendered social reproductive activities that women are simultaneously expected to complete as discussed in detail in Chapter Two.

Furthermore, even though entrepreneurship is supposed to be gender-neutral, its connection to hegemonic masculinity is obvious in much literature that takes for granted the separation between work and family (Ahl, 2006). Drawing on economic theorising that posits all entrepreneurs
are, or should be, ‘rational men’, current entrepreneurship theorising that portrays entrepreneurs as separate from their environment and surroundings comes into sharp contrast with the family-embeddedness that characterises many female entrepreneurs (Walby, 2000, Aldrich and Cliff, 2003). Recent research, such as that which challenges the female entrepreneur ‘under-performance’ myth (Marlow and McAdam, 2013), questions masculine entrepreneurial norms, bringing to the fore the significance gender plays in theorising entrepreneurship. Such studies help to make women visible within the current economic reality and expose how women and men are affected differently by political and economic issues by questioning how gender acts as a “governing code” (Peterson, 2005, p. 502).

As illustrated, tourism development initiatives that utilise entrepreneurship as a developmental tool are criticised for only superficially including gender within their policies. However, these initiatives encourage women to occupy more powerful positions in society via increasing their ability to accumulate, which is one of the main power-bestowing methods within modern-day capitalism (Karamessini, 2013). The complexity that arises from the contradiction between tourism development’s role in economically empowering women by promoting female entrepreneurship, but also gendering this social practice by relying on masculine versions of entrepreneurship theory, shall be the subject of discussion in this chapter. By critically reviewing literature on conceptualisations of the role gender plays within tourism and how gender permeates and permutates entrepreneurial performances, my intention is to highlight what research has been done until now in these areas and what questions remain unanswered.

3.1 Gender and tourism

As discussed in Section 1.2.4, where a working definition of ‘gender’ is provided, gender orders social dynamics and pervades all aspects of economic and personal life by being the product of sex-related, socially accepted behaviours which have become internalised as a natural way of being (Beauvoir et al., 2000, Fenstermaker and West, 2013). As tourism is “built of human relations” (Aitchison, 2001, p. 134), the impact of gender relations on tourism is an interesting and under-researched topic. The role gender plays within tourism is of special interest as women are often encouraged to enter tourism employment due to its flexibility and its ‘suitability’ for women to engage in this activity without challenging gender norms regarding women’s roles as home-based carers. An example of the type of tourism entrepreneurship that conforms to gendered norms surrounding feminine subjectivities of care is the engagement in the production of handicrafts to sell in the tourist-souvenir market, as in the case of Mexican weavers (Cohen, 2001) and Mayan
craftswomen (Cone, 1995). As these craftswomen are able to work on their crafts at home, they are perceived as also being able to combine this activity with childcare and thus to adhere to feminine subjectivities connected to care. Other tourism entrepreneurship development programs that encourage the perpetuation of gender roles confining women to the private space include schemes that help women convert part of their house into a guesthouse for tourists, thus both staying at home and engaging commercially in what is considered a feminine stronghold - caring (Mannon, 2006).

One of the criticisms Swain (1995) makes about previous attempts to include gender in tourism analyses is that by failing to define gender they have failed to show how “interlocking dimensions of gender” (p. 251) operate within tourism.

3.1.1 Gender in a constant state of becoming: Gender role negotiations

Socio-culturally constructed notions of gender are responsible for constructing ideals, the attainment of which affects how people become involved in the productive economy, such as through tourism development programs that promote engagement in entrepreneurship. Taking what constitutes an ‘ideal mother’ as an example, gender roles are important, as femininity is culturally very closely related to motherhood and especially in Western cultures, these ideals involve intensive mothering which competes for time with paid employment such as tourism entrepreneurship (Fox, 2006, Lyberaki, 2011). However, in the new economic reality, the ideal of women providing both in monetary terms and social reproductive terms for their families, encapsulated in the concept of ‘working mother’, is becoming even more accepted as the norm (Page, 2013). On the other hand, ideals of masculine dominance in the productive arena with male members of the household working and providing for the family economically, sustain male ‘breadwinner’ ideals (Thébaud, 2010).

All these often conflicting ‘ideals’ are in a constantly alternating relationship with gender, as current politico-economic conditions influence familial and individual priorities. The changing conditions mean that negotiations start occurring among family members, as social relations are re-ordered to fit with current demands on time and economic needs (Fenstermaker and West, 2013). As discussed in more detail in Section 2.2.3.3, the role of the domestic arena in the construction of gender roles is significant and so this is often where gender role negotiations occur. Conflicting time demands urge women to ask for the re-distribution of tasks within the family, thus effectively also prompting the negotiation of the gendered roles related to specific social reproductive tasks (Forstner, 2012). However, such negotiations need to be undertaken over generations for any change in gender roles and relations to be visible, making it a very slow process with results that are hard to readily identify as they have been internalised and normalised (Livingston, 2011).
The methods which people use to negotiate social reproductive gender roles vary, and are often gendered themselves, thus perpetuating adherence to gender norms. For example, the use of ‘nagging’, feigning helplessness and using praise are some ways Chinese women (Lui, 2013) negotiate for the re-distribution of household tasks, which is a highly gendered way of negotiating as it draws on the connection between weakness and femininity. The derogative term of ‘nagging’ is also used by male Khmer participants in Brickell’s (2011) study to describe their wives’ request for help with social reproductive activities, thus asserting their dominance and superiority in order to adhere to masculinity. A study on the passive and active negotiation tactics used by working parents within household bargaining also finds a strong correlation between the type of tactics used and gender, with femininity being linked to passive negotiating techniques (Hochschild and Machung, 1989).

The ways in which social reproductive roles are negotiated most times are very subtle and vary according to cultural norms. For example, in a study in Mexico, women offer to do more domestic work to negotiate their entrance into employment (Gates, 2002). On the other hand, in Cambodia, a study (Brickell, 2011) finds that working women with unemployed husbands demand their husbands’ active contribution to household tasks. One participant in Brickell’s (2011) study asks for her husband’s contribution by threatening to throw her husband out of the house and insulting him. This difference in approach that women have to redistributing their time and household work more equally, shows how the scale and scope of gender role negotiations often differs according to socio-cultural context but also according to relative pre-existing power.

The redistribution of household work that instigates the change in gender roles and relations highlights the significance of time within these analyses, as expanded upon in Section 2.2.4.2 where the value of social reproductive tasks in terms of the ability to re-distribute time is discussed. Adkins’ (2009, 2012) focus on the dynamism of time in gender role negotiations, is of particular relevance when trying to conceptualise how people re-distribute their time and is in direct relationship to how gender roles are negotiated. In the context of female tourism workers in Central America (Ferguson, 2010b) for example, who have to spend a large amount of their time working in tourism, the ways in which they re-distribute their time in order to ensure their family’s social reproduction is a significant measure of how they negotiate gender roles. (2010b)(2010b)(2010b)(2010b)

Whilst the majority of tourism development literature has focused on women’s unequal position with respect to social reproductive responsibilities, little attention has been paid to the ways in which men are situated within development policies, as development programs increasingly focus on encouraging women’s economic empowerment. Although living in a ‘man’s world’, masculinities are increasingly spoken about as being ‘in crisis’ as men experience a declining ability to provide
economically for the family, thus falling short of the idealised masculine role of ‘breadwinner’ (Chant and Gutmann, 2002). This shifting responsibility in men’s financial contribution to the family, coupled with enduring perceptions that social reproduction is a feminised activity has left some men struggling for comprehension of what their new roles and social identities are. For men who have lost the ability to provide even symbolically to the family’s finances, because they are unemployed for example, the gender roles they aspire to are shaken, leading men to “rapidly achieve parasitic status in the household” (Mannon, 2006, p. 524) as they neither work nor help with household duties as seen in a study based in Costa Rica. Unlike women who are encouraged to take on masculinised breadwinner roles by new economic realities which are fuelled by capitalist pressures to accumulate, men lack “alternative gender scripts” (Chant and Gutmann, 2002, p. 274). Thus, men feel that development programs exclude them, which adds to the feeling that they (men) are becoming increasingly redundant in familial life. So, studies that include a focus on how masculinities as well as femininities are being negotiated within development program conditions are called for, as they can be pivotal in informing discourses surrounding gender’s role within tourism development and thus assist in creating programs that pioneer well-being for people irrespective of gender.

It is important to note here that whilst there is much past research on the subject of household bargaining, most literature focuses on explaining the cause of the uneven distribution of household tasks between women and men, for example by using resource exchange theory (Bittman et al., 2003), rather than investigating the way in which gender roles are changing as a result of these negotiations. Investigating the often multiple directions in which gender roles are transforming through these negotiations is of significance when trying to present people’s lived realities and effecting positive social change.

3.1.2 Progress on including gender within tourism research

Tourism employment is highly gender-biased and hence gender analyses are highly relevant to tourism, so an increasing number of academics are dealing with the subject of gender roles in tourism, since Swain’s (1995) seminal article in response to Kinnaird and Hall’s (1994) article on gender roles’ significance within tourism. In these two articles, the realisation that women who worked within tourism predominated in artisan work and caretaking, led to the questioning of the gendered division of labour within tourism. Indeed, tourism as an industry that specialises in the provision of low cost, authentic leisure experiences is very much dependent on services that are connected to femininity, such as nurturing tourists through guided experiences and cooking local

3 Relative resource theory posits that labour distribution is linked to the family members’ relative resources (e.g. work experience in cleaning)
food (Vandegrift, 2008). One of the reason for the limited number of critical feminist analyses of how gender roles are related to relations of tourism production and consumption, may be that male hegemonic practices are internalised as the norm, so the need to investigate gendered behaviour through a different lens has been marginalised, with most studies talking about gender using the term as synonymous to ‘women’ (Petzelka et al., 2005). Indeed, historically (Tribe, 2006, Tribe, 2009), tourism research has been very much dominated by positivist imperatives, focusing on performativity and profitability, largely because tourism researchers are located within business and management departments at universities, which encourages research based on masculinised perceptions of the economy as discussed in more detail in Section 3.4. Hence, a need to investigate how gender has influenced current discourses of tourism is evident.

The need to further investigate the underlying causes that determine gendered choices with regards to participation in tourism activities are some of the key issues addressed by Kinnaird and Hall (1994) who argue that constructions of gender relations are context-specific and in a later article propose a “gender-aware framework” for understating tourism processes (Kinnaird and Hall, 1996, p. 95). Swain (1995) analyses tourism’s dimensions in more depth, raising questions about the gendered realities that shape tourism development policies and underlining the importance of defining gender within tourism literature. Swain makes a long over-due call for analyses, particularly of tourism producers, that question gender’s role within economic processes. A call for the re-connection of tourism to political economy was more recently made by Mosedale (2010) who questions the complex relationship between culture and socio-economic processes that seem to blend into each other. The focus of Ateljevic and Doorne’s (2003) analysis of tourism entrepreneurship in Croatia also points to how the boundaries between culture and socio-economic processes are blurred.

More recently, Aitchison (2009), Pritchard (2008), Morgan (2000), Ateljevic (2007) and Boonabaana and Tucker (2011) are examples of academics who critically appraise the role gender has within tourism, adding to the body of literature that Swain (1995) and Kinnaird and Hall (1994) instigated. Aitchison’s (2009) focus on the “socio-cultural nexus” (p. 632) follows the cultural turn within tourism studies, suggesting a focus on both the material and the cultural as being the space where gender roles and relations are re-worked. However in doing so, from the author’s feminist standpoint, ethnographic perspective, Aitchison (2001, 2005) misses the nuances that a politico-economic analysis of gender roles within tourism labour can reveal. Reinforcing the call for more critical analyses of tourism, Ren, Pritchard and Morgan (2010) argue that tourism research should address the social relations, such as gender, that underpin tourism processes by connecting empirical examples to theory. However focusing more specifically on the role gender has in tourism labour
research, few academics have broached this subject apart from Tucker’s (2003, 2007, 2011) longitudinal research on female entrepreneurs in Göreme, Turkey. Tucker’s research is instrumental in providing valuable insight into how gendered processes relate to socio-cultural and economic activities, such as the way in which principles of ‘honour and shame’ act to distribute economic activities both within and outside the house. As the female entrepreneurs in Göreme are bound by cultural laws limiting their movement outside the house, they find ways of engaging in entrepreneurship via converting their houses to homestays or inviting tourists into their cave houses and then selling them handicrafts that they make. This research shows how gender permeates tourism entrepreneurship and also illustrates the role cultural norms play in governing economic activities within tourism.

Adding a new dimension to research on gender in tourism, Mosedale (2010) posits that in the context of contemporary mobility that puts a different value on labour, especially visible within alternative economic practices such as couch-surfing, political economic analyses of tourism are essential. Illustrative of the relevance of political economy to tourism studies is the recent interest by political economy scholars such as Ferguson (2010a, 2010b) who highlight the significance gender roles and relations play within tourism development and how politico-economic circumstances affect tourism processes, suggesting that much tourism development does not in fact empower women as control over finances is maintained by men. Ferguson’s work (2011a) is significant in questioning the role of gender within tourism as she concentrates on how gender roles and relations are influenced by female tourism workers, relating her analysis to context-based social and political conditions. Whilst class, race and economic standing also play a role in the way gendered subjects within tourism experience inequality in the workplace, it is still gender roles that largely determine what kind of jobs women do within tourism. By looking closely at the lives of three different ‘types’ of women engaging in tourism work – a migrant from the First World, a migrant from the Third World and a national – Vandergrift (2008) finds that, in the Costa Rican tourist destination of Puerto Viejo, although women’s capacity to produce labour is ethnically and nationally segmented, the reward for completing this labour is similarly low-paid. As the women in Vandergrift’s (2008) study are all held responsible for parenting, this gendered responsibility shapes their work options, irrespective of what ethnicity they are.

Whilst tourism literature has limited focus on the role gender plays within its economic processes, gender and development literature has dealt with this to a greater extent. So in the next section, I shall discuss how drawing on gender and development literature can expand knowledge of the role gender plays in tourism labour analyses.
3.2 Tourism, gender and development

Development can be defined as a “planned project by which resources, techniques and expertise are brought together” (Kabeer, 1994, p. 69) to increase economic growth. However, development should not only aim to achieve economic growth, but also positive social change with an increase in well-being for the people involved (Pearson, 2000). Moreover, it is important to conceptualise development as the result of a social transformation rather than a shift in individual decision-making (Oppenheim Mason and Smith, 2003).

As women’s contributions to the economy have been largely rendered invisible, many development programs, such as the ones implemented by the World Bank, specifically target women in fulfilling their objectives to increase economic growth (Griffin, 2010, Ferguson, 2011a). This selective focus on women as targets for development programs leads to the questioning of what role gender has within development programs. As Ferguson (2011a) stresses, development is not a “neutral and benign process” (p. 240) and in contrast to its promotion as gender-blind, it often contains an explicitly gendered dimension in that women are perceived as ‘inextricably linked’ to the family. However, basing policies on this gendered assumption perpetuates conditions of gender inequality. Thus there is a need to monitor how women are affected by development programs, as women are encouraged to partake in economic growth initiatives but also still held responsible for social reproductive tasks (Momsen, 2004).

3.2.1 Emergence of gender and development literature

Whilst a detailed analysis of the historical emergence of ‘gender and development’ as an academic subject of interest is beyond the scope of this study, it is useful to conceptualise why it emerged. One of the key realisations in the 1970s was that poverty was more prevalent among women and hence was ‘feminised’ (Boserup, 2007). This led to development projects being informed by liberal feminism and based on the idea that women are a vulnerable group in need of assistance in gaining economic power (Chant, 2007). This was called the Women In Development (WID) phase, and although WID made women visible in the development process by equating economic power to social power, it has been criticised for equating ‘gender’ to ‘women’ and underestimating how the structural inequalities between women and men distract from achieving development objectives that aim at more gender equality (Cuppers, 2005). The next phase, known as the Women And Development (WAD) approach, had overcoming poverty as its main tenet. This “gender-friendly” (p. 14) approach to eliminating poverty whilst adhering to neoliberal structures, which was informed by Marxist feminism, has been criticized for lacking a connection between economic growth and the perpetuation of gender equality (Ferguson, 2010a). The Gender and Development (GAD) phase,
focused more on uncovering the structural inequalities that hinder women from becoming economically empowered, such as male control of family finances (Singh, 2007). The GAD approach did have some positive effects, one of which was to focus more explicitly on power relations by *politicising* gender relations and hence challenging macroeconomic issues from a gender perspective (Momsen, 2004). The GAD approach was instrumental in promoting the idea that gender equality should be the focus, rather than just women, and advocated for the need to consider socio-cultural constructions of gender. GAD criticised the fact that focusing just on women, removed the focus from the real problem that was women’s subordination to men. This type of approach meant that men were included in development policies, such as the ones formulated by the World Bank which helped mainstream gender by adopting a relational approach that included men rather than investing in women-only projects (Bedford, 2007).

(Ferguson, 2010a) By the 1990s all these approaches converged and the ‘empowerment’ approach started to be used by development agencies. Regarded by institutions as a way of enhancing productivity without changing the status quo, empowerment is a development process that helps people gain self-confidence and self-esteem (Rowlands, 1997). ‘Empowerment’ was expected to be achieved by undoing negative social constructions, such as gender role expectations, so that women could feel that they had the agency to react and influence changes to their benefit (Eade, 1999). However, empowerment is criticised as being transformed from women’s agentic process of self-realisation and mobilization to demand change, into a transformation dependant on transfer of information and money (Whitehead et al., 2007). At the same time, the idea that in order for change to happen, men must to be more caring and help out more with household tasks, was promoted and the necessity to keep men within the family was stressed. These development strategies, which were largely led by the World Bank, have however been criticised as leading to the dis-empowerment of women outside these ‘traditional’ family structures, leaving them vulnerable to violent husbands as they feel less able to leave (Bedford, 2007).

Despite this criticism, empowerment did become a widely used concept and many development programs used this as the main buzz word to signify achievement of their goals (Rowlands, 1997). However, this renewed focus brought about new questions and changes in focus as it was increasingly recognised that notions of what constitutes ‘empowerment’ were not global (Chant, 2006a). For example, a recent study that reflects on the ways in which the Grameen bank ‘empowers’ through micro-credit, draws attention to how use of the term ‘empowerment’ needs to be carefully considered according to context (Selinger, 2008). As empowerment is based on Western ideals, these may not necessarily reflect all women’s well-being. For example, the Bangladeshi
female entrepreneurs that are the subject of this Grameen study are subject to different constraints to what Western women are, such as the inability of many Bangladeshi women to inherit property and the restrictions on their employability enforced by Muslim customs, indicating a weakness in the use of ‘empowerment’ as an all-inclusive term. Indeed, Selinger (2008) points out how it is crucial to examine whether ‘empowerment’ is the most appropriate term to use for evaluating how women’s lives change as a result of gaining access to capital. So it is important to consider how Grameen loan recipients are embedded within relations of dependence and independence simultaneously. Along the same lines, Boonabaana and Tucker (2011) and Kabeer (1999) caution that as many development programs are modelled on Western ideas of what constitutes ‘empowerment’, the long-term implications for changes based on the values of outsiders, may be catastrophic for communities with very different values.

More recently, poststructural analyses of gender and development in a variety of cultural settings have started to draw attention to how gender cannot be essentialised as it is culturally and socially constructed and always in a state of becoming (Tucker and Boonabaana, 2011). So rather than just including women within development plans, which much gender and development literature focuses upon, I suggest looking at how women benefit from development programs by investigating the power imbalances within social relationships that women are situated within.

3.2.2 Tourism as a vehicle for achieving more gender-equal development?

Tourism is increasingly conceptualised as a legitimate arena to apply development programs aimed at poverty reduction and gender equality, which is indicated by the wealth of funding for tourism projects around the world (Ferguson, 2007b). A recent report (UNWTO, 2011), into the role women play within tourism and how tourism affects women, shows that tourism offers many opportunities for women to become employed as there are low barriers to entry and there is the option for part-time or informal work. In this report, part-time work is perceived as employment that will not disrupt gender roles dictating women’s primary responsibility towards their family. However, whilst tourism allows for the entry of more women into the workplace, largely because of the “housewifesation” (Gentry, 2007, p. 478) of much of tourism labour, which is how labour is based on gendered assignation of work that resembles household task to women, tourism work has its disadvantages. It often takes place at anti-social hours thus making it hard for women to reconcile work and family commitments. Seasonal tourism work can be of very high intensity during the tourist season and offers no work during the off-season. Tourism businesses can often be located at a distance from workers’ homes making it difficult in terms of time and finances for women workers to access their place of work (ILO, 2013)
Despite this, tourism does provide jobs for a large majority of women globally and whilst not equally represented, women are more likely to hold positions of responsibility (e.g. managers) than in other industries (UNWTO, 2011). However, on the down-side, women earn less than men in tourism (Hollingsworth, 2006); employment positions are gendered (e.g. women dominate in sales, flight attendant positions, and cleaning); and women are “overly represented in the informal sector” (UNWTO, 2011, p. 9). In fact, the majority of women who work in tourism complete work that is a ‘natural’ extension of their daily housework, such as cleaning, cooking and welcoming guests (Sinclair, 1997). However engaging in the productive economy by undertaking work that mimics gendered social reproductive duties, can perpetuate stereotyped gender roles that connect femininity with caring, cooking, and cleaning (Estrada, 2002).

Many of the development programs that promote employment within tourism as the panacea for women’s economic ‘underperformance’ (Marlow and McAdam, 2013), do so however in an industry that is already characterised by highly ‘feminised’ labour dynamics due to the flexible and seasonal nature of tourism work. Embedded as the tourism industry is, in global dynamics of inequality, the effectiveness of development programs in achieving more gender equality by encouraging women to become employed within tourism is debatable (Ferguson, 2011a). For example Tucker (2007) finds that although women do become involved in paid work because of tourism development, gendered dynamics prevent the development being as beneficial to them as it is to men in Göreme, Turkey.

Indeed Tucker (2007) points out how development projects often create opportunities for women to engage in home-based microenterprise formation, for example in the form of a home-stay, as this is thought to suit them because it does not compromise their roles as mothers and carers. However, taking a Western feminist stance it is exactly this conceptualisation of gender roles e.g. femininity being associated with the home, that reinforces the traditional division of labour by assigning employment mimicking feminine subjectivities of caring, to women. In this way, tourism development programs rely on utilising women’s skills gained through gender role socialisation to convert women’s labour power into a productive mechanism, without really needing to invest in women’s training (as they are already trained e.g. in cleaning, caring for children) (ILO, 2013). An example of this is the promotion of female tourism handicraft entrepreneurship to un-or under-employed women (Ferguson, 2011a). So one of the criticisms of development programs is that policies are based on gendered stereotypes that connect femininity to care, hence perpetuating these gendered assumptions. An example are the anti-poverty programs in Brazil and Mexico referred to by Whitehead et al (2007), where children’s school fees are paid in return for the mothers cleaning schools and clinics. In this case study it is argued that although the development program
provides the mothers with a source of income and help with childcare, it does not promote a change in gender equality as it perpetuates gendered roles of women as trained in, and responsible for, the social reproductive activities of childcare and cleaning.

Achieving gender equality as a goal of tourism development translates into the equal valuing of the work women and men do and that men and women have equal conditions for realizing their full potential as well as equal opportunities to reap the socio-economic benefits of their efforts (ILO, 2013). However, what is often missing from development programs that aim to solve ‘gender issues’, is the need to conceptualise gender as a fluid entity influenced by cultural, religious and politico-economic conditions, which illuminates how all women do not have shared realities. By ignoring that gender is fluid and influenced by current socio-economic surroundings, development programs often have difficulty in effecting a positive impact on women’s day-to-day life (Singh, 2007). To this extent, development programs are criticised for using macro-social ideologies such as Western feminism to decide what is best for women, disregarding the fact that women do not constitute a uniform category, and thus that women’s world-views differ according to context (Kabeer, 2005).

Depicting women as having shared realities (Bhavnani et al., 2003) and not considering the world views of women themselves (Raju, 2002), is indeed one of the critiques of the development and gender paradigm. By assuming that women have uniform realities, development programs may lose the uniqueness of women’s lives by creating a widely applicable category of gender. An example of this is seen in a study on Palestinian and Israeli female entrepreneurs, who whilst sharing a similar sex, due to marked differences in the socio-cultural and politico-economic contexts they were situated within, experience their introduction into microenterprise (via development programs) very differently (Strier and Abdeen, 2009). Israeli women conceptualise their participation in development in terms of victimisation and structural limitations whereas the Palestinian entrepreneurs stress how they achieve agency and emancipation from their involvement in the productive economy.

Another criticism of development approaches is the focus on economic power within the productive economy rather than at the social reproductive economy level. This is focused on by Ferguson (2011a), who deconstructs the World Bank programs’ gender component to conclude that whilst the World Bank programs facilitate women’s entry into paid work, there is little exploration of how gender equity in other aspects of life can be improved. Hence, the gender element is reduced to assisting and supporting women only as economically active, productive entities rather than as people governed by socio-cultural and politico-economic ties (Singh, 2007). Experiences in tourism development programs in South Asia aimed at increasing women’s economic power, had varied results and some women’s power increased while others’ economic power decreased as they got
laden with debts or their autonomy was reduced (Kabeer, 2005, Mahmood, 2011). The lack of insight into how gender roles and relations are affected or negotiated as a result of these programs, raises questions about how development programs are incorporating gender into their programs. Indeed, as Parmar (2003) points out when commenting on the Grameen Bank microloan initiatives, one of the dangers of focusing on increasing women’s access to capital is that they feel less motivated to address the structural basis of their oppression.

A recent report (UNWTO, 2011) on women employed within tourism attempts to address the ways in which tourism development efforts contribute to achieving more gender equity and presents interesting case studies of women who challenge prevailing gender norms. An example of this is three female entrepreneurs, the women behind the “Three Sisters Adventure and Trekking Company” in Nepal, whose engagement in tourism has “broken down some entrenched gender stereotypes” (UNWTO, 2011, p. 53) that confine Nepalese single women to home and render married women unemployable. Another interesting case study is the one featuring three housewives from the Galapagos Islands who create a bakery called “Las Perlas” for cruise-ships aided by UNWTO ST-EP funding, and successfully negotiate childcare responsibilities with their reluctant fishermen husbands. The husbands who are used to their wives waiting for them at home after long trips at sea, now bring “lunchboxes” (UNWTO, 2011, p. 59) to their wives’ workplace, indicating how a negotiation of gender roles regarding gendered social reproductive responsibilities is taking place, instigated by the women’s involvement in the productive economy. However, whilst the UNWTO report presents a number of interesting case studies which represent various sectors within tourism, including microentrepreneurs, the majority of data used within this report is taken from the statistics on hotels and restaurants (for the period 1999-2008) found in the ILO Laborsta database. So any conclusions drawn out of this set of data with caution should be considered cautiously when attempting to apply them to women working as tourism handicraft microentrepreneurs, who have their own specificities of operation (UNWTO, 2011). Indeed, the UNWTO report itself is based on gendered notions of femininity being connected to caring roles and draws heavily on the importance of economic empowerment to women without considering in depth how, and if, gender roles are being negotiated. This reasoning raises the question of whether the report describes examples of where development is “working for women” or if these are examples of “women working for development” as the nuances behind women’s involvement in the productive economy are not fully explored (Chant, 2006a, p. 102).

Indeed, recent reports show that development programs, the majority of which focus on microenterprise initiatives targeted at women, show a dissonance between economic ‘empowerment’ and women’s well-being, as men often take control over funding aimed at women
(Ferguson, 2010a). It is also important to note that whilst engagement in tourism can help break the cycle of poverty through women’s formal and informal training such as that gained by engaging in tourism entrepreneurship, lack of education and resources may still prevent the poorest of women in participating and hence tourism can in fact perpetuate existing economic and social inequalities (UNWTO, 2011). This focus on microenterprise as being the major vehicle for achieving development goals, raises the question of how development programs aimed at increasing gender equality through women’s increased involvement in tourism, operate. So, to follow, will be an introduction to the type of initiatives that development programs encouraging women to get employed within tourism create, with a focus on the major form of tourism development strategy, which is encouraging female entrepreneurship.

### 3.3 Tourism development’s focus on promoting female entrepreneurship

Tourism, is one of the world’s top job creators both because it has low entry requirements, allowing for the quick entry of women and migrants, and also because for every job that is created within the core tourism sector 1.5 more jobs are created in peripheral services (Bolwell and Weinz, 2008). On a global scale, travel and tourism is expected to directly create 120 million jobs and 328 million indirectly, hence accounting for one in ten jobs globally (ILO, 2013). According to this recent ILO report (ILO, 2013, 2011a) women make up 55.5% of workers within tourism globally and 70% at a regional level. A large majority of workers within tourism work in small to medium enterprises (SMEs) which highlights the importance of considering entrepreneurship theorising within tourism. For example, in Europe 99% of companies employ under 250 people and hence are classed as entrepreneurial ventures (ILO, 2013). Simultaneously, globally, tourism work is characterised by seasonality, informality and majority lot of tourism employment is low-paid and part-time (Yunis, 2009). Correlating the high number of women working within tourism to how tourism work is characterised, there is a link between this type of work and feminine subjectivities. Indeed, within tourism, women occupy lower-paid jobs and, for example, within hotels are concentrated within feminised departments such as conference & banqueting which reflects the connection between femininity and caring (UNWTO, 2011). This situation leads one to wonder if women’s presence within tourism employment is a ‘chicken and egg’ situation whereby prevailing gendered structures push women into tourism and in turn tourism perpetuates gendered labour. Apart from the gendered structures that contribute to a high proportion of women being employed within tourism, such as limited access to education or the social pressure to combine gendered caring responsibilities with work, development programs also contribute to the large number of women working within tourism (UNWTO, 2011). In their quest to make women visible within the global economy, a range of
national, international, governmental, NGOs, development donors and aid agencies are involved in ‘enabling’ women to work for tourism (Griffin, 2010). Examples of the organisations involved in promoting women’s employment through tourism include bilateral donors such as SNV and DANIDA, global banks such as the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank and politico-economic unions such as the EU and the UN (UNWTO, 2011). It is interesting to note that very few state tourism authorities include gender issues in their development strategies, most preferring to focus on the more general area of sustainable tourism strategies, within which some gender equality aims are addressed (Ateljevic, 2009).

There is a plethora of ways in which the above development agents promote women’s involvement in tourism, from providing funding in the form of micro-loans/micro-credit (Mahmood, 2011, Strier and Abdeen, 2009), promoting micro-entrepreneurship (Ferguson, 2010a), offering mentoring services and training in business-related skills (Pardo-del-Val and Ribeiro-Soriano, 2007) (Petridou and Glaveli, 2008), to promoting collective entrepreneurship via the creation of women’s cooperatives for which funding, training and mentoring are provided (Karasavvoglou and Florou, 2006). However, the common denominator to most development approaches is a focus on the creation of small-scale, community-based enterprises which are perceived as having the greatest potential for improving women’s well-being (Scheyvens, 2000). For example, the World Bank’s strategy for improving women’s well-being in Central America via the Copan Valley project focuses on small-scale forms of tourism development (Ferguson, 2010a), whereas NGO-initiated tourism development in Uganda also focuses on small-scale forms of tourism development by encouraging women to create small handicraft businesses (Tucker and Boonabaana, 2011).

This focus on the ‘micro’, within tourism development that has a gender focus, is illustrated by the prevalence of micro-credit and microenterprise as development strategies and corresponds to perceptions that women benefit from the formation of small-scale enterprises. However, as a concept itself, keeping businesses small in scale perpetuates gendered notions dictating women’s primary role as family carers. Hence, a critical review of how micro-development initiatives operate within the context of women’s empowerment is relevant at this stage in order to tease out how these approaches affect women and to analyse how the objectives of ‘empowerment’ and ‘poverty reduction’ are realised.

3.3.1 Microentrepreneurship as a gender-focused tourism development tool

The concept of microcredit has been around since 1979 when Professor Yunus introduced the idea of giving loans (or microcredit) to the world’s very poor, most of which are women, and made
the Grameen Bank\(^4\) a household name (Servon, 2006). Since then, there has been a proliferation of
development programs offering credit to poor women mainly in developing countries, such as
programs by SEWA (Self Employed Women’s Association) in India (Lingam, 2008). Whilst microcredit
is largely associated with developing countries, more recently, microcredit organisations are assisting
people hit by the economic crisis in developed countries such as America, for example via Kiva.org,
an online microcredit organisation connecting lenders to borrowers worldwide (Shevory, 2010). This
also shows how the face of poverty is changing and can no longer be synonymous with women in
developing countries.

Whilst microcredit is promoted as a development tool to help women achieve economic
empowerment, there is much literature that questions the feasibility of using the term
‘empowerment’ in non-Western contexts. For example, Selinger (2008) questions whether
empowerment is a suitable concept to evaluate how women’s lives change in a mobile phone
program which Bangladeshi women can subscribe to by obtaining microcredit, as perceiving
empowerment in terms of gaining access to new technology and capital may be problematic in this
context. Furthermore, it may be more useful to perceive the effects of microcredit as being not only
empowerment in an economic sense, but a combination of social and economic effects as the two
are inextricably linked (Gibson-Graham, 2006). Indeed looking at microcredit as having purely an
economic function questions whether in fact microcredit helps women in the long term or is just an
economic ‘safety net’ to economic austerity measures, providing a temporary solution for poverty
alleviation (Kabeer, 2005). Indeed, the feminisation of credit through microcredit is criticised as
harnessing women’s emancipation to the engine of capitalist accumulation as women’s economic
empowerment is romantically associated with higher moral and ethical aspirations (Fraser, 2009).

Looking at microcredit as producing “cultural possibility” (Moodie, 2008, p. 456) is perhaps a
good alternative for analysing the effects of microcredit on women as it focuses on how social
relations and exchanges are affected. Perceiving microcredit as a social project wherein women
make sense of social exchanges and interactions, is one of the reasons Moodie gives for microcredit
continuing to be attractive to women in Rajasthan despite microcredit’s limited ability to lift them
out of poverty. Another reason may be that despite the high interest rates and bad terms that
microcredit institutions in third world countries offer, terms that even people in affluent countries
would rarely accept, microcredit is often a better alternative than getting money from money-
lenders (Keating et al., 2010).

\(^4\) Since the introduction of microcredit from the Grameen bank, this approach has been criticised for “reducing
women to welfare objects” as it encourages authorisation of male relatives on borrowers’ loans (Selinger,
2008, p. 38)
Indeed, limited control of finances is one of the major problems that microcredit programs have, as illustrated in a study in Pakistan where only 27% of female recipients of microloans decided how to use the loan themselves (Mahmood, 2011). This brings to the fore how culturally-enforced gender roles bestowing men with control over finances affect microcredit development efforts aimed at increasing women’s well-being. Even the founding father of microcredit schemes, that is the Grameen Bank lending scheme, is not free from the infiltration of stereotyped gender norms within its policies. As such, the Grameen Bank has been criticised for lending to women simply because they are more likely to repay because they are bound by cultural norms of ‘respectability’, such as those dictated by purdah in Bangladesh (Rahman, 1999). An oxymoron hence arises as attention is drawn to the need to monitor how gender operates within development structures that promote gender equality. This also indicates how a somewhat anachronistic interpretation of gender equating to women is used within development projects in order to conform to funding institutions’ requirements for a gender focus (Ferguson, 2010a).

Microenterprise emerged in response to the proliferation of microcredit schemes in the 1990s and is promoted as an alternative method for women to become empowered on a long-term basis through engagement in entrepreneurship. In the past years there has been a rise in Microenterprise Development Programs (MDPs) as a means of combating poverty and eliminating gender discrimination, led by powerful institutions such as the World Bank, making microenterprise the primary mechanism to integrate women into economic development (Strier and Abdeen, 2009). Indeed, microenterprise is one of the key tools used by the UNWTO and the World Bank to achieve the Millennium Development Goals of gender equality and women’s empowerment (Ferguson, 2007b, Ferguson, 2011a). However, like microcredit, by strongly emphasising economic emancipation as opposed to social, and by focusing on the market as a way to meet all people’s needs, microenterprise development programs have been criticised for overlooking key relationships that affect people’s lives, such as intra-household relationships (Ferguson, 2010a). Indeed, microcredit has been blamed for promoting a rhetoric of responsibility among female citizens as microcredit initiatives take the place of state help programs. As the state increasingly shifts responsibility to the individual, the traditional family is viewed as a ‘safe haven’ against the world of capitalism that serves to reinforce stereotypical gender roles within the family, hence reducing microcredit’s ability to increase gender equality (Keating et al., 2010). Hence, microcredit, within the current order of economic instability, urges women to become hyper-responsible for relationships of social reproduction as economic actors and as mothers.

5 In most development literature, microenterprises are considered those with five employees or less and can be as diverse as side-walk merchandising, handicraft production and shop-ownership (Chandy, 2011).
The success of these programs is thus dependant on incorporating social and economic objectives as part of the process, as seen in research on Caribbean micro-entrepreneurs (Karides, 2005) which found that early development policies in the Caribbean viewed the largely feminised microenterprise sector as inhibiting financial growth in line with Western industrialisation ideals of financial growth. Although subsequent development policies take into account the importance of microenterprise in the Caribbean’s economic growth, Karides (2005) criticises the way the policies present micro-entrepreneurship as a solution for women to adhere to dual caring and working roles thus reinforcing gender stereotypes rather than increasing gender equality as is the programs’ stated aim.

Incorporating social elements into microenterprise was the subject of a review of microenterprise initiatives in 1990, where Mayoux (1995) found that there was limited success in women achieving any significant social advantages from the development efforts. An example was the American microenterprise program called MicroFem, which, by encouraging women to engage in home-based entrepreneurship, perpetuated women’s connection to the domestic sphere and exacerbated women’s marginalised status (Ehlers and Main, 1998). Indeed, literature on micro-entrepreneurship itself is biased as many past studies on microenterprise development programs draw on quantitative data, overlooking the personal views of participants and ignoring non-economic factors such as gender roles and division of labour (Kantor, 2003, Eversole, 2004). However, a few studies focusing more on non-economic factors involved in micro-entrepreneurship are evolving which shows an increased academic interest in this aspect of micro-entrepreneurship (Strier and Abdeen, 2009). Previous authors looking at development programs offering microenterprise opportunities to women have focused on using microenterprise as a method to alleviate poverty and thus have mainly researched very poor women (Mayoux, 1995). Indeed for most of the world’s poor, micro-entrepreneurship is the only way to make a living (albeit meagre) (Chandy and Narasimhan, 2011). However, it is not only in developing countries that micro-entrepreneurship is being promoted as a successful approach to development. The popularity of tourism development programs which have micro-entrepreneurship as their goal has increased, as there is strong consensus that microenterprise contributes to the economic development of both developed and developing countries (Anthias and Mehta, 2003, Henken, 2002).

Promoting entrepreneurship is one of the dominant methods of engaging women within tourism and addressing development agency strategies’ gender component, following the example of World Bank programs such as the Copan tourism development program in Honduras which is one of the first of this kind (Ferguson, 2010a). However, this focus on encouraging women to engage in small-scale entrepreneurship creates a clash in gender roles because, even though it is traditional
gender roles that encourage women to engage in small-scale operations, entrepreneurship is traditionally a masculine endeavour. As a result, female entrepreneurs try to simultaneously adhere to masculinised notions of success, often related to economic profit, whilst at the same time continue to take primary responsibility for social reproduction. This often leads to ‘anomalous’ tourism development results. For example, female tourism workers in Central America are able to economically support their family but are blamed for not providing their children with adequate childcare (Ferguson, 2010b). Thus, there is a need to investigate the underlying reasons for this anomaly within development programs’ results, indications for which lie within conceptualisations of how entrepreneurship theorisations are based on gendered norms.

3.4 Male hegemonic discourses in entrepreneurship theorising

A loose definition of an entrepreneur is “someone who perceives an opportunity and creates an organisation to pursue it” (Bygrave, 1997, p. 2). Whilst there has been some debate regarding who counts as an entrepreneur, for example whether there is a difference between a small business owner and an entrepreneur (Morrison, 2006), or if an entrepreneur is just someone who, like Bill Gates, takes a new idea and creates a new industry based on this idea (Hanson, 2009), this study considers anyone who owns a small business as an entrepreneur.

Since the shift towards neoliberal individualism, entrepreneurship has been increasingly perceived as the “foundation of opportunistic individualism” (Ahl and Marlow, 2012, p. 544) and simultaneously as an economic activity that offers the potential for creativity and innovation, free from organisational constraints, as well as an activity that can be accessed on a meritocratic basis (Ogbor, 2000, Sturdy and Wright, 2008). This explanation of entrepreneurship being highly individualistic and based on the theory that economic beings operate as separate from their environment, warrants a closer investigation of how this limits who can take the subject position of ‘entrepreneur’ (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). Indeed, examining traditional definitions and theories of entrepreneurship reveals a male-dominated bias (Green and Cohen, 1995), which is reflected in the prevailing historical discourse that “to think entrepreneur, was to think male” (Marlow et al., 2009, p. 139). The most common discourse associated with entrepreneurship draws heavily on the image of a young, independent, risk-taking man, striving for innovation and substantial monetary profits, or as Ahl puts it “a heroic self-made man” (2006, p. 599). According to Bruni, Gherardi and Poggio (2005), the mythical figure of Mercury⁶ encapsulates what an entrepreneur should be like: have a “shrewd, 

⁶ Mercury is the Roman patron god of financial gain, commerce, communication, luck, trickery and thieves. His name is possibly related to the Latin word merx (“merchandise”) (Littleton, 2002).
pragmatic, creative, open-minded and adventurous” personality (p. 1). The association of entrepreneurship’s distinctive features of autonomy and innovation with hegemonic masculinity shows how gender operates within conceptualisations of entrepreneurship to measure women according to masculine values (Gupta et al., 2009, Murgia and Poggio, 2009). Whilst the media and academia play an instrumental role in projecting this gendered interpretation of entrepreneurship, cultural mechanisms that perpetuate stereotyped versions of masculinity also play a significant role in maintaining the association between entrepreneurship and masculinity (Hamilton, 2013).

Historically, there was the assumption that entrepreneurial behaviour was not gender specific and so literature treated entrepreneurs as a consistent group irrespective of gender (Brush, 2006). It was not until the 1980s that scientific discourse looking at female entrepreneurs as more than just a small subset of entrepreneurship, started to gain ground (Moore and Buttner, 1997). Hence, academics started to argue that it was no longer appropriate to conclude that findings about male entrepreneurs applied equally to women (Lewis, 2006). In response to this realisation, separate studies focusing on female entrepreneurs were conducted. Research on female entrepreneurs then started to conjure up images of women emulating masculine characteristics and having similar motivations and objectives as male counterparts (Brush, 2006). The male hegemony embedded in entrepreneurial discourses was seen in how images of the “iron lady” (p. 13) were used to describe female entrepreneurs, whereas traits associated with femininity such as compassion and caring were rarely investigated as being associated with entrepreneurship (Bruni et al., 2005). Within business, gendered ideals of performance led to women emulating traits located in the symbolic domain of the male such as risk-taking and proactivity, leading to the perception that in order to be successful, women had to act as “honorary men” (McDowell, 2011, p. 346) by departing from feminine ideals of passivity, flexibility and adaptation.

Indeed, masculinity within entrepreneurship is rendered invisible as the male entrepreneurial norm is normalised and perceived as gender-neutral. This is obvious when women who engage within entrepreneurship do so by adhering to and reproducing ‘invisible’ masculine entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviours in order to gain legitimacy with this discourse (Marlow and McAdam, 2011). Limiting expressions to a masculine norm, results in female entrepreneurs, at least superficially, from departing from what is commonly perceived as feminine attributes of non-competition, caring and empathy in order to fit in to entrepreneurial norms (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). Furthermore, silence regarding how entrepreneurial discourse is gendered is perpetuated as women avoid being identified as different from the entrepreneurial masculine norm, as contemporary research on female entrepreneurs who emulate masculine entrepreneurial characteristics, shows (Lewis, 2006).
As the number of female entrepreneurs started to increase exponentially (Bygrave, 1997), partially driven by the various development programs that view women as an economic resource for the market economy, there was recognition that a new angle needed to be taken to researching female entrepreneurs. In terms of the business type that female entrepreneurs choose, research indicates a tendency for woman-owned businesses to be small in terms of employment and market-share (Carter and Marlow, 2007) as they are more likely to be operated from home using informal sources of finance (Harding, 2006). As seen in a review of research articles published between 1982 and 2000 on women’s entrepreneurship (Ahl, 2004), the majority of studies focus on female entrepreneurs’ psychology; their personal background and business characteristics; rural entrepreneurs (Robinson, 2001); attitudes to entrepreneurship; motivations to start a business e.g. necessity/opportunity (Warren-Smith and Jackson, 2004); the start-up process; management practices; strategies; networking; family issues (Lee-Gosselin and Grisé, 1990); and access to capital & performance (Ahl, 2006). However, as gender and development literature expanded and women were increasingly perceived as not having shared realities (Kabeer, 1999), it also became increasingly obvious that studies that provide a profile of a ‘typical’ female entrepreneur, are essentialising (Mirchandani, 1999).

However, it is still common for many entrepreneurship studies to present female entrepreneurs as underperforming (Marlow and McAdam, 2013) the reason for which is often connected with how women purposefully keep their business small, to prioritise for family obligations (Butler, 2003). This is related to how entrepreneurship is embedded in neoclassical economic discourses that are based on perceiving entrepreneurs as economically active individuals operating independently from their environment and surroundings (Walby, 2000) rather than prioritising family responsibilities (Aldrich and Cliff, 2003). To this extent, much cutting-edge research in the field of female entrepreneurship is based on the idea that in order to progress entrepreneurial theory, dominant economic theories need to be criticised to reveal how gendered structures contribute to how people experience entrepreneurship (Ahl, 2006, Ahl and Marlow, 2012, Ahl and Nelson, 2010, Calas et al., 2007, Calas et al., 2009, De Bruin et al., 2007, Hughes and Jennings, 2012).

One of the trends within research on female entrepreneurs is to focus on how expectations to be responsible for family life affect women who engage in entrepreneurship, as seen in reviews of studies on female entrepreneurs (Ahl, 2006, Brush, 1992). Hence, as an increasing amount of research conducted on female entrepreneurs focuses on the assumption that female entrepreneurs’ “primary social responsibility is the family” (Bruni et al., 2005, p. 14), this highlights the significance of gender roles within conceptualisations of entrepreneurship. The implications of gendered expectations on female entrepreneurs to remain responsible for family life is echoed in research
showing that American female entrepreneurs are more likely than their male counterparts to offer flexible work times to help their employees combine work and family (Robinson, 2001). Indeed, as discussed in Chapter 2.1, society encourages women to be producers and reproducers leading women to deal with the task of juggling familial responsibilities with work commitments (Woldie, 2004). It is interesting to note that some female entrepreneurs capitalise on this very clash between women’s roles as productive workers and caring mothers, by providing services to help working women fulfil both roles. An example of this is the ad-hoc, express-mothering services Leung’s (2011) participant-entrepreneurs offer, such as taking a child to the doctor, offering counselling for teenagers and help with cooking. By offering ad-hoc caring services to working mothers in Japan, the entrepreneurs Leung (2011) focuses on, fill a gap in the market for such services as increasing numbers of women work full-time, but gendered responsibility for social reproduction remains connected to femininity. Hence, this type of entrepreneurship draws upon gendered identities to simultaneously occupy a niche in the market of care-giving and perpetuate notions that social reproduction is a feminine task which working women must take responsibility for.

Recognition of the difficulties inherent in women being perceived as both producers and reproducers is evident in how reconciliation of family and working life is one of the most pressing political issues facing European societies (Crompton et al., 2007). Trying to reconcile family and work time is especially difficult for women who engage in entrepreneurship within tourism, as idiomorphic challenges exist due to tourism’s seasonality, long hours and intensity. The intensity of tourism on women’s time can be seen in Kousis’s (1989) study of a Cretan tourism community, where female tourism entrepreneurs work 14-24 hour days and have no free weekends or holidays during the tourist season’s seven-month period. Working in tourism also has other idiosyncrasies as Ateljevic & Doorne’s (2003) research on tourism entrepreneurs in Croatia shows, where dealing with tourists seems to evoke an association with femininity and accordingly men refuse to deal with tourists as it “is beneath their male dignity” (p. 142). All these observations on how social norms interact with entrepreneurship prompt for a more critical review of what entrepreneurship actually is.

3.4.1 Entrepreneurship as more than just an economic function

Morrison (2000) suggests that entrepreneurship has more than just an economic function as it has its foundations in people and society and thus represents a mixture of material and immaterial, influenced by the entrepreneur’s socio-cultural background. Indeed looking beyond the narrow translation of entrepreneurship as an economic activity, allows for the conceptualisation of empowerment through entrepreneurship as being achieved not only through the market, and thus as Ferguson (2011a) argues remaining in the market, but also as a social process that challenges taken-
for-granted boundaries (Morrison and Skokic, 2012). Calás et al. (2009) also suggest that viewing entrepreneurship as primarily an economic activity may conceal more than it reveals. So, exploring the social aspect of entrepreneurship as well, is vital in furthering our understanding of entrepreneurship when perceiving the economy as a cultural and social formation rather than just a site of exchange of labour (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2003). Indeed, looking at entrepreneurship as a social process, allows for the interrogation of how gender operates within entrepreneurship to form entrepreneurs’ lived realities, which is vital in order to “escape a dead end” in entrepreneurship theorising (Ahl and Marlow, 2012, p. 543). Reframing entrepreneurship as an act to create change may indeed allow for more accurate representations of how entrepreneurship operates (Hughes and Jennings, 2012). An example of how the mere act of engaging in entrepreneurship can produce social change, is seen in work on female tourism entrepreneurs in Turkey by Tucker (2007), where gender roles that dictate women should stay within the private domain are questioned as a result of women’s engagement in entrepreneurship.

Furthermore, researching entrepreneurship can be seen as “boundary work” (Tucker, 2007, p. 211), because entrepreneurial action is simultaneously embedded in local traditions whilst at the same time challenging these taken-for-granted stereotypic roles (Steyaert and Hjorth, 2006). Thinking about the diverse cultural contexts within which entrepreneurship takes place, the importance of moving away from Western descriptions of entrepreneurship as an industrial process that subsumes local culture but instead viewing entrepreneurship as an economic activity derived from socio-cultural processes, becomes all the more significant (Tucker, 2010). Whilst microcredit programs increase women’s ability to earn an income through engagement with entrepreneurship, if control of the family’s finances is still in the hands of their husbands because local belief systems such as honour and shame notions dictate this, then it is vital to examine what role cultural power plays in interpretations of entrepreneurship (Mahmood, 2011, Tucker and Boonabaana, 2011, Kabeer, 2005, North, 2009). Hence the ways in which culture interacts with entrepreneurship is a subject that warrants investigation when looking at what entrepreneurship is, as entrepreneurs often integrate cultural aspects with traditional economic aspects to create their own blend of entrepreneurship as seen in the tourism entrepreneurs in Croatia that Ateljevic and Doorne (2003) studied. An example of how cultural aspects blend with economic aspects in Croatia is how the tourism entrepreneurs incorporate their ‘traditional lifestyle’ that focuses on a carefree approach to social relations and business activities, into their version of entrepreneurship, thus departing from entrepreneurial norms that dictate entrepreneurs’ main goal is to maximise profit at the expense of maintaining social relations.
One of the more visual ways of blending culture with entrepreneurship is by integrating traditional designs and techniques into handicrafts that are then sold to tourists as souvenirs (Perivoliotis, 2002). Apart from the superficial connection of artisanal objects with cultural elements of entrepreneurship, the connection between feminised social reproductive tasks, such as weaving, and handicraft entrepreneurship becomes apparent. Encouraging women to engage in handicraft entrepreneurship in particular, raises the question of how gender roles that connect femininity with social reproduction responsibility are perpetuated through such development strategies as shall be discussed in further detail next.

3.4.2 Handicraft entrepreneurs

All around the globe, from Bangladesh to the Andes and Honduras, development programs aimed at increasing women’s economic standing encourage women to engage in entrepreneurial pursuits by utilising skills that women already have because of prevailing gender norms that have trained women in these particular skills (Ferguson, 2010a, Le Mare, 2012, Forstner, 2012). Indeed, a recent report stresses how it is essential that handicraft production is paired with another industry such as tourism, illustrating how combining handicraft entrepreneurship and tourism makes business sense (Andrews et al., 2013).

Handicraft skills are related to what are considered ‘feminine’ social reproductive activities such as providing for the family in various ways, including making items for the family to wear, sleep in and eat from. Since ancient times, spinning and weaving were considered part of women’s social reproductive duties and textile-making was considered appropriate for women as it was easily interruptible and resumeable and did not place children in danger (as for example silversmithing would) (Barber, 1994). Indeed, whilst men and women engage in various types of crafts, textile production is still largely completed by women on a commercial scale (Forstner, 2012), even though in certain instances the whole family will be involved in textile production as for example the Mexican weavers in Oaxaca that Cohen (2001) studied.

Modernity is changing perceptions of what constitutes an essential social reproductive activity, as industrialisation has meant that few people nowadays make their own clothes or blankets (Louri and Pepelasis Minoglou, 2002). In the context of female entrepreneurship, a change in what constitutes an essential feminine social reproductive task, is indicated in a decrease in demand for handmade textiles as seen in Lazaridis’ (2009) study where silk-cocoon fabric makers in Crete say demand has dropped as there is “no longer need to display these items in our living rooms, to be considered as good housewives” (p. 58). A similar decrease in the demand for handicrafts from locals was also observed among Hmong women who are experts at needlecrafts and intricate cut-paper
designs, indicating how social expectations of how a ‘good’ women should be, are changing (Feng, 2007). Political structures, such as policies making dowry illegal in Greece (Vaiou, 2008), also contribute to weakening the link between making textiles and femininity, as women are no longer required to present a whole range of handmade fabrics in order to be perceived as an acceptable bride.

However, despite this change in society, development programs promoting entrepreneurship as a woman’s ‘empowerment’ vehicle, exhibit a lingering link between handicraft production and femininity (Kantor, 2003). It is this link with handicrafts that development organisations such as NGOs in Bangladesh utilise to cover the ‘gender’ aspect of their development programs, indicated by the fact that out of 700 NGOs in Bangladesh, 91% were involved in handicraft programs (Haque, 2002). Indeed, the artisanal or handicraft sector is the second largest employer behind agriculture in the developing world according to a recent report (Andrews et al., 2013). However, this type of policy acts to perpetuate gendered stereotypes connecting feminine subjectivities to primary responsibility for social reproduction, as handicraft production is perceived not to challenge women’s roles as wives and mothers, especially if it is completed at home (Le Mare, 2012). The assumption that women are the continuers of tradition is drawn upon by entrepreneurship programs such as the craft-based female entrepreneurship programs in Puno in the Andes (Forstner, 2012). Indeed, reports on how development programs achieve goals of women’s economic well-being, exhibit gendered assumptions themselves, by for example, stressing how artisanal work is perfect for women as it offers flexibility and the ability to care for children while they work, which does little for changing the status quo of women’s marginalised position (Andrews et al., 2013). Even within industries such as the Indian silk industry where gender policies are in place, such as employing women at all levels of seniority, problems exist such as low levels of female entrepreneurship in silk reeling, despite many loans being taken out for this purpose (Mayoux, 1993).

Hence the question arises of ‘how’ and ‘if’ engagement in handicraft entrepreneurship helps women negotiate gender roles related to social reproduction, an issue which scarce literature has dealt with. Whilst studies reveal that women are encouraged to engage in handicraft entrepreneurship because they are perceived as ‘naturally’ better at it, does this in fact contribute to creating a vicious circle in which such labour is feminised and thus devalued (Möller, 2011)? For example, even though silk weaving in Thailand requires complex skills, Humphreys (1999) points out that by perceiving these skills as ‘natural’ to women, their skills are perceived as non-skills, thus rendering the labour ‘feminised’ and of little value. An example of how women are associated with devalued labour is seen in George’s (2013) research on the Kerala hand-loom industry where women are taking the place of men at the looms only because the men are moving away from the industry
either because of alcoholism, incarceration or better work opportunities and the women are effectively doing a job which men don’t want to do. The feminisation that characterises craft production hence perpetuates the characterisation of female entrepreneurs who engage in this occupation as being low-skilled, poor and with low education levels (Le Mare, 2012).

However, on the other hand, a paradox is created as women who engage in entrepreneurship, even types of entrepreneurship that emulate social reproductive activities, often succeed to carve out their place within entrepreneurial discourse (Bruni et al., 2005). An example in which a specific stereotyped identity can be used to one’s advantage, is seen in how the foreign women whom Tucker (2010) studied in Goreme, Turkey, manage successfully to carve out their place within the working environment by being considered as ‘naturally’ better at dealing with tourists due to their identity as ‘tourists’ themselves.

As discussed, many development programs that promote women’s involvement with handicraft production for tourism see it as a way of enhancing women’s economic standing through women’s engagement in what is associated with a feminised social reproductive skill. It is interesting to see that gender also penetrates conceptualisations of ‘types’ of entrepreneurship that are suitable for women, as many women are encouraged to engage in collective entrepreneurship formations such as women’s cooperatives, which will be discussed next.

3.4.3 Collective entrepreneurship: women’s cooperatives

Collective entrepreneurship definitions vary in focus, but they all include elements of how collective entrepreneurship is an economic structure in which the synergy of individuals acts to drive an organisation with common goals, collaborating for mutual benefit (Comeche and Loras, 2010). There seems to be a rise in academic interest into investigating collective entrepreneurship, indicated by an increase in publications utilising the term (Burress and Cook, 2010), such as West’s (2007) study into collective entrepreneurs’ decision-making processes. However, this interest is still considered marginal when comparing to the plethora of research into ‘classic’ entrepreneurship (Malo et al., 2012). One of the reasons for collective entrepreneurship being viewed in a somewhat dull light is the term’s connection to failed socialist systems, and hence is seen as an inefficient business strategy (Mourdoukoutas, 1999). Another reason for collective entrepreneurship being perceived as not ‘real’ entrepreneurship, is the misconception that collective entrepreneurship is part of the non-profit sector and as such its primary aim is to benefit the community, rather than to benefit the individual entrepreneurs who make up the cooperative (Simmons and Birchall, 2008).
There is also a perceived connection between collective entrepreneurship and femininity which acts to feminise and devalue this type of business structure, as *feminine* labour time is devalued (Forstner, 2012). The connection between femininity and collective entrepreneurship also creates the perception that collective entrepreneurship is an “amateur, leisure type of employment” (Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou, 2003, p. 35), that women engage in, in their spare time. Indeed the very concept of collective entrepreneurship, which is an economic activity that attempts to further individual or community economic standing, stands in juxtaposition to the conceptualisation of an entrepreneur as a heroic, independent individual governed by a desire for economic growth in isolation from his surroundings, based on neoclassical economic conceptualisations of how an economically active being, acts (Griffin, 2010, Bruni et al., 2005).

One of the main forms that collective entrepreneurship takes is that of a cooperative, the emergence of which is outlined by Cook and Plunkett (2006). A cooperative can be defined as an “autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprise” (Vakoufaris et al., 2007, p. 777). Cooperatives are often promoted by development programs as a vehicle to increase women’s economic and social power for various reasons which are often related to perceptions of women as having stereotyped gender roles that make then primary carers within the family (Malo et al., 2012). Hence, group structures are assumed to provide a safe environment for women to challenge gender inequalities by discussing matters of common interest whilst at the same time working towards improvements in their economic status with minimal risk in investment compared to a private investment (Kabeer, 1999, Iakovidou, 2002). In literature on women’s cooperatives in Latin America, weaving cooperatives are very common and their benefits to women are reported to include increased participation in politics, learning new skills, demonstrating increased leadership, escaping confinement from the domestic sphere and challenging gender roles (Grimes and Milgram, 2000).

Some research has shown that one of the results of women participating in cooperatives is that they achieve more egalitarian gender relations within the home and the community (Grimes and Milgram, 2000). For example, in a study of female weavers in Oaxaca, Mexico a gradual change in gender roles is occurring as a result of the women’s involvement in the cooperative, indicating a change in the division of domestic duties after “years of tension and adjustment” (Stephen, 2005, p. 268). Another example of where involvement in cooperative entrepreneurship can help increase women’s negotiating power within the household is seen in research in the Galapagos Islands (UNWTO, 2011). However, there is scant literature investigating how gender infiltrates women’s experiences of entrepreneurship within cooperatives in specific contexts, which would be very useful
in gaining more insight into the effect various economic structures can have on gender roles and relations.

Assumptions that women adhere to neoclassical economics’ conceptualisations of what ‘matters’ are evident in the majority of research on women within cooperatives, which focus on analysing the reasons for women not succeeding by measuring female ventures against neoclassical economics standards of success. Indicative of this is how in Greece, agrotourism cooperatives are widely promoted as a way of getting rural women more involved in the economic sphere as well as achieving better gender quality. However, their only sporadic success has been attributed to women’s lack of business skills, which is an explanation based on classical economic perceptions of what determines if a business is successful or not, without examining the underlying social structures contributing to the way the cooperative operates (Aggelopoulos et al., 2008, Kizos and Iosifides, 2007, Lassithiotaki, 2011). Based on this perception, many authors present the solution for better development programs for women to be more training programs in classical business skills such as marketing, accounting and the “reinforcement of entrepreneurial behaviour” (Petridou and Glaveli, 2008, p. 263). However, without insight into what entrepreneurship may mean when we remove all the gendered structures influencing it, there is a gap between what the development programs want to achieve and what happens in reality, as women are blamed for not adhering to masculinised versions of entrepreneurship. This is succinctly put by Ladipo (1981) who explains how governmental goals and Yoruba societal realities are rarely aligned. In the Nigerian women’s cooperatives she studied, one of her participant-cooperative members illustrates this dissonance by saying how: “The society’s ears were closed to personal difficulties, but the members’ ears were open” (p. 129).

This is an example of how, whilst the need to have a “competitive advantage” (Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou, 2003, p. 38) is essential, in order to be considered ‘successful’ in a business environment, the nuances of what constitutes ‘successful’ need to be investigated further, by incorporating the role gender plays (Barker, 2005). In the context of the current financial crisis for example, cooperative women’s adversity to risk and to take out loans is now operating to their advantage as they are more resilient than other businesses who are crippled by loan payments taken out before the crisis (Karamessini and Rubery, 2013). So even in a classical economic sense, some characteristics of attributes associated with feminine subjectivities, such as caution and adversity to risk are perhaps worth further investigation in order to create new ideals of how entrepreneurship can be sustainable over the long-term. Perhaps non-adherence to what constitute the market rules (e.g. taking out loans) provides protection when the ‘market’ system malfunctions as in economic crises (Harman, 2010).
The perception of collective entrepreneurship as feminised is not only a gender issue but also a cultural one. Comeche and Loras (2010) point out that it is western concepts of neoliberal independence that do not recognise collective forms of entrepreneurship as they depart from capitalist economy relying on individualism. However, in research comparing Maori and Pakeha (European New Zealanders) entrepreneurs, Maori entrepreneurs are found to be more interested in engaging in collective entrepreneurship, because it benefits the larger community rather than the individual (Henry, 2004). Similarly, Mennonites in Paraguay who are against the concepts of accumulation for private gain, find collective entrepreneurship as the only method of engaging in business (Dana and Dana, 2008). This reveals how even though the community aspect is a part of the entrepreneurial experience, it is seldom studied (Fine and Milonakis, 2009), perhaps because the ‘separative-self’ image of entrepreneurship does not allow for a sense of social solidarity (Waylen, 2000).

This raises the question of the extent to which cultural structures are taken into consideration within tourism development programs that present cooperative engagement as the best solution for women, or if assumptions of rationality and independence embedded within these structures are normalised and hence made invisible. For example, joining a cooperative is not a good solution for all women, as cultural regulatory mechanisms such as gossip may prevent women from joining as seen in Lazaridis’ (2009) study of Cretan silk producers who did not want to join cooperatives in case they were gossiped about. A similar aversion to working in cooperatives because of potential gossip is also seen in Rajahstani women studied by Moodie (2008). Fear of the ‘evil eye’ is yet another cultural mechanism affecting women’s participation in collective entrepreneurship. Operating in various countries such as India, Greece and Turkey, the ‘evil eye’ comes from perceptions that harm will come to the handicraft-makers when people see the nice things they make and jealousy is evoked (Carstairs, 1983). Furthermore, in some contexts, challenging male authority by women who achieve socio-economic power through their involvement in collective entrepreneurship, has had some horrific effects such as the assassination of a female pottery cooperative leader in Chiapas in the 1990s (Eber and Kovic, 2003).

What are lacking in literature on collective entrepreneurship, are accounts that probe into how the women engaging in cooperative entrepreneurship conceptualise ‘entrepreneurship’ and the role gender roles and relations, culture and politico-economic environments play in these conceptualisations. There have been few attempts to address this issue, although exceptions include Forstener’s (2012) study of the role gender and culture plays in women’s entrepreneurial experiences in craft groups in the Peruvian Andes, and a study of the role gendered stereotypes dictating women’s primary responsibility to be the family play in young female farmers’ lack of
participation in cooperatives in rural Greece (Gidarakou et al., 2008). However, there is scarce literature speaking directly to how entrepreneurs conceptualise their involvement in collective entrepreneurship and how this relates to social reproductive roles and relations.

Whilst gendered structures operate differently within entrepreneurship depending on what form entrepreneurship takes, such as individual or collective, as discussed above, there are other factors that need to be taken into consideration when examining how entrepreneurship operates and how it is perceived by entrepreneurs. When looking at entrepreneurship from a social perspective, for example when looking at the importance for entrepreneurs of finding a good work-family balance, considerations of how entrepreneurship interacts with tourism’s characteristics such as seasonality, are particularly relevant and seldom written about from a gender perspective (Greenhaus and Allen, 2011).

3.5 Seasonality, entrepreneurship and gender

Seasonality within tourism is defined as the visitation of tourists to a destination on a seasonal basis and is often governed by climatic conditions (Cuccia and Rizzo, 2011). This intense migration of tourists and tourist employees to seasonal destinations, causes a number of impacts both on the environment, for example in the form of increased water demands, on the local inhabitants who have to re-adjust to their streets being blocked by slow-moving, absent-minded tourists and to the tourism producers who work intensively after the quiet slumber of the shoulder season (Ball, 1989). More recently, there is increased focus on the effects climate change has on tourism seasonality (Amelung et al., 2007). A great deal of literature seeks to deal with the problems associated with the fluctuations in visitor numbers and revenues, seeking to create all-season destinations and thus eradicate seasonality which is seen as a malady (Higham and Hinch, 2002, Hinch and Jackson, 2000). Seasonality is also very closely connected to mobility, as employees seasonally relocate to search for work in tourism destinations, thus increasing the mobility of social relations as well (Duncan et al., 2013).

Whilst there are studies looking at the social impacts of seasonality (Deery et al., 2012), the majority of these use social exchange theory (SET) (Emerson, 1976) to look at the costs and benefits tourism has on hosts in exchange for the hosts’ involvement in tourism, rather than looking at how underlying socio-cultural and politico-economic structures influence perceived social impacts of seasonality. For example, Stylidis and Terzidou (2014) use SET to analyse residents’ support for
tourism during the economic crisis in Kavala, Greece. However, scarce literature has investigated how seasonality impacts upon gender roles and relations.

Whilst much literature focuses on how seasonality’s most prominent impact is on the economy and by extension the labour market (Andriotis, 2005), there are few studies that address seasonality’s economic impacts from a feminist economics angle, thus taking into consideration seasonality’s impacts on the social reproductive economy. Seasonal time-demands are especially draining on tourism micro-entrepreneurs and the juxtaposition between periods of intense work-demands and periods of limited work during the shoulder season creates flickering negotiations of gender roles related to social reproductive tasks. This is because during the shoulder period when engagement in entrepreneurship is limited, host communities return to more stereotypic perceptions of gender roles as also seen in a study on Croatian tourism entrepreneurs (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2003). As entrepreneurs do not live in isolation from their family, even though neoclassical economics theorising perceives economically active individuals as unaffected by their environment (Waylen, 2000), and as gendered responsibilities for childcare do not have a shoulder season, during the tourism season, seasonality can have severe effects on tourism entrepreneurs who are torn between caring and work requirements.

As gender is gradually dissolved and re-constituted from repetitive performances (Butler, 2004), it would be interesting to investigate the role seasonality has in this process focusing on the period of liminality that is created at the beginning and end of each season wherein entrepreneurs can re-negotiate social reproductive gender roles. A similar liminal period is observed in literature on migrants, when women who have migrated in search of work return home to their families (Parreñas, 2013). Like many female tourism entrepreneurs whose intense work commitments reduce their availability to provide childcare, prompting for a re-negotiation of social reproductive responsibilities, similarly, as migrant mothers are spatially unavailable to provide childcare, this prompts negotiations of social reproduction responsibilities (Hoang and Yeoh, 2011). Hence, comparing and contrasting literature on how social reproduction roles are negotiated in the liminal periods between home and abroad for migrant mothers and seasonal and shoulder season for female tourism entrepreneurs may provide valuable insight into the relationship between seasonality, gender roles and entrepreneurship. Furthermore, investigating this could further current literature on the socio-economic impacts of seasonality on tourism entrepreneurship, from the entrepreneurs’ perspectives.
3.6 Chapter summary

This chapter critically presents literature that speaks to the ways in which gender permeates performances of the economic, focusing on what is known as the ‘productive’ economy. By questioning how gender acts as a governing code within politico-economic structures, I attempt to see how women can be made visible within the current politico-economic reality (Beauvoir et al., 2000, Ahl and Nelson, 2010). Gender plays an essential role in all societal processes as it silently pervades all aspects of economic and personal life (Bruni et al., 2005, Hughes and Jennings, 2012). Gender is the mechanism by which notions of what is perceived as ‘feminine’ or ‘masculine’ are produced and normalised and as such, is a fluid force constantly both changing itself and its surroundings. As gender is a significant form of social power, investigating its role within the productive economy is of great interest as this aspect is often overlooked, for example by tourism development programs that only superficially include gender within their policies (Karamessini and Rubery, 2013). Gender role negotiations are indicators of how change is occurring within society as social relations are re-ordered to fit with current demands on time and economic needs (Fenstermaker and West, 2013). An example of this is the modern-day connection between femininity and ‘working mother’ ideals whereby women are expected to take on primary responsibility for the family in terms of providing social reproductive and economic support. However, whilst for women engaging in the productive economy overloads them with roles available to them, men are limited to roles that connect masculinity to providing economically for the family and thus lack “alternative gender scripts” (Chant and Gutmann, 2002, p. 274) which can cause various social problems. For example even though men may be inactive in the productive economy due to unemployment, they still feel unable to contribute to the social reproductive economy.

Looking at how gender operates within tourism is particularly relevant as tourism employment is highly gendered, with women occupying feminised positions such as maids, hosts, cleaners and cooks (Kinnaird and Hall, 1996). However, relatively few academics have explored this subject since Swain’s (1995) seminal article that brought to light how gender often shapes tourism processes. More recent work on gender in tourism challenges male hegemony within tourism practices by investigating the role culture plays on how economic practices are gendered (Aitchison, 2009, Tucker, 2007, Tucker and Boonabaana, 2011).

Tourism employment is an important vehicle for development programs to achieve their aims of reducing poverty, which is especially prominent among women. Whilst the structural causes of women’s oppression shall not be discussed in detail here, it is highly relevant to stress that these are not only economic as many development programs assume (Pearson, 2000). Hence the gender
elements are reduced to assisting women rather than getting to the root of problems by investigating how gender roles and relations contribute to the oppressive socio-economic structures both men and women are situated within. Although development is meant to bring social transformation, it is often the ‘miraculous pill’ of economic empowerment that forms development programs’ goal (Oppenheim Mason and Smith, 2003). Indeed, development is far from being a “natural and benign process” (Ferguson, 2011a, p. 210) and studies citing how women’s empowerment has been achieved should be treated with caution and in relation to the cultural context they are situated within (Chant, 2006a). Paying attention to the fact that women do not have shared realities as their world-views differ is one of the aspects often missing from development programs (Kabeer, 2005), which is why Singh (2007) argues that development programs have difficulty in affecting long-term positive change on women’s day-to-day life.

A plethora of organisations are involved in ‘gender and development’ programs around the world, from national NGOs, international aid agencies and highly influential banks to politico-economic unions such as the UN and EU (Griffin, 2010). These development agencies most commonly support the creation of small or micro-businesses in the development programs that have a gender focus. However, this focus has been criticised as corresponding to gendered notions of women as primary carers and having to combine family with work (Ferguson, 2010b). On the other hand, micro-credit programs that offer small loans to women in order to allow them to set-up businesses have been criticised as being little more than an ‘economic safety net’ rather than a long-term solution to poverty, as social factors that govern who uses the money, are not addressed (Kabeer, 2005, Moodie, 2008).

Microenterprise approaches to development have now become the primary mechanism to engage women within the productive economy (Strier and Abdeen, 2009) and this is one of the key tools used by the World Bank. However, again, these programs focus more on the economic aspects of peoples’ lives, overlooking the social and the role key relationships play in peoples’ lives such as gender roles and relations. Indeed this focus on the economic is echoed in much literature on entrepreneurship where the ideal entrepreneur adheres to hegemonic masculine traits of “opportunistic individualism” (Ahl and Marlow, 2012, p. 544). Much entrepreneurship literature shows a connection between masculinity and entrepreneurship leading to the perception that women who want to be entrepreneurs must also adhere to these ideals as feminine ideals of passivity, collectivity and caring are considered weaknesses within entrepreneurship theorising (McDowell, 2011, Brush, 2006). More recent studies focusing on female entrepreneurship from a feminist angle bring to the fore how different conceptualisations of entrepreneurship are possible, such as a recent study challenging women’s ‘underperformance myth’ (Marlow and McAdam, 2013).
However, few studies have investigated in depth how women are carving our new meanings of entrepreneurship or suggest how these new conceptualisations can add to existing entrepreneurship theorising.

There is a recent focus on the social side of entrepreneurship, with current research urging for a focus beyond the narrow meaning of entrepreneurship as an economic activity to perceiving it as a social process (Morrison and Skokic, 2012, Ferguson, 2011a). Moving away from Western-centric conceptualisations of entrepreneurship as an industrial process that subsumes local culture, allows for a better picture of economic reality to be painted as entrepreneurs create their own ‘blend’ of entrepreneurship. For example, development programs that encourage women to become handicraft entrepreneurs are often embedded in cultural norms that connect women’s ‘worth’ to their ability to make handicrafts (Le Mare, 2012). Even though making handicrafts is rarely considered part of women’s social reproductive duties today, its connection to femininity lingers, with development programs perpetuating gendered stereotypes (Kantor, 2003). This type of policy does little for improving women’s marginal position, as together with the assumption that women are ‘naturally’ better at producing handicrafts (especially textiles), comes the assumption that women’s primary responsibility is her family (Andrews et al., 2013). Indeed encouraging women to work collectively, such as for example within women’s agrotourism cooperatives in Greece, evokes the image of a feminised occupation as this departs from entrepreneurial images of independence, hence rendering collective entrepreneurship as an “amateur, leisure type of employment” (Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou, 2003, p. 35). Although cooperatives’ power is in providing women with a safe environment in which to discuss matters and collectively confront gendered economic barriers, much literature focuses on how they are not ‘effective’ business structures (Iakovidou, 2002). This raises a point of criticism: that the notion of ‘success’ is based on classical economic versions of success as being economic without incorporating the role gender plays in these conceptualisations (Barker, 2005). Further training in business skills and ‘entrepreneurial behaviour’ are suggested as a solution (Lassithiotaki, 2011), rather than investigating the role socio-cultural factors may play, such as for example, ‘evil eye’ beliefs that prevent some women from participating in cooperatives in India and Greece (Moodie, 2008, Lazaridis, 2009).

Finally, since seasonality characterises tourism economic activities as much tourism is climate-depantant, looking at how gender roles and relations are affected by seasonality is an interesting and little explored topic. Most literature views seasonality as a malady that needs to be remedied (Higham and Hinch, 2002) and as such, there is growing interest on the effects of climate change on seasonality (Cuccia and Rizzo, 2011). The majority of these studies focus on the economic impacts of seasonality, but however ignore the impacts on the social reproductive economy despite disruptive
seasonal relocation of social reproduction that occurs every season as tourism workers move to tourism destinations in search of work (Duncan et al., 2013).

In Chapter Two and Three, many questions for research were raised by looking at the literatures surrounding social reproduction, gender roles and tourism development, thus providing the context for this study. In the next chapter, Chapter Four, I describe the epistemology and ontology that guides this study. As well as initially delving into how a standpoint feminist epistemology guides the study, I will describe how the area of study was chosen and how the ethnographic tools of participant observation, semi-structured interviewing and field notes are used to construct knowledge.
4 Research methodology and methods

This chapter explains the theoretical framework that underpins this study and goes into detail about why the method of critical feminist ethnography, which includes techniques such as participant observation, interviews and fieldnotes, is the best way to answer the research question posed. In explaining the above, the question of the need for reflexivity within the study arises and the ethical considerations that should be taken into account to protect both the researched and the researcher from harm are explored. Finally, the ways in which knowledge constructed from interactions in the field is converted into narrative is explored by explaining what kind of analysis is best for this study.

4.1 Methodology

Methodology is often described as the strategy employed in order to achieve the study’s desired results, which effectively answers the research question(s) (Crotty, 1998). The central research question that this study aims to answer is: “What is the relationship between female tourism handicraft entrepreneurship and gender roles and relations in Greece?”.

I am choosing a qualitative approach to answer the stated research question as I want to investigate how female entrepreneurs view themselves as entrepreneurs and what social reproduction tasks they perceive themselves to be responsible for, and the best way to investigate opinions and perceptions is to use qualitative methods such as the ethnographic methods of participant observation and semi-structured interviewing. As social life is a result of interactions, qualitative research is useful in making visible the participants’ opinions and interpreting these opinions in terms of the meaning they attach to them. It allows for the co-construction of understandings of the world between researcher and participants (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004).

Using an interpretivist paradigm that entails ontology in which social reality is regarded as the product of processes by which social actors negotiate the meanings for actions and situations, allows for an investigation into how female entrepreneurs’ perspectives might be different if the world were different. More specifically, I take a critical angle to construct knowledge within an interpretivist paradigm. Critical theory deviates from interpretivism in that critical theory does not
fully rely on participants’ accounts to give a ‘true’ interpretation of the world as critical theory views participants as embedded in discourses surrounding gender roles that make them see the imposed as natural, for example seeing the masculine entrepreneurial norm as the only way of being an entrepreneur (Tribe, 2008).

The epistemology behind this research is postmodern in nature and so I accept that reality is socially constructed, thus the investigation will be in a self-critical, creative dialogue, aiming to reveal hidden realities and initiate discussions. During the investigation, I, as a researcher, am part of the setting, rather than a “fly on the wall” as in positivist research (Macdonald et al., 2002, p. 136). A positivist approach is rejected as positivist epistemology is a reflection of the dominant worldview that is shaped by “hierarchies that characterise social life” (Hesse-Biber and Yaiser, 2004, p. 11) such as patriarchy and other modes of social power. Also, whilst positivists seek knowledge, I aim to co-construct it with my participants, accepting that there is no universal truth, but rather context-bound, non-generalisable truths. At the same time, I will attempt to utilise a methodology of “getting lost” as Lather (2007, pp. 224-226) suggests, by adopting a research stance that does not claim knowledge and mastery but aims to “produce different knowledge and to produce knowledge differently” (p. 135). Recognising the difficulties of telling stories of lived experiences, with the risk of them being nothing less that “precious posturing” (Spivak, 1993, p. 155), by critically analysing these accounts I will try to bring female entrepreneurs’ realities to the foreground, facilitating representation of their life-views.

4.1.1 On using critical feminism as a methodology

“Feminism is a fluid form of discontent that repeatedly presses against...weak spots in the patriarchal crust” (Offen, 2000, pp. 25-26)

My methodology is influenced by a feminist theoretical perspective (Hesse-Biber and Yaiser, 2004) and I aim to be attentive to issues of difference, question social power, work towards social justice and create knowledge that is ultimately if not directly of benefit to women. Hence praxis (a committed political position) within this research is important as I want to achieve positive outcomes for both the researcher and the researched. Indeed in practice, many participants expressed gaining a feeling of pleasure from participating in the research, like for example Anna who said: “I like your questions because no one has asked me these questions before. I haven’t thought of all these things together – separately yes, but all together, no, and I like it”. This indicates how participants experience positive results by being asked to participate in the study and by being encouraged to think more deeply about their gender roles and relations within society. I mention that my methodology is merely influenced by a feminist theoretical perspective as it is difficult to define all
the strands which make up the feminist methodology braid. As Stanley (1990) concludes, feminism
does more than just characterise a methodology, it “is not merely a perspective, a way of seeing; or
this plus an epistemology, a way of knowing; it is also an ontology, a way of being in the world.” (p.
14).

Furthermore, as feminists are united in revealing taken-for-granted assumptions about gender,
I aim to unpack how ‘reality’ is constructed in ways that oppress people not adhering to stereotypical
gender norms, by situating gender as a valid category of inquiry (Macdonald et al., 2002). An example
of how reality can be ‘unpacked’ is by revealing the ways in which constructed meanings of
femininity related to social reproduction legitimate the subordination of women within social spaces
such as the family. Another way in which feminism critiques the taken-for-granted is the way in
which it critiques neoclassical economic theorising. The feminist critique is that while relations of
production and reproduction are seen as co-existing systems that influence each other, neoclassical
economics keeps them separate from each other (Harman, 2010). Furthermore, the household
economy is often referred to as capitalism’s “feminised other” (Gibson-Graham, 2006, p. 7) resulting
in invisibility of its workings, despite the household economy’s essentiality in capitalism’s
functionality. Hence, feminism is particularly suited to this study as it critiques existing theories that
contain a gender bias, such as entrepreneurship, with the aim of bringing to the fore women’s
experiences and perspectives that have been ignored by traditional research ( Alvesson and
Sköldberg, 2009).

More specifically, as I aim to criticise current neoclassical economic theorising that situates
entrepreneurship within the masculine domain, thus normalising masculinity and excluding feminine
interpretations of entrepreneurship, this study is driven by a critical feminist theoretical perspective.
Critical theory questions the status quo whilst supporting the notion that there may be a reflexive
relationship between propositions and the social context they are applied to (May, 2001). I use the
critical theory stance to criticise taken-for-granted concepts such as gender, and uncover the
workings of gender within economic structures such as entrepreneurship as well as to investigate the
relationship between social reproduction and entrepreneurship. A critical approach is particularly
suited to this study as it aims for emancipation through the suggestion of a more gender-fair world
by rejecting “crude forms of economic determinism” (Tribe, 2008, p. 246). As much of tourism
research is driven by a materialist ideology (e.g. on how to be a more profitable business), this study
responds to the call for more critical research that challenges hegemonies and effects social change
(Ren et al., 2010).
One of the most pervasive hegemonic structures throughout society is that of masculine dominance, which is why I use gender as a tool to deconstruct meanings of tourism entrepreneurship. Furthermore, one of the primary principles of feminist methodology is that it is committed to the advancement of women’s issues (Hesse-Biber and Yaiser, 2004). As a researcher, I am committed to knowledge having an element of emancipation and want to create knowledge that is of use to women (and men), so I adopt a feminist approach to critically investigate how gender permeates tourism development by using tourism entrepreneurship as an example of this tourism process (Tickner, 2005). I aim to advance women’s issues by creating more representative interpretations of women’s experiences of entrepreneurship by disrupting the main/male-stream theory, which traditionally guides research and which is particularly present within entrepreneurship theory. As Ahl (2006) and de Bruin et al (2007) suggest, current entrepreneurship theory is not applicable to female entrepreneurs as it is based on masculine norms of rational man as a separate self, unaffected by his environment. So investigating how gender is constructed within entrepreneurship and how gender permeates entrepreneurship is helpful in advancing entrepreneurial theorising that is more applicable to women. Furthermore, research in tourism in particular is especially gendered as Bensemann (2011) points out in her chapter on female tourism co-preneurs. This further explains using a feminist approach in order to uncover the gender relations underlying tourism processes such as entrepreneurship. By using a critical feminist approach I hope to find out how women’s personal experiences of entrepreneurship challenge current theories that are based on gendered interpretations of entrepreneurship.

Here I must stress that this thesis is guided by a Western feminist ideology and hence the research questions that are posed correspond to issues that this type of feminist considers significant, and the way in which research is carried out is also representative of this stance. For example the link between caring and femininity shows a Western feminist stance and I acknowledge that in Third World countries, different definitions of femininity may exist as well as different manifestations of feminism. Indeed, feminism as a concept is often considered a ‘western’ preoccupation, which women in Third World countries want to be disassociated with, creating their own version instead (Parpart, 1993). However, in this thesis, Western feminism is used for two reasons. The first is because the majority of literature using feminism to critique the masculine norm within entrepreneurship, comes from a Western feminist stance, even though they do not explicitly acknowledge the type of feminism that informs their research (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). The second reason is because the author’s Western origins and upbringing make this type of feminism more
relevant to her struggles as well as her feeling that she has the ‘right’ to talk from this particular stance. In addition, since empirical research is conducted within a Western country, Greece, adopting a Western feminist stance becomes all the more relevant. Looking beyond the issues of who has a right to research about what, feminism is used here to facilitate a collective movement to address inequality and discrimination against women. Post-structural feminism, which challenges the notion of female essentialism and assumptions of a shared subordination arising from a similar biological identity, which is a point often used to critique the use of feminism in research in Third World countries, allows for research that advances thinking on gender, tourism and work and informing ontological pluralism (Calas et al., 2009, Willmott, 2008).

4.1.2 Why not patriarchy?

As I am taking a feminist stance and the term patriarchy is often associated with feminism as the shorthand for male’s dominance over women, I shall briefly explain why patriarchy is not used as a guiding concept within this study. Patriarchal structures represent significant constellations of social relations which can structure gender relations (Sargent, 1981). Patriarchal relations in cultural institutions (e.g. religion) have historically been very important discourses, laying down norms regarding forms of conduct for men and women e.g. the Church supporting the notion that woman’s place is at home (Walby, 1990). One of the most common patriarchal narratives is the one involving whose role it is to maintain the household and take care of the children and elderly (Saul, 2003). Hence, patriarchy can be seen as a discourse that undermines the position of women by “excluding them from participation in socio-economic structures” (Omwami, 2010, p. 18).

However, the concept of patriarchy lacks analytical utility as although it invokes male agency, there is no clear “specification of its origins, structure and direction” (Fox, 2006, p. 27). Furthermore viewing patriarchy as a system of gender oppression insinuates an essentialist comprehension of (male) gender as being able to oppress another gender (female) rather than gender being a fluid construct and social structures being built by gender relations (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). Also, by using patriarchy as a term, there is an underlying assumption that it exists and thus its validity is taken for granted (McDonough and Harrison, 2012). Furthermore, when looking at studies of masculinities, the notion of ‘patriarchy’ as the male dominant theoretical signifier is not an inclusive notion, as men can be dominated by men as observed by Macleod (2007). Gender ideology expressed in gender roles and relations is thus a more useful concept than patriarchy when talking.
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7 One of the questions relating to who has the ‘right’ to take a particular stance was presented to me during a workshop at the Women’s World Congress 2014 that was held in Hyderabad, India. I concluded that I, a white, privileged female, growing up in a Western country cannot claim to expertly talk about Indian feminist ideology when I do not have lived experience of how it is to be an Indian female living in India.
about how gendered structures exert social control through social institutions such as culture, religion, family, state policies and the economy (Wickramasinghe, 2009).

4.1.2.1 Feminist constructivist ontology

By using a feminist constructivist ontology which is often used within modern feminist economics theorising, a critical analysis of female entrepreneurship can be achieved (Waylen, 2000). Constructivism as an ontology, recognises that agents (e.g. female entrepreneurs) and structure (e.g. state childcare policies) interact to create social reality. More specifically feminist constructivism sees economics as socially constructed via masculine ideals. As feminist economists refute the idea of individuals being uniform, rational beings, thus rejecting the Marxist idea of gender-blindness, from this angle, people are conceptualised as acting according to social constructions such as gender (Cook et al., 2000). Moreover, a constructivist ontology can add nuance to understanding the interplay between social agents and structures and thus provide space for novel interpretations of ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘social reproduction’.

4.1.2.2 Feminist standpoint approach to research

When a feminist viewpoint is used to look at female entrepreneurship, it can expand the “conceptual space where women currently reside” (Calas et al., 2007, p. 70) and suggest ways of dealing with social inequality issues. More specifically within this study, as I want to critically enquire about the effect tourism has on those who live within it (i.e. the female tourism handicraft entrepreneurs), adopting a standpoint approach provides a way of answering these questions, as well as raising awareness and perhaps bringing about change (Humberstone, 2004). This is because feminist standpoint epistemology favours ‘truths’ that emerge from women’s lived experiences whereby knowledge is co-created between researcher and researched within a certain context. Hence, reality is subjective as it depends on how it is understood by the researcher and the researched. The local, context-bound knowledge produced from this interaction is non-generalisable, so does not purport to universal positivist claims of truth about the relationship of entrepreneurship and gender roles, but is of significance in furthering entrepreneurship theorising by providing a rich description of context-bound reality.

This is in line with most interpretive research that acknowledges the existence of multiple truths rather than a single, testable truth as within the positivist tradition (Macdonald et al., 2002). As such, the ‘truth’ within feminist standpoint research is seen as socially constructed and inextricably linked to the meanings given to it within the research process. Women’s experiences are rarely uniform anyway, as they differ according to individual backgrounds, ethnicity, class, etc. which is acknowledged by modern-day feminist thought that focuses more on feminisms of difference
rather than of universal one-fits-all explanations (Fenstermaker and West, 2013). Furthermore, this study’s emancipatory element of giving marginalised people a voice, fits well within a standpoint approach which emphasises the importance of stimulating social change rather than just looking for the ‘truth’ (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). However, it is important not only to consider how one can know what there is to be known, but also the positionality of the researcher in this construction. This positionality, which is known as ‘reflexivity’ is an important part of the research process and shall be discussed next.

4.1.3 Reflexivity

Much literature supports that reflexivity is crucial in legitimising, validating and questioning qualitative research as it questions the researcher’s ability to represent the stories emerging out of transactions with participants (Pillow, 2003). The relationship that I, as a researcher, have to the knowledge created within this study is significant within the critical feminist standpoint framework adopted in order to answer this study’s research question. Critical reflexivity on my part is essential to this feminist research as I am the person who has chosen what to research and how to write about it and so it is necessary that my beliefs and background can be scrutinised as they are part of the research process of co-constructing knowledge with the participants, rather than claiming to be a neutral observer and interpreter of events (Fine et al., 2000). Hence, within this section I suggest how my world-stance affects my understanding and interpretation of events, whilst recognising that even though I strive to make my position transparent, this does not make my position completely unproblematic as the self cannot be assumed to be unified and knowable (Spivak, 1988).

Being a researcher with feminine subjectivities completing research on women for women is in some ways an advantage as I have an insider or emic angle to feminine gender subjectivities. However, I also recognise that this position can mask some of the nuances encountered in interactions with participants as I am deeply embedded within my perspective and because of this familiarity may be unaware of them (Duijnhoven and Roessingh, 2006).

The unawareness of nuances because of my insider position in relation to gender also extends to my ethnic identity as half Greek-half English, having grown up in Greece for the first 18 formative years of my life. So when participating in the research process, I am aware that not viewing people’s behaviour in an ‘exotic’ context may also blind me to some aspects of participants’ behaviour as these could be perceived by an outsider to the community. However, whilst I am to some extent an insider, my outer physical appearance and accent do place me in a limbo space by being partly but not fully Greek. This has its advantages, because as an outsider, I can be easily forgiven for not adhering to social norms as I am assumed not to know how these operate (Simoni and McCabe,
2008). For example, when visiting single male participants in the mountainous village of Margarites, I feel that this distinction made me more gender-neutral, although it may have also been my identity as a researcher at a foreign university and as being from Athens (and not local) that also contributed to this feeling. In terms of gender-neutrality, I feel this facilitated my entry into groups such as Kostis’ family without causing any gossip. The experience of having a family lunch with Kostis and his relatives brings to the fore how, as Pillow (2003) points out, “reflexivity as recognition of the other” (p. 184) is also very important. By having lunch with his family where they were all able to interrogate the purposes for which my research was to be used, it facilitated for their voice to be heard and for me as researcher to be viewed as a person with weaknesses, which I hope acted to decrease inequalities in our relationship. Indeed in all engagements with participants I endeavoured to reduce the perception of my position as ‘powerful, knowledgeable’ researcher by stressing how I wanted my participants to treat me as their student in our interactions.

With regards to my emic/etic identity this is complex and relates to my having gatekeepers known within the community, which possibly affected the way some of the participants opened up to me. On one hand since I had a connection to the area through knowing someone from the area (this was always a question asked during engagement with participants), I was accepted as not completely ‘kseni’ (a ‘foreigner’ in Greek). Not being a ‘kseni’ is, as Dubisch (1993) also observes, an advantage in gaining participants’ trust to express themselves freely as a ‘kseni’ is perceived as a polluting element to be kept far away from family matters, which I was to some extent asking about. At the same time as in Greece there is a distrust of people asking questions about one’s business, a distrust which is impacted by the increasingly volatile political context of Greece whilst doing fieldwork, my external appearance and slight accent may have been beneficial to me in terms of access and gaining my participants’ trust, as at least phenomenologically, I differ from a stereotypical Greek public servant. Recognising the complexity created by the blurred boundaries between insider and outsider positionalities that I experienced, and how this may affect reflexivity, I maintain a questioning stance and hope to encourage the reader to also do the same (i.e. question the current research).

My identity as partial insider gave me certain advantages when engaging in participant observation, for example sharing a common language (Greek) with participants gave me the ability to engage with them better. Lacking Greek language skills, communication on an advanced level would have been impossible without the presence of translator, as the majority of participants spoke limited English. The presence of a translator would have impeded the quality of information created in our interactions, as a unique feeling of trust was gained with participants which would have been
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8 Tourism entrepreneurs are especially afraid of inquisitive visitors as they are prone to tax evasion and fear that tax inspectors may disguise themselves.
harder to gain if a third person was always present. In addition, the use of translators in ethnographic research is sometimes criticised as the translator favours the researcher’s (who is paying) language rather than the source language, thus creating power discrepancies in the representation of the people researched (Agar, 2011).

Another aspect of my identity as insider is my background as past handicraft-maker entrepreneur myself. Having been an avid handicraft-maker for a number of years, with experience in silversmithing, crocheting, micro-sculpting and selling handicrafts I made online and at fairs, connecting with my participants was relatively easy. A particular moment when this was obvious to me whilst doing fieldwork was when I felt a special connection being formed when Frosso, a female potter in Crete, showed me the items she had made whilst completing a silversmith course and I showed her items from my silver collection, after which a feeling of trust and mutual understanding developed. This allowed for a friendship to develop and we enjoyed various social activities together such as going to theatrical and music performances and this is a friendship which is still alive at the time of writing this thesis.

4.2 Ethnographic methods

As this study is based on epistemological principles that constitute the ways of knowing about the world as being embedded within social relations, ethnography is chosen as the method of choice as it allows for the in-depth observance of these relations over a prolonged time period (Harding, 1996). Furthermore, ethnography is linked with an epistemological stance that says that in order to understand one’s world you need to live it. More specifically, as this study is driven by critical feminism, critical ethnography is used in order to explore the everyday where gender roles and relations are constituted (Van Loon, 2007), to make visible the invisible, to describe power relations and to “critique the taken for granted” (O’Reilly, 2012, p. 52). This type of ethnography is chosen as a method within this study as it can uncover what Bourdieu (1977) calls the “symbolic acts of violence” in which all members of a culture are complicit by exposing social processes of control such as those related to gender and social reproduction. Feminist ethnography is one variety of a critical approach. I will be using feminist ethnography techniques to emphasise the external world’s reality by understanding its impacts from the perspective of those experiencing it, by looking at how the everyday contributes to the maintenance of power.

As feminist ethnography is based on the assumption that it is necessary to experience life as participants do (Gomm, 2009), I hope to act as the research “co-producer” (Leopold, 2011, p. 88),
where the researched become objects of knowledge and together with the researcher produce what can be known. By viewing the participants as being the embodiment of subjectivities such as gendered and economic subjectivities, I perceive participants as acting according to the gendered and economic structures and discourses that influence them and these subjectivities become apparent via interactions such as conversations between me, the subjective researcher, and the participants (Devault, 2004). One of the main ways of constituting ethnographic research as valid is by attempting to reduce the subjective disparity between researcher and researched, by striving to create relationships based on trust, openness and honesty (Scarles, 2012). Whilst gaining participants’ trust is very useful in terms of getting ethnographic accounts wherein the researched feels comfortable enough to vocalise their world-stance, it does have certain ethical repercussions which are discussed further on within this chapter.

The ethnographic methods I use are those of participant observation, semi-structured interviews and fieldnotes. Using the method of participant observation as my main research tool, I participate in social life and thus gain insight into everyday social transactions that people may forget to mention or not normally want to discuss. Using the technique of semi-structured interviews I am able to elicit replies from the perspective of the individual, without asking leading or confusing questions. As concepts of economic theories may be alien to the participants, using such a technique has the potential of providing a rich data source for analysis by allowing the participants to determine which incidents are most relevant for their experience of entrepreneurship. Adhering to my feminist framework, these ethnographic techniques can help participants depart from dominant values by not telling me what they think I want to hear, but how what they perceive their involvement in entrepreneurship to be.

4.2.1 Participant sample and selection

Participants for this study have to fulfil the requirement that they own and operate their own business, make their own handicrafts as souvenirs for tourists and are located within one of the two sites chosen for ethnographic research. When selecting the ethnographic sites, one of the essential characteristics of these sites was for me to have a ‘gatekeeper’ there, that is a person who is known to the researcher and facilitate access to the site in terms of introducing potential participants for the study (O’Reilly, 2012). The gatekeepers in this study consist of one of my high-school friends who used to be a female tourism entrepreneur in Rethymno Old Town and a friend’s parents who are medical academics in Ioannina, Epirus. Hence my gatekeepers are not ‘formal’ gatekeepers in the sense of allowing me to access participants which I would have not been able to otherwise, as for example in the case of accessing sex offenders at a probation centre (Reeves, 2010), but are
significant in helping me ‘ease’ into the research setting. To this extent, having a ‘gatekeeper’ in each site goes beyond simply providing access to participants; having a gatekeeper is significant in more practical terms such as providing me with temporary housing and emotional support after landing in a relatively unknown area with few social acquaintances (Schensul and LeCompte, 2012).

Whilst my gatekeepers introduced me to some of the participants in this study, I also utilised my social network to approach some participants. The initial idea of meeting participants for this study via snowballing whereby one participant introduced me to a fellow handicraft entrepreneur, in this study had limited effectiveness, and depended on the area in which the entrepreneurs were located. For example, the entrepreneurs who were located in Rethymno Old Town which is an area saturated by tourist shops, all in close competition with each other, were rarely keen to introduce me to other entrepreneurs. This may indicate not only how competitiveness intervenes in social relationships causing divisions based on competitive advantage but also how the intense work patterns induced by tourism serve to isolate tourism entrepreneurs as they have little time left for socialising and getting to know who their competition is. However, in the more mountainous ethnographic sites, tourism handicraft entrepreneurs were much more open to introducing me to their fellow entrepreneurs. For example, in Margarites village, just 30 minutes’ drive from Rethymno Old Town, I found all my participants through snowballing. After being introduced to one of the potters by my gatekeeper, he introduced me to another potter, who in turn suggested I visit someone else and so on. On the other hand, some participants came from me simply going to their shop and asking them if they wanted to participate in the study (e.g. Ioanna) and others came via acquaintances whom I met whilst in the field participating in social activities. An example of the latter is the way in which I met Frosso, a pottery entrepreneur in Rethymno Old Town whom I was introduced to by Maria, a lady who was teaching me how to weave at the Folk Art Centre course I enrolled for.

Barriers in accessing participants were encountered in some instances, such as having to ask permission from female entrepreneurs’ husbands in Metsovo which discouraged me from asking the women to participate. In the case of the Rizarios handicraft school participants, I had to ask permission from the headmistress in order to speak to the female entrepreneurs working there, which I felt slightly disrupted the way participants reacted to me as I became endorsed by a person in power. An example of this disruption occurring were the uncomfortable silences I had to endure whilst trying to engage some of the female handicraft school teachers in conversation, without fruitful results, which I attribute to the women’s regard for authority which effectively blocked them from opening up to me as I was considered as connected to the headmistress since she introduced me to them. So, in this instance, the feminist goal of developing egalitarian relationships between
researcher and participant was diluted by this power imbalance (Stacey, 1988). However, I was able to develop better relationships with some of the other women at the handicraft school who were closer to my age group. Whilst initially they were cautious about talking to me, after a few visits we were able to establish rapport which culminated in planning social meetings.

Another tenet of critical feminist ethnography is for it to be empowering for the participants (Skeggs, 2007). I observed this happening at various instances with the participants saying how they liked the questions I posed, as Anna says: “I like the questions you ask, as no one has asked them to me before” (Anna, interview) and they felt empowered as Katerina says: “I feel empowered by you taking an interest in my experiences” (Katerina, interview). As a researcher, I also felt empowered by the feeling of doing something that produced this feeling of empowerment, which speaks to the importance of reciprocity to establish a non-exploitative relationship which is important to the generation of knowledge.

This brings to the fore how the creation of valid knowledge within this study’s feminist framework is only possible if egalitarian, respectful relationships based on reciprocity are developed between participant and researcher (O’Reilly, 2012).

As researcher I feel indebted to the participants for allowing me into their lives and devoting their precious time speaking to me and on any occasion that I could, I helped them with whatever they asked me for help with. This occurred in a number of instances, an example of which is the help Ioanna asked from me in translating some German webpages to assist her son apply for an undergraduate degree in Germany. Another instance is how Frosso asked me for advice regarding her idea of creating innovative tourist packages that would combine accommodation in her rooms-to-let above her pottery studio with pottery lessons and excursions to archaeological sites and museums with pottery displays. Another instance in which I tried to reciprocate the participants’ help was when I managed to secure funding for the financially suffering (as evident by workers’ salaries being halved and the quality of food served to boarding students reduced) Rizarios Handicraft School towards the end of my time spent engaging in research with them. I achieved this by drawing on business contacts to donate to this not-for-profit organisation in exchange for the image of a ship woven by Handicraft School’s entrepreneurs to be used on the company’s Christmas e-card. However in some instances I felt that giving my true opinion on matters such as improving one participant’s cluttered shop-front would not have been conducive to our ongoing relationship and so intuitively did not provide any advice on this matter. This is an instance which shows that having a

9 Images of ships commonly (although this is rapidly changing to globalised trends of trees, snowmen, etc.) grace the front of Christmas cards in Greece whereas miniature models of ships instead of trees are adorned with lights to celebrate Christmas time.
successful relationship with participants is not something that can be “taught, instructed, rehearsed” (Pillow and Mayo, 2004, p. 163), but is based on intuition.

Whilst all the different ways of finding participants may have initially contributed to varying levels of trust being formed, progressively this difference in approach became less marked as our relationship developed. Indeed, the selection process of the final participants was very much a two-way process as effectively we choose each other. As spending a prolonged amount of time with participants is a pre-requisite for ethnography (Crang and Cook, 2007), it was essential that we ‘got on’ together and that the participants felt it worth their time spending hours talking to me on a weekly basis for three months, during the busy tourist season. So in effect, my participants ‘chose me’. This speaks not only to the essentiality of a good research-participant relationship in order to produce valid interpretations of the knowledge transpiring from the research-participant interactions, but also to the importance of empathy within feminist research (Skeggs, 2007). Empathy in this instance relates to the researcher’s instinctive understanding of the potential participants’ feelings of not wanting to participate but doing so because they think they should. To this extent, whilst I met many potential participants, I continued visiting only ten (10) participants in each ethnographic site, amounting to approximately half of the total potential participants approached (Table 4.1).

It is relevant to note the disparity among this study’s account of handicraft-makers and images of these people created by past literature which highlights the need for longitudinal ethnographic studies monitoring both the change occurring in these communities and also for a more valid representation of these tourism structures, as also noted by Tucker (2010). When initially embarking on my fieldwork I had expected to find many older ladies who make and sell handicrafts such as embroidery and crocheting, however in reality, there were very few of them and even in a village close to Rethymno, called Anogeia, that is known for exactly this type of entrepreneur, I found that despite the ‘old ladies in black’ that Greger (1988) suggests being present throughout Greece, this was not the case. The ‘old ladies in black’ in Anogeia do sell embroidered and crocheted items via their tourist shops, but most of the fabric items have not been made by them. Indeed one of my first encounters in Rethymno was with a hotel owner who recounted the story of how some guests complained, because after closer inspection of the embroidered fabrics they bought from Anogeia, (which they had been led to believe were handmade by the ‘old ladies in black’), they found a label on the fabrics indicating that they were in fact made in China.

Another departure from what I expected to find versus what I actually found, relates to the education levels of participants. To this effect, I found that many of the participants had high
education levels, with a high percentage having attained a university or college degree before entering handicraft tourism entrepreneurship. This departs from stereotypical ideas that people engage in handicraft entrepreneurship because of its low-education level entry requirements. Whilst handicraft entrepreneurship may have very low-education level requirements, especially in developing countries (World Tourism Organization, 2008), it seems that particularly in Crete, people enter tourism handicraft entrepreneurship as a choice rather than as a last alternative. However, as can be observed in Table 4.1, there does seem to be a relationship between low education levels and rurality in Greece (Psaltopoulos et al., 2004), as observed in Epirus, which is a more rural area than Crete and where participants’ education levels are generally lower than participants’ education levels in Crete.

Table 4.1: Table showing participants’ location, name, origin, age, sex, educational level and type of handicraft entrepreneurship. (Participant names are a combination of pseudonyms and real names, depending on participants’ preferences.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnographic site</th>
<th>Participant name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Age (approx.)/Sex</th>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Type of handicraft entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rethymno, Crete</td>
<td>Ioanna</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>45/female</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Crocheting, embroidering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liana</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>35/female</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Wedding favours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hara</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>35/female</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Silversmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MrsE</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>70/female</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Crocheting, embroidering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frosso</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>45/female</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kostis</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50/male</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giorgos</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>40/male</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marinki</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>40/female</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katerina</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>40/female</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manolis</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>40/male</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>60/male</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagori, Epirus</td>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>35/female</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Felt-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giota</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>35/female</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Felt-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panos</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>45/male</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Jewellery-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anetta</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50/female</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>35/female</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthoula</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>30/female</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DarkK</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>45/female</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Traditional food cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dina</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50/female</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Traditional food cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BlondeK</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>45/female</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Traditional food cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaggelio</td>
<td>Non-local</td>
<td>45/female</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Knitter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Ethnographic sites

With regards to the location of the ethnographic sites where I carried out the fieldwork, I chose two areas which were most accessible to me in terms of culture, language and gate keepers, and hence where I could learn the most from these particular social settings (Schensul and LeCompte, 2012). The main pre-requisite in choosing an ethnographic site to answer this study’s research question regarding the relationship of female tourism handicraft entrepreneurship to gender roles, was to find participants who were engaged in tourism handicraft entrepreneurship. So participants falling into the category of tourism handicraft entrepreneurs are those directly involved in the tourism sector by selling the handicrafts they make predominantly to tourists rather than to locals. Hence two areas in Greece known for their handicrafts and tourism were focused upon: the island of Crete and the mountainous area of Epirus in Northwest Greece. The maps that follow provide an indication of the geographical location of Greece in relation to the world and the location of the ethnographic sites within Greece. The later also provides an idea of the geographic isolation of the ethnographic sites chosen.

Figure 4-1 World map showing location of Greece [source: geology.com]
In each ethnographic site, ethnography was conducted for the duration of three months. Although there is no set time period fieldwork has to take place for, in order for the study to be considered a credible ethnography, various authors argue that it should be enough time to gather sufficient information in order to provide a full picture of the field (Charmaz, 2006). Spending a sufficient amount of time in the field is important not only in order to establish rapport with participants and gain their trust, but also for the researcher to transcend the ‘newcomer perspective’ when everything is new and intriguing and to re-assess issues that were taken-for-granted or perceived differently when linked to events experienced after being for some time in the field (O’Reilly, 2012).

The difference between locations in terms of nationality of tourists and tourist season, i.e. international summer tourism in Rethymno and national winter tourism in Ioannina, may also provide some interesting nuances to the study. Another reason why the particular areas are chosen is that they have a relatively high number of handicraft producers and sellers which will give me a large pool of participants to choose from. In addition, Rethymno has a handicraft school, a local folk art centre and a small village, Margarites, where almost exclusively potters make and sell their art to passing-by tourists. In Zagori, there is a handicraft school which supplies its goods to a local exhibition centre visited by many tourists annually and Zagori attracts many nature- and adventure tourists who come to ski, hike or climb. The presence of handicraft-related structures in the
ethnographic sites, illustrates the importance handicrafts and tourism play in Rethymno and Zagori, hence making them ideal sites to study in order to answer my research question.

With regards to the timing of the fieldwork, tourism seasonality has to be taken into consideration as during shoulder seasons it is difficult to locate potential participants. Hence, as tourism in Zagori is mainly winter tourism, the months September – December are best for approaching my participants there. Crete is a summer tourism destination and hence the participants are easier to approach in the months June- August, as during the winter months internal migration is common and most tourist shops are closed.

To follow, are detailed descriptions of the sites where ethnography took place with reference to their politico-economic and socio-cultural features and their tourism development structures, which will provide the reader with a ‘feel’ for the areas in which research was conducted. In order for the reader to get a more ‘visual’ feel of the ethnographic sites, pictures taken of the ethnographic sites’ tourism-related structures are shown.

4.2.2.1  **Rethymno, Crete**

![Figure 4-3 Ethnographic sites within Crete - Rethymno and Maragarites village](source: greecretavel.com)

Crete, the fifth largest island in the Mediterranean and Greece’s largest island, is the first ethnographic site. This island is renowned for its natural beauty, diverse landscape, long coastline,
Minoan archaeological sites, such as Knossos, and its gastronomic delights. In terms of tourism development, Crete experienced rapid economic growth in the mid-1960’s due to tourism, whilst tourism growth was at a high between the mid-1980s and mid 1990s (Briassoulis, 2003). Crete’s local population grew quite rapidly between 1971-2001, fuelled by better employment opportunities both because of tourism but also because of Crete’s dynamic greenhouse sector (50% of the country’s greenhouses are in Crete).

The Cretan participants come from the Rethymno prefecture whose centre is a small seaside town located in northern Crete, approximately equidistant from the two main Cretan cities of Chania and Irakleio. Rethymno prefecture experienced one of the highest population growth rates in Crete and in order to accommodate the increasing population and tourist influx, the town has sprawled out in all directions in the last 30-20 years, as witnessed by various people I spoke to there. For example, my landlord recalled that the apartment I lived in during my three-month stay in Rethymno was in fact a productive vineyard just 30 years ago. Since the university was built around 1980, Rethymno also has a large student population and so life in the city remains viable during the winter months when tourist facilities close, unlike many other Greek tourism summer destinations.

Rethymno is a city that still bears the remnants of Venetian influences such as ‘Fortezza’ (Figure 4.1), the imposing Venetian castle and the ‘Rimondi’, the lion-shaped marble water fountains, mingled with Turkish-influenced minarets poking their spindle heads far above most buildings in the ‘Old Town’ of Rethymno. The ‘Old Town’ is also where most accommodation, tourist shops, bars and restaurants are located. Rethymno also has a vibrant art scene and the newly-built art museum has some superb works of modern art from emerging Greek artists.
Rethymno prefecture’s nature offers contrasting scenery with harsh, dry mountainous areas alternating with lush green valleys, which offer opportunities for hiking expeditions for nature-loving tourists. Mount Psiloritis, which is the highest mountain in Crete, is located in Rethymno prefecture and attracts climbers from around the world. For adventure-loving tourists there are also over 800 caves to explore, the most popular being Melidoni cave which has ancient historical significance. Scattered around the prefecture are 18 well-preserved Byzantine churches (although badly signposted) and numerous archaeological sites where items from the Neolithic, Minoan, Classic and Roman periods have been found and are exhibited in the Archaeological museum. The imposing rocky coastline is interrupted by sandy beaches and the most deserted and clean beaches are located in the prefecture’s southern coast where tourism development is minimal and visitors are mainly national tourists. In Rethymno city the beaches are covered with rows of umbrellas and sun-loungers (Figure 4.2) and shared between the endangered loggerhead turtle population (numbering about 130 turtles in Rethymno) and the thousands of tourists who stay in hotels just across the road from the beach.
With regards to the type of tourism Rethymno receives, this is characterised by high seasonality with the majority of tourists arriving April – October each year (Briassoulis, 2003). Many international tourists visit Rethymno, attracted by the promise of sea and sun and also lured by attractive tourist packages on offer which include the flight, hotel and full board (Andriotis, 2001). In 2012, there was an increase in the numbers of Eastern European tourists who mainly stayed in all-inclusive hotels, whereas the numbers of German tourists who used to make up the bulk of tourists to Crete were at least 30% down (Reuters, 2012). British tourist numbers fell by about 11% (Keenan, 2012) and there was a significant reduction (45.1%) of American tourists (Greek Statistics, 2012), perhaps because of the bad media representation of Greece’s economic crisis-related riots. Although the riots were limited mainly to a very small area in central Athens, they were projected as affecting the whole of Greece, some blogs even reporting that there would be difficulties obtaining food or taking money out of ATMs (TTG Nordic, 2012)! In addition, elderly foreigners who have made Crete their place of retirement and thus are considered as long-stay tourists reported having to abandon Greece as the declining and underfunded public health system in Greece no longer supports their medical needs. The increase in low-budget tourists who mostly stay in all-inclusive hotels and have
low budgets to spend on items such as souvenirs or food, was detrimental to many of the
participants’ businesses (participants’ narrations).

With regards to the development of tourism in Rethymno, this was quite rapid with a large
number of hotels and tourist accommodation being built in the last 30 years to accommodate the
enormous increase in overnight stays, which between 1975 and 1981, was 517% (Briassoulis, 2003).
As Greek tourism policy in the 80s targeted islands and less developed areas in line with EU policies,
much funding for tourism development and infrastructure was pumped into Rethymno via EU
subsidies and national funds aimed at increasing ‘competitiveness’ and ‘culture’. Whilst rumours
have it that Crete was favoured, gaining 23% of total national tourism-related funding, because of
influential right-wing politicians originating from the island, this cannot be verified. Mass tourism
prevails in Rethymno and is operated mainly by small-to-medium sized family enterprises, with
foreign tour operators controlling tourism demand (an unofficial estimate of 70% of tourist
accommodation is controlled by foreign tour operators) (Briassoulis, 2003). As is common with mass
tourism, environmental problems are observed in Rethymno, such as marine pollution from tourism
effluence, for which a solution was found relatively recently in the form of upgrading the sewage
system which had been over-capacity due to increased tourism needs (Nea Kriti, 2012).

The main organisations for promoting tourism development in Rethymno are the Prefecture
Organisation for Touristic Promotion, the Municipality’s Tourism Promotion Office and the
Municipality’s Social Benefit Organisation (KEDIR). Whilst little information could be mined regarding
the Prefecture Organisation’s activities, mainly due to their lack of a website, it seems that they are
active in Rethymno’s tourism development, acting as the intermediary for various EU-funded
programs aimed at tourism development, attending tourist fairs and marketing Rethymno as a
tourism destination (Anatoli online, 2010). Rethymno Municipality’s tourism office aims at
addressing local issues related to tourism in cooperation with local groups affected by tourism such
as taxi drivers, bus drivers, restaurant owners and tour guides. These issues, in 2007, included
policing restaurants which put tables on the pavements, lighting various areas, organising events,
creating a museum for fishermen and improving road infrastructures (Rethymno Municipality
Tourism Office, 2007). KEDIR, although its main activity (as described on its website) is managing
public child daycare centres, day centres for the elderly and centres for social care, it is also the body
responsible for organising various festivals that take place in Rethymno creating a focal point for
visitors already in Rethymno and attracting visitors from other parts of Crete. This odd combination
may be due to the fact that the same person who is in charge of KEDIR is also in charge of the
Municipality Tourism Office.
I experienced two of the three festivals organised by KEDIR as I volunteered for them whilst doing my fieldwork. One, the local food and wine festival, was a festival held in July 2012 featuring various food producer stands such as wine and cheese producers from the Rethymno prefecture and a handicraft exhibition (Figure 4.3). The festival had workshops on how to make Cretan pasta, olive oil soap (which one attendant swallowed thinking it was soup and had to be rushed to hospital!) and various traditional food recipes involving snails and sausages.

![Handicraft display of traditional Rethymnian embroidery at the Wine and Food festival, Rethymno, Crete](image)

*Figure 4-6: Handicraft display of traditional Rethymnian embroidery at the Wine and Food festival, Rethymno, Crete (author’s picture, July 2012)*

The other annual summer festival organised by KEDIR is the Renaissance festival, which has a variety of classical music concerts which attract mainly local international residents. At this festival I participated by ushering and ticketing whilst dressed in traditional Venetian clothing (Figure 4.7). The third festival organised by KEDIR is the one celebrating Greek carnival at the end of February which is one of the most popular carnival parades in Greece, attracting high numbers of national tourists during the parade week.
Whilst festivals are a way of attracting tourists, subsidies are a way of encouraging tourism entrepreneurs to make their businesses more competitive. Subsidies encourage entrepreneurs to invest in new technologies (e.g. a new e-shop to sell their products online), use consulting services, or improve their business’s buildings which is what this year’s state Competitiveness Development Program (ESPA 2007-2013) program hopes to achieve (Ministry of Development Competitiveness Infrastructure Transport and Networks, 2013b). These are nationwide programs, with specific conditions, such as a percentage of subsidies given for various geographical zones (e.g. 50% of total investment is subsidised for Crete, whereas only 30% is subsidised for Attiki). However, there is a certain amount of corruption surrounding subsidies and many of the people I spoke to in Rethymno said that the majority of EU subsidies made available via the LEADER program, whilst given to improve tourist facilities or to differentiate the tourism product by promoting agrotourism, apparently account for the large number of Navara/Hilux luxury pick-up vans that dominate on the Cretan roads. This misuse of EU funds was common knowledge amongst most participants and one participant in particular pointed out how in his village, out of 12 projects that received EU funding to become agrotourism hotels, only two function as such, the rest being completed but used as private houses.
Despite this apparent underlying corruption, a wide variety of tourism resources exist, and more specifically in the handmade-souvenir sector which this study is focusing upon, there are a number of successful private initiatives. In the ‘Old Town’, which is full of narrow cobbled roads and ancient architectural relics around each corner, the shops range from those oriented purely towards tourists, selling cheap fridge magnets and t-shirts with Greek flags on, to the more unique and high range jewellery, pottery and clothes shops. Local handicraft-makers include silversmiths, potters, leather-bag makers, embroiderers, crocheters, stone-carvers, weavers, painters and a papier-mâché artist. Some of these handicraft-makers have studios in the Centre for Folk Art which is housed in a renovated Venetian building with interior garden and is where I took weaving lessons from a volunteer whilst in Rethymno. Whilst not able to sell directly from their studios, the artists act as a ‘live’ museum which tourists can visit during the day and see the artists at work using traditional methods such as weaving, book-binding, religious painting (iconography) and stone-carving. In practice, however, this idea was not very effective and it was sad to see that despite the intriguing conceptual idea of a ‘live’ museum, very few tourists visited and often the artists were absent from their studios during the day. In December 2013, I was informed by a participant that the building was being sold off to private investors as EOMMEX that owned it went bankrupt.

The majority of people who both make and sell handicrafts tend to be located in quieter areas of the ‘Old Town’, which fewer tourists frequent, whereas shops that simply sell handicrafts made by others are more centrally located (fieldnotes, June 2012). This variation in location is justified by some of the participants in this study as being because handicraft-makers need relative peace in order to create their wares, which locating their shop in a busy area would not provide. In order to be able to combine selling and making their handicrafts, handicraft entrepreneurs choose to be located in relatively quiet spots within tourist areas as they are often family businesses with limited staff resources.

**Margarites village, Crete**

Surrounding Rethymno city there are various villages, some of which are famous for a particular handicraft such as weaving in Anogeia and pottery in Margarites. The mountain village of Margarites is situated about an hour’s drive west of Rethymno town and has historically been a centre for the production of pottery as it is close to the resources needed, that is clay. Located on the side of a lush green gorge full of cypress trees, it is cooler in Margarites than in the Old Town where on stifling hot days even breathing is difficult. Hence, it was a welcome break to ascend via the scorched dry countryside to reach this refreshing and hospitable village with its narrow streets and houses of historic rural architecture (Figure 4.8).
In Margarites village the vast majority of entrepreneurs are potters who produce and sell ceramics, often doing both in the same building (Figure 4.9). Their styles vary, with some potters making intricately designed high-end ceramic musical instruments, some making ancient Greek designs and some continuing to produce the designs that their fathers taught them albeit very skilfully so. Most of the entrepreneurs, have their studio, home and shop in the same building and apart from selling their wares to tourists, also export items to Europe and America and some mass-produce pottery items as wedding favours.
Both international and local tourists visit Margarites during the day, often on their way to, or back from, the historic Arkadi monastery\textsuperscript{10} (Figure 4.10), but few stay the night mainly because there is limited accommodation and no night-life, so the pottery shops have shorter opening times (10am-6pm) than the Old Town shops. Seasonality in tourist visitation is observed here as well, with the main tourist season being from April to October each year after which the potters can tend to their land, pick their olives and rest after the hot and busy summer.

\textsuperscript{10} The Arkadi monastery is built in the Roman/Baroque style and was a centre for science and art until it became known as the place of the heroic sacrifice of 900 Cretans, who in 1866 blew themselves and the monastery up rather than surrender during the war for independence from the Ottoman Empire.
Socially, Cretans are considered quite a unique breed of people with their own idiosyncrasies regarding the meaning of family whereby extended family is the point of reference and allegiance (Terkenli et al., 2007). Many people I spoke to in Rethymno did in fact re-iterate this allegiance by pointing out that the Rethymniotes would choose a shop solely based on their family relations to the owner, rather than the quality to price ratio as most people would do elsewhere in Greece, for example in Athens. Cretan women have been portrayed as submissively silent whilst cunningly plotting their response (Herzfeld, 1991b). Although this may have been more common in older generations, the younger women I spoke to exhibited no such attributes, voicing their opinions without restrictions.
Mountainous regions such as Epirus (Figure 4.11) are sparsely populated with only 9% of the total Greek population living there (Bada, 2003). Zagori in the Ioannina prefecture of Epirus has a harsh climate, which is in sharp contrast to the summery and mild climate of Crete. During the winter months, snowfall is often a hazard and as thick fog is almost a daily occurrence, one is forced to get used to cautiously driving through the ‘misty mountains’. The Zagori region is located in the Pindos mountains in north-west Greece (Figure 4.12) at an altitude of 1000m and is characterised by dense forests of European black pine, fir and beech trees, rapid streams and mountain lakes. The name Zagori means “behind the mountains” and the area comprises of a network of 46 villages which have buildings of traditional architecture, many made from the local grey slate stone (Dodoni, 2013). These stone-built houses actually seem to be camouflaged as they are almost indistinguishable from the rocky ridges that feature the same stones. A local woman told me that this camouflaging was purposefully done, as was the creation of only small windows in the houses, so that the women and children could protect themselves from robbers when their male relatives were away working for long time periods in the cities.
The villages that I visited are located in Central Zagori which is part of the Vikos-Aoos National Park, which was founded in 1973 and is one of Greece’s ten national parks (Trakolis, 2001). The park, which features Vikos gorge - one of the tallest and narrowest gorges in Europe with an opening of 2m at its narrowest point and a height of up to 1100m, has a rich biodiversity and gives refuge to wildboar, chamois and bears which are protected species in Greece. With regards to its human inhabitants, Central Zagori is an isolated and sparsely populated area characterised by high unemployment and low income per capita and an ageing population, since many young people have left for urban centres (Karametou and Apostolopoulos, 2010). Whilst EU development programs in the 80s kept some of the population in the villages, urbanisation has continued and the population in Zagori decreased by 38% from 2001-2011 (Dinalexis, 2013). Sheep grazing has traditionally been the main activity for locals who sell the milk to the nearby milk-processing factory of Dodoni. Today many local shepherds have turned into employers as they hire cheap immigrant labour to look after their sheep, and spend their time taking advantage of EU-funded tourism development programs11 (Green, 2008). Despite sheep grazing still being practised widely, the demise of handicraft schools in

11 Green (2008) discusses the issue of Epirots’ relationship to EU development programs in depth, saying that people working for development agencies are accused of ‘eating’ EU funding rather than distributing it. This contrasts with the development agencies’ somewhat imperialistic viewpoint that the farmers are uneducated people who would not know how to use the money correctly and spend it on home improvements or cars, which is sadly to some extent true.
the area and abandonment of the practise of making one’s own clothes from wool, means that it is currently almost impossible to find wool spun from local sheep’s wool.

Tourism development in the Zagori area started in the 1970s when mainly national tourists with a strong preference for climbing and mountaineering first started going to Central Zagori and the surrounding areas. This nature-loving culture seems to be true of the locals also. The local mountaineering club I joined there had a far larger membership than the mountaineering club I joined in Crete. During the 1980s, state and EU rural development programs such as the LEADER programs helped build infrastructure such as roads and many small hotels of traditional character were also built. So now many locals are involved in tourism in various ways, such as owning or working in small hotels and restaurants, being part of women’s cooperatives, or producing handicrafts as souvenirs. Adventure tourism in the area is quite advanced and there are numerous small enterprises offering trekking, mountain climbing, kayaking, rafting, abseiling, mountain biking trips and ski lessons. Another attraction to the area are the popular ‘tsipouro’ festivals which are held in various Zagori villages in mid-November each year to celebrate the new batch of ‘tsipouro’ being ready and feature live bands performing traditional music which people dance to in large circles. ‘Tsipouro’ is a local alcoholic beverage produced from fermented grapes which tastes similar to Italian grappa.

The tourists who visit Zagori are domestic tourists who stay for an average of 5 days, largely during the autumn and winter months according to a study by the Greek National Tourism Organisation (GNTO or EOT)(EOT, 2003). This reliance on domestic tourists, many of whom originate in Athens and now cannot afford the 6 hour drive in terms of expense, has meant that Zagori has been particularly hard hit by the economic crisis. When I carried out my research in the winter of 2012, most of the hotel owners I spoke to reported very low occupancy rates despite it being peak season for them. In addition, all the handicraft-makers and women’s cooperative members I spoke to lamented the massive decrease in tourist numbers. It is interesting to note that the Greek Tourism Organisation report on Epirus that was drafted in 2003, actually suggests measures to accommodate the large visitation numbers which had exceeded the area’s carrying capacity, however the crisis-driven austerity measures seem to have done the job for them (EOT, 2003). The roads in Monodendri for example, which was a village where some of my participants attended the Rizarios Handicraft School (Figure 4.13), used to be saturated with tourist buses and private vehicles during the winter months, however when I was driving in the village I seldom met any cars on the roads.

Monodendri is a village with more tourism development than most nearby villages, and has a variety of restaurants, hotels and cafes and some shops selling cheap mass-produced souvenirs. One
of the reasons for this development is because the village is at the gateway to Vikos gorge thus offering an astounding view of the gorge. Another reason is that the Rizarios handicraft shop (selling items made by the Rizarios school) and the Rizarios art museum are located there. Monodendri used to be a very wealthy village and evidence of elaborate ‘arhondika’ (old mansions) are still found in the village with their stone-built walls, the interior of which often features painted murals on the walls, colourful wooden panelled ceilings, enclosed courtyards and heavy wooden doors.

Figure 4-13: Entrance to the Rizarios Handicraft School in Monodendri, Zagori (author’s picture, November 2012)

Elati, where two participants, Lena and Giota own a felt and wool shop (Figure 4.14), the only souvenir shop in the village, is a small village where few tourist buses go and is characterised by stone-built houses and its proximity to a bear population. Promoted mainly as an agrotourism destination (Bada, 2003), Elati has various luxury hotels which classify themselves as agrotourism hotels solely by virtue of being situated in nature and having views of the imposing Astraka mountain slopes. The one adventure tourism operator who has his base in the village offers guided hiking tours to the surrounding areas and also works as a ski instructor in the nearby ski-field of Vasilitsa during the winter.
Kato Pedina is where two participants own the village cafe or ‘kafeneion’, (Figure 4.15) and it is one of the oldest villages in Zagori with ancient relics found in the area dating back to 1200 BC (Epirus Development Agency, 2009). Despite its previous glory, Kato Pedina which means ‘low fields’ in Greek, is a sparsely populated village with only 41 registered inhabitants (about half of whom actually live there) (Dinalexis, 2013). With regards to tourism, Kato Pedina has low visitation rates and little tourism infrastructure, although it has good road connections. Two new hotels were in the process of being built there when I carried out my research and they were the village’s only hotels. The village’s ‘kafeneion’, a place that operates as a combined restaurant, cafeteria, bar and post-office, is the only place for tourists to eat, drink and purchase handicrafts which are mainly knitted items and wire jewellery made by Vaggelio and Panos, the couple who own the ‘kafeneion’.
Katsikas, where the women’s cooperative (Figure 4.16) is located, is a small suburb of Ioannina city and has no tourist infrastructure. The tourists who visit the shop/studio are usually people who have tried the cooperative’s jams, pasta or liquors at one of the hotels in Zagori and want to buy more for their homes. Whilst the cooperative women seem to have branched out into catering for local events by making pies and other Epirot delicacies, their location, coupled with their dependence on domestic tourism and lack of technological tools such as a website, is detrimental to their business.
Having described the sites where the ethnographic work took place, I shall proceed to describe how I approached the participants in the study by detailing the specific ethnographic methods used in this study, which are: participant observation, semi-structured interviews (discussions) and fieldnotes.

4.2.3 Participant observation

Participant observation can be simply explained as the process of participating in events and recording them. One of the main benefits of using participant observation as a method is that a deep understanding of how meaning is created can be gained. However, the challenge when engaging in participant observation is to balance attempts to make the strange familiar and the familiar strange.
The exact amount of participation and observation cannot be pre-determined and lies on a continuum between complete participation and complete observation. The balance between participation and observation is determined by the researcher, but also by the community being studied and depends on compromises in access and community expectations. As being a participant means that one takes part in social interactions whereas observation requires one to act like an outsider by watching and noting things down, ‘participant observation’ can be considered an oxymoron. Hence an ethnographer engaging in participant observation can be seen as “one of us but not one of us” (O’Reilly, 2012, p. 151). Even though being able to participate in participants’ lives is often difficult as the researcher may lack the skills needed in order to participate (Crang and Cook, 2007), for this study, a good balance of participating and observing was achieved by utilising my interest in handicrafts and experience in selling handicrafts in order to participate in the participant’s work-life. By asking participants if they could teach me their crafts or if they wanted help on a voluntary basis with selling their items I was able to gain access to visit the participants frequently. In this endeavour I was taught a specific type of crocheting, “saita”, by MrsE; I was taught how to pot by Frosso; I was taught how to knit by Vaggelio; I was taught how to felt by Giota and I helped Liana to make wedding favours. With other participants I was more engaged in helping them sell items by talking to customers, utilising my English language skills to translate, wrapping up items or staying at the shop when they needed to be absent for a short while. With regards to the time spent with participants, my visits were on a weekly basis and I spent 2-3 hours with them depending on the circumstances. For example, sometimes, the participants invited me for lunch or social outings in which case I spent more time with them.

Gaining access to frequently visit the participants was initially difficult, not only because they were busy and I was visiting their work-place, but also because the majority were completely unfamiliar with this type of method. One silversmith in Ioannina told me explicitly not to approach the silversmiths at the KEPAVI (Centre for Traditional Entrepreneurs in Ioannina) with the method of participant observation, but rather give them a questionnaire, as they “are not very open-minded and may be suspicious of your motives” (Alexandros, interview). So participating by learning or helping gave me an excuse to be present at their work-place as a researcher even if my research method was not fully understood. In addition, as women in Greece are meant to be constantly active (Lazaridis, 2009), especially for the female entrepreneur-participants, sitting and chatting with someone on a regular basis could be constituted as harmful for their reputation.

Part of a participant-observer’s role is to stand back intellectually and reflect on events, otherwise one is not much more than a simple participant (Angrosino and Rosenberg, 2011). One of the reasons participant observation is used in this study is because it can help me as a researcher to
learn through experience and empathy by understanding something from being inside it rather than looking at it from the outside. Another advantage of participating is that the entire context of the event is included in the observation rather than relying on a perhaps partial interpretation of the event gained from an interview at a later date.

Whilst participant observation is a key characteristic of ethnography, there is debate surrounding the equation of ethnography with participant observation, with some authors suggesting that “engaged listening” (Forsey, 2010, p. 560) be used for instances when the researcher is not fully involved in participating, but at the same time is not a neutral ‘observer’. I have taken the “participation as observer” approach (Denscombe, 2007, p. 218), which means that the researcher’s role is openly recognised, and people under observation have knowledge that they are being studied and also know what the topic of the research is (Gomm, 2009).

Anthropologists such as Malinowski (1960) argue for the detachment of participation from observation. However, from a postmodernist approach that supports the theory that the social world is co-constructed, participation is an essential tool to understand the world by taking part in this co-construction. An example of the importance of participation to understanding the persons being researched is offered by Desmond (2006), who in his investigation of firefighting, worked as a firefighter, as he felt he needed to “feel it (firefighting) growing inside” (p. 392) of him in order to fully comprehend the firefighting habitus.

One of the advantages of carrying out participant observation is that through multiple interactions with participants, assumptions that the researcher has about her participants can be tested. As I am aware that as a researcher I am “relationally implicated” (Nairn, 2005, p. 295) in the production of assumptions about others, I feel that the opportunity given by these multiple interactions helped dispel some of my assumptions about participants. An example of this happening was the instance when I met two female entrepreneurs who own a felt-making shop in Zagori and I got the impression that they were a couple since they worked and lived together. However, on subsequent meetings as we spoke about our personal lives more extensively, I clearly saw that this was not the case. The observation of this important gendered nuance would not have been possible just through a single interaction such as an interview.

As rapport and entry into the researched community are best facilitated if community members understand and accept the purposes of my research, I was clear from the very first introduction to potential participants about my role and my research topic. However, as the concepts of ‘gender roles and relations’ and ‘social reproduction’ are complex, my interpretation of these concepts to participants was initially necessarily simplified. As time passed and our relationship
developed, I tried my best to convey how I understood the concepts of ‘gender roles’ and ‘social reproduction’ and hence was able to better explain to them the research questions I was trying to answer.

With regards to accessing participants for this study, interviews acted as an initial way of approaching people as the concept of participant observation was unfamiliar to them, as interviews were more acceptable as a ‘valid’ research method. Hence, two sets of semi-structured interviews were conducted with participants, as will be described next.

4.2.4 Semi-structured ethnographic interviews

Social life is dependent on conversations, so in order to investigate social change, in-depth conversations are necessary. Indeed, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985) an interview is simply a “conversation with a purpose” (p. 268). The purpose of interviewing participants in addition to participant observation in this study is two-fold. One reason is related to gaining access to participants and constituting the research as ‘valid’ in the participants’ eyes, who are unfamiliar with the method of participant observation. Hence, the initial interview was an ‘introductory’ or preliminary interview which facilitated getting a meeting with potential participants in order to explain my research theme and goals and also to ask them if they would allow me to participate in some aspect of their work whilst observing our interactions (see APPENDIX for interview questions). Construction of interview questions was a participatory process as I slightly modified the questions according to participants’ suggestions, answers and reactions. For example, a question relating to the meaning of social reproduction was completely removed after some participants were perplexed and unable to answer it, whereas I frequently adopted words and expressions used by participants to explain the questions in more depth.

Not all ‘preliminary’ interviews resulted in participant observation relationships. In fact I conducted a large number of preliminary interviews after which the potential participants did not want to partake in participant observation because of their time commitments or because they did not feel this was a valid method. Indeed, some of the people interviewed had the impression I was on holiday as participant observation so closely resembles ‘hanging out’ with people, which does speak to the shifting roles that a researcher has when undertaking tourism-related research as participants and other locals often identify the researcher as tourist (Duijnhoven and Roessingh, 2006). To some extent the researcher is a tourist as both travel to often ‘exotic’ destinations to experience certain things and then go back home to tell people about it, but the difference is that the tourist-researcher has an ulterior motive for being there and most importantly, documents the interactions (Crick, 1985, Ren et al., 2010).
The other reason for conducting interviews was to supplement information from participant
observation and have a recording of the participants from which quotes could be easily drawn.
Ethnographic interviews, which are what the second set of interviews can be characterised as, were
the most appropriate to gain a detailed insight into participants’ lives as they depend on a good
quality relationship having developed before the interview. Indeed ethnographic interviewing refers
to interviewing after developing a respectful, on-going researcher-participant relationship, which
encourages a genuine exchange of views as the participant feels enough trust to explore with the
researcher the meanings they place on their lives (Sherman Heyl, 2007). In order to develop a
respectful relationship in which the participants felt that their opinion was valued, when engaging in
interviewing during fieldwork I stressed how participants should regard me as their student, in order
to elicit replies that were as free as possible from power imbalances and in effect encouraged them
to treat me as “educating a young and ignorant newcomer” (Cameron, 2001, p. 146). In addition, in
order to give participants the ability to express what they thought was important to them, whilst I
did have a set of framework questions, I encouraged our conversations to follow a natural course
without me interrupting, a technique also employed by Lazaridis (2009) in her ethnographic research
on Greek silk cocoon-makers.

The knowledge created in these interviews is co-constructed between interviewer and
interviewee as both persons bring together their interpretations of meaning and somewhere in
between what the participant says and what the interviewer understands is where knowledge is
created from these interactions. Indeed, Scheurich (1995) disputes the possibility of any joint
construction taking place, referring to the meanings created in human interactions as a “shifting
carnival of ambiguous complexity” (p. 243). However Fine (1994) supports the view that knowledge is
co-constructed in interviews and encourages researchers using interviewing to try ways of “working
the hyphen” (p. 72) in order to discuss how interpersonal politics are present in the interview
encounter and how this affects the production of knowledge. Some critics of interviewing have
serious concerns about the epistemological basis of interviewing, as they view the production of
knowledge as only ever being partial because of the disparities between language and meaning
(Scheurich, 1995) and the subconscious multiplicity of intentions by interviewer and interviewee.
However, none of these critics reject the method of interviewing as they recognise the value in trying
to do it as long as one bears in mind all the above limitations (Sherman Heyl, 2007). As Liebow (1993)
says on this matter “trying to put oneself in the place of the other lies at the heart of the social
contract and of social life itself” (p. xv), whereas Bourdieu (1996) also points to the significance of the
researcher “mentally putting herself in their place” (p. 22) in order to increase the possibilities for
valid knowledge being created within interviews. The disparity between what the interviewer
understands and what the participant means was interestingly brought up by one of the participants
who calls herself “uneducated” (DarkK, interview) by saying that “maybe what I say you will understand differently to how I mean it” (DarkK, interview).

As it is important for interviews to feel relaxed and enjoyable (O'Reilly, 2012) in order to enable an open exchange of views, participants were interviewed in a space convenient to them, which was usually their work-place, and they dictated the date, time of the day and time spent engaging in the interview. Prior to conducting the interview, participants’ informed consent was verbally obtained so as not to pressure them to sign any papers which would unnecessarily formalise our relationship and possibly place pressure on them to continue with participant observation, even if they did not really want to. With regards to the method of recording the interviews, all participants were asked if they consented to be voice-recorded which most accepted. The ones that did not accept were not voice-recorded and mental and written notes were taken instead.

4.2.5 Fieldnotes

The majority of ethnographic accounts are based on using fieldnotes to write down events that happen whilst in the field, participant observing, interviewing or just observing events in the field. Most researchers seem to concur that the most significant element in recording these observations is to record them in written form as soon after the event as possible for as accurate a representation of the event as possible (Lareau and Shultz, 1996). The key for good fieldnotes according to Lofland and Lofland (2006) is simply to “get information down as quickly as possible and be as honest with yourself as possible” (pp. 95-96). Another way of recording fieldnotes which was the one I applied, is by making “mental notes” (Emerson et al., 2007, p. 356) which is a process by which one orients their consciousness in order to remember events to write them down later. Indeed this process is not a simple one and as I note in the fieldnotes dated 02/07/2012 on my conversations with one potential participant it was physically and mentally tiring in the beginning to train one’s mind to remember the significant events in order to record them later on as fieldnotes and differed from just conversing with a friend. As I note on this: “I got a bit tired as she talks a lot and perhaps because I feel like I have to remember things and trying to figure out what I need to remember which is relevant”. Taking mental notes initially was necessary in order to keep interactions with participants as uninterrupted as possible; for me as researcher to remain free of any distractions caused by interrupting conversation to write things down, and; to reduce the reminder that I am a researcher with possibly different priorities to the participants. In addition, as I was participating and using my hands to, for example, pot or crochet, it was often not practically feasible for notes to be taken without interrupting the process of participation.
There is some disagreement as to whether two types of fieldnotes should be kept, with O’Reilly (2012) suggesting that ‘intellectual’ and ‘personal’ versions should be held to distinguish between describing events associated with the research itself and the researcher’s personal feelings about events. However, influenced by Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (2007) I am of the opinion that personal emotions, reactions and anxieties should not be kept separate for a variety of reasons. One of these reasons is that emotional responses may mirror participants’ responses occurring in the field. An example of this happening during my fieldwork experience is where I refer to “being embarrassed to go and introduce myself and try and become friends with participants” (fieldnotes, 03/06/2012), an insecurity which I saw mirrored in participants’ hesitation to engage in participant observation. Another reason for pursuing this method is that recoding one’s emotions over time allows the researcher to identify prejudices and changing attitudes that may be useful to take into account when analysing ethnographic work. As an aspect of social life, emotions are very much part of everyday life and thus such an account can help provide a rich analysis of the complexities of experiences that perhaps cannot be conveyed by simple observation or interviewing (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009).

Whilst writing about one’s initial impressions and key events alongside her personal reaction is in itself a process of representation and construction, it can be argued that this provides a filtered version of the world rather than mirroring the reality. This is because reality is subjective and according to a postmodern approach continually constructed and so these written accounts are ‘real’ only in the specific time and place. It is also important to remember that it is not possible to record every single instance over a six-month period, especially when actively searching for events and spending time travelling from location to location, talking with not just the participants but also other people local to the ethnographic site in order to gain an immersive ‘lived’ experience of the research process and in the meantime gaining useful peripheral data regarding socio-cultural norms and current localised politico-economic updates. Hence, the fieldnotes that made their way onto paper were selective and I found that I often battled with the question of whether or not I was including the most relevant or significant events in the fieldnotes. As I write in the fieldnotes dated 06/06/2012: “I wonder if my writing is rich enough?”.

Taking the field to be produced via social interactions between the ethnographer and her environment, fieldnote texts are co-constructed by the ethnographer and the research subjects that have been transformed into “active partners” (Angrosino and Rosenberg, 2011, p. 467) who help formulate the research plan. So writing fieldnotes is a core activity in participant observation as this is a way of transforming events into written accounts, thus enabling the inscription of these fleeting moments into a form than can be revisited at a later date.
Another important reason for taking fieldnotes is to put one’s thoughts into order at the end of the day and by recording emotions and events, relive them and partly analyse them. This was especially useful when thinking of ways in which to improve my methods of engaging with participants. However, as noted in the fieldnotes, in relation to engaging in participant observation, one enduring feeling did remain throughout fieldwork which was the feeling of fear that the participants would suddenly decide they did not want to participate anymore. This feeling of trepidation continued from doing fieldwork in Crete where I note how: “Before going I always have a certain trepidation which I cannot fully explain! Like I don’t want to go or feel sad and as though I won’t achieve much…” (fieldnotes, 27/07/2012), to when I engaged in fieldwork in Epirus. One day on the way to a village in Epirus, this pre-contact trepidation manifested itself physically, as I recorded in the fieldnotes: “Decided to go to Metsovo, although in the morning I wasn’t at all sure I should go there as I wondered who I should talk to there. I actually felt physically ill (sick) on the way there.” (fieldnotes, 24/10/2012). In lack of any better explanation, perhaps this was an extreme example of trying to guard myself against merging and thus retaining the perspective of a stranger as O’Reilly (2012) suggests personal fieldnotes serve to do, or perhaps it was just fear of the unknown. This is an example of how fieldnotes can be used to provide a written account of the researcher’s feelings, in the field, and also serve as a way in which the researcher can express her feelings, providing a psychological avenue of release from all the new experiences and difficulties encountered along the lonely research journey. Whilst not intending to provide an “author saturated” (Geertz, 1988, p. 97) text, by inscribing the emotions attached to engaging in participant observation, I hope my fieldnotes, like Malone’s (2003) “methodological memos” (p. 804) provide the impetus for refining methodological insights, a role Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (2007) suggest fieldnotes can play.

4.3 Ethical issues

Ethical issues are important to consider when doing research and they relate to ethics of harm respect, reciprocity, honesty and responsibility to participants and researchers. For this study, Category A ethics approval was received from the University of Otago Ethics Committee which included the submission of an informed consent sheet and information sheet for participants to read in order to decide if they wanted to participate in the study. In these documents, the voluntary aspect of participation was stressed and by relaying them to the participants verbally I paid attention to situations in which participants felt coerced into participating, in which case I did not insist on their participation.
Whilst one of the main promises of ‘informed consent sheets’ is to protect the confidentiality of the participants, much literature states that this is virtually impossible (Lincoln and Guba, 1989), especially within small village communities, like some of this study’s ethnographic sites. For example, even if I changed the name of Margarites village, as it is unique in its structure in Crete being comprised of potters and being in close vicinity to Rethymno, participants’ friends would recognise the village if not the participants; hence its original name (Margarites) has been maintained. Indeed as Malone (2003) argues, in inductive research such as this, it is hard to anticipate what will emerge in the field and so impossible to know what exactly to inform participants about in order to get their consent. Furthermore, a lack of understanding of the methodology and the research process also compounds the inability to fully inform participants. This shows the difficulty, in practice, of keeping research intentions fully overt despite one’s best intentions (O’Reilly, 2012).

I found that the inability for the study’s research objectives and methodology to be fully understood by participants was evident on several occasions. This could have been due either to the ethnographic methods’ inherently transformative properties in terms of research or because of many participants’ unfamiliarity with concepts such as gender roles, social reproduction and participant observation. An example of the latter was when Kostis, a male potter in Margarites village told me when I was participant observing that “we haven’t spoken much about matters relating to your research” (Kostis, interview), illustrating how his perception of what my research was trying to achieve was different from mine. This brings to the fore the feeling of discomfort that I sometimes got when engaging in research by not being able to fully convey the nature of my research, as I write in the fieldnotes: “I find it difficult to explain all the complicated gender/social reproduction stuff to them in a way they can understand without getting offended” (fieldnotes, 24/08/2012). This speaks to what Pillow (2003) calls the “reflexivity of discomfort” (p. 187) and the acknowledgement of this ‘uncomfortable’ truth can add vigour to this account by contributing to the way knowledge is produced within this study, providing a way in which to challenge the representations I make within this study.

However, despite any unintentional mis-representations that may have occurred as described above, throughout this study, participants’ accounts have been treated with an “ethics of care” (Preissle, 2004, p. 518). An ‘ethics of care’ is used by many feminist researchers and refers to the researcher’s moral obligation to avoid harming participants by embarrassing them, as well as the obligation to represent their accounts as best possible. In this respect, I strive to follow Spivak’s (1985) advice to be “vigilant about our practices” (p. 184) to guide the research both in terms of methods but also in terms of written representation, and adopt the moral rule not to do to others what I would not like to be done to me. I endeavour to present the emerging fieldwork material to
my best ability as being respectful to the participants by not, for example, including participants’ more private confessions or circumstantial observations that could potentially cause harm (e.g. embarrassment) to the participants if their identity was to be revealed. In this respect, I do not feel it appropriate to use all information created in the researcher-researched interactions as what Stacey (1988) calls “grist for the ethnographic mill” (p. 187), however tempting this may be in adding flavour to the analysis.

Whilst I recognise that the creation of greater intimacy during the frequent meetings with participants was facilitated by my insider angle and constituted me as more ‘trustworthy’ via having shared language, gender and experiences (e.g. handicraft-making entrepreneurship) with participants, I also recognise that this intimacy may expose participants to exploitation (Fine et al., 2000). Especially in cases such as in the Rizarios handicraft school, where in order to gain access I had to get permission from the headmistress who then introduced me to potential participants, I acknowledge that the power dynamics at play whereby I was endorsed by a person of power may have put participants in a vulnerable position by not being able to reject participation. This happens in the case of Malone’s (2003) study where she felt that a professor at the school she was researching, who was acting as her gatekeeper, actually may have “trapped” (p. 803) students into agreeing to participate. However, just as Malone’s participants found various ways to resist participating, not all the women whom I approached in the handicraft school participated in the study and so I feel that the ones who did, did so on their own volition.

I use code-names for some of the participants at their request, however some participants wanted to be visible within this research and their names have been preserved as is. This speaks to the anonymity that much literature equates with the researcher’s moral responsibility for care of participants. Furthermore, and in relation to participants’ anonymity, in Chapter Six, pictures of participants are displayed with the participants’ consent. Whilst much literature stresses the importance of securing participants’ anonymity, many participant-entrepreneurs in this study were keen to be named and made visible as they felt this gave them a sense of agency. Burgess (1989) also speaks to names’ agentic action by pointing out how “names give meanings to people’s actions” (p. 206). As seen in work by Rydzik et al. (2013), who encounter the issue of unclear guidelines for the presentation of participants when using an arts-based visual methodology, obscuring faces on photographs or giving participants code names may discriminate against participants who want to be heard and seen.
4.4 Analysis

Making sense of all the rich information that emerged during the fieldwork, by connecting it to current socio-economic theories, was the main objective of this study’s analysis. Analysis is an interesting subject to write about as it is so tangled up with the ethnographic research process that there is no one analysis phase (O'Reilly, 2012). Accordingly, analysis started from the first day in the field, as observing, participating and note-taking encouraged reflexivity in terms of standing back and processing the day’s events and constantly trying to make connections with the research question. Analysis progressed by re-listening to participants’ interviews, partially transcribing them and translating them and typing-up hand-written fieldnotes. Choosing to hand-write fieldnotes and then type them up was a conscious decision as I wanted to re-live the notes by transforming them into a written form of narrative and thus have the nuances of experiential knowledge constructed in the field, fresh in my mind. In addition to typing the fieldnotes up, I also made notes in the margins, thus partially analysing the fieldnotes both in terms of content related to the research question and in terms of the methods and methodology used. After having produced written versions of interviews and fieldnotes, I proceeded to search for patterns which would aid in the organisation and presentation of the information in a manner that the reader can comprehend, being constantly guided by the over-arching research question: “What is the relationship between female tourism handicraft entrepreneurship and gender roles and relations?” In practical terms, the written accounts were pored over in search of instances which spoke to the productive economy and the social reproductive economy, which were subsequently highlighted. Additional highlighting took place to draw out instances relating to the ways in which participants negotiated tourism seasonality and the economic crisis.

Simultaneously, whilst utilising the written accounts, memories of ethnographic moments, feelings and contemplations not included in written accounts also came to inform the analysis. By interweaving relevant literature such as that relating to feminist economics, gender and social reproduction into interpretations of participants’ constructions of reality, an account of how social reality is discursively constructed by the performed narratives of the subjects was achieved. So, this analysis style resembles narrative analysis as I am interpreting how others experience events such as engagement in tourism handicraft entrepreneurship, by also giving my perspective on the meaning and relevance of these events (Cortazzi, 2007). As narrative is one of the fundamental ways in which people explain their understanding of the world and make sense of past experiences, it is particularly appropriate to use narrative analysis in this study to analyse how participants construct themselves as economic and gendered subjects.
Participants are hence seen as subjects performing economic subjectivities of entrepreneurship by embodying this economic structure. This embodiment is spoken about by Marx who narrates how workers were shaped by the industrial processes they engaged in (Castree, 2009). Moreover, according to Hollinshead’s (2009) concept of world-making which is the actions individuals perform to privilege dominant representation of their ‘world’, it is important to take into consideration that individuals are characterised by economic determinism, even though they may construct imaginary worlds to avoid this association. The ensuing tension between individual choice and determinism is illustrated as occurring by Seigels’ (2005) “reflective dimension” (p. 5), which is at the core of this analysis as I explore how gender infuses the underlying political and economic structures that influence participants’ utopic perceptions regarding the existence of individual choice.

Throughout this study, analysis and writing are considered as inseparable and hence findings are inscribed within the ways they are written, so it is difficult to conveniently draw out clean-cut conclusions from the ensuing thick analytical description without taking into consideration the circumstances of the writing production (Atkinson, 1991). One of the advantages of being a native Greek speaker relates to the comprehension of participants’ actions, words and facial expressions which are all taken into account when analysing the written accounts spoken about. Without this ability to detect how language signifiers work, my analysis would lack rigour, which is also why no transcriber was employed for this work. As Poland (2003) points out, ensuring the accuracy of verbatim reports, by analysing not only what is said but how it is said, is crucial to capturing social reality as this study aims to do.

This is why the current chapter on the methods used is descriptive, and also why a chapter on the context in which the research took place is included within the analysis chapters, as both relate to the circumstances of the production of the written analysis. As all written research texts have the ultimate goal of being persuasive, giving the reader as much background as possible is essential in order for the arguments made within the analysis chapter to be convincing. For the reason of enhanced interpretation of events by the reader, extracts from interviews and fieldnotes are frequently interwoven into this study’s analytical accounts.
4.5 Summary

In this chapter, the methodology and methods used in answering the study’s research question were discussed in terms of their suitability for this purpose. Initially, the use of critical feminism as a methodological paradigm was related to this study’s empowering aim in terms of creating knowledge related to conceptualisations of female entrepreneurship, that are of more use to women. A critical feminist perspective was utilised to criticize dominant masculine interpretations of entrepreneurship in order to create space for new interpretations of what is important to female entrepreneurs. Situating myself as researcher within a feminist standpoint framework, I believe that knowledge is co-constructed between the researcher and participants and that ‘truths’ are socially constructed, located in lived experiences and context bound. Hence in order to construct these truths, my reflexivity as partial insider is discussed to highlight how this may influence interpretation of events encountered when using ethnographic methods of participant observation, semi-structured interviews and fieldnotes to find out what can be known about participants’ experiences of entrepreneurship.

As this study’s epistemology is that ways of knowing are based on the world being embedded in social relations, ethnography allows me to construct knowledge about my research topic by observing social relations, in-depth. By staying for three months in two ethnographic sites in Greece, Crete and Zagori, both known for their handicrafts and tourism development, I was able to engage ten participants in each ethnographic site, whom I visited frequently. Two sets of semi-structured interviews were used, the first set as a way of finding out about the entrepreneur’s story and also to break the ice and ask them if they would like to engage in participant observation. As participant observation was a novel concept to most potential participants, it was more effective to start off with an interview which initially validated my presence as researcher and then ask participants if they could teach me their craft or allow me to help in the shop, rather than ask to ‘observe’ them. Fieldnotes, which are a way of transforming events, feelings and experiences to a written form that can be revisited at a later date, served as a silent dialogue partner in the researcher’s lonely research journey.

All stages of this research journey were treated with an “ethics of care” (Preissle, 2004, p. 518) whereby, as a researcher, I tried my best to respect participants by not disclosing potentially embarrassing confidential material and by being honest with them regarding the purposes of the research. Furthermore, in line with an ethic of reciprocity, I helped participants when I could, examples of which included securing funding for the handicraft school and helping translate documents for an entrepreneur’s son who wanted to commence studies in Germany. However, my
inability to fully describe some of the concepts I was researching, partly because of the way ethnographic research moulds the research direction and partly because of the complexity of the terms used, was something that I felt a bit uncomfortable about.

Finally, the way in which this study’s analysis took place is discussed in terms of method, which included re-listening to interviews, partially analysing them in the field, re-writing fieldnotes and searching for patterns. Viewing participants as subjects performing economic subjectivities and embodying the economic structure of entrepreneurship, the analysis focuses on how events within the field speak to these subjectivities and how gender is infused in them, as shall be discussed in the following analysis chapters. In the subsequent chapters, by interweaving literature with knowledge created during fieldwork, I aim to provide a representation of the shifting interpretations of tourism entrepreneurship and gender roles as experienced by participants in this study that took place in Greece from the period of June 2012 until January 2013.
Chapter Five

5 The Greek context

In order to analyse the complex data emerging from the ethnographic studies discussed in the methodology chapter, I must first set out the politico-economic and socio-cultural structures that describe the scene where the fieldwork took place. Greece makes a compelling place to investigate the relationship of entrepreneurship with gender roles as it is a country where until very recently women’s work outside the home was viewed as a threat to a male’s honour and domestication of women was promoted as a symbol of prestige12 (Stamiris, 1986).

Initially in this chapter I describe the current political, social and economic conditions in Greece in order to provide a contextual understanding regarding social reproductive gender roles. With regards to the political conditions, evolution of the women’s movement and subsequent suppression of the feminist movement in Greece - both within society and within academia - indicate how Greek women are only marginally supported by formal structures, despite the existence of a Gender Equality Ministry (Vaiou, 2008). Women are however supported under law, as is indicated in the welfare and employment laws which insist on equality between men and women. However gender roles are not only affected by formal structures such as laws and political groups, but also by social constructs such as shame and honour principles, the Church’s idealised version of a woman who prioritises family responsibilities and closely knit family units that absorb social reproduction duties (Herzfeld, 1991a).

Looking at the economic factors, I describe tourism development programs available to women and evaluate how these may affect gender role negotiation by providing women with an avenue to earn both money and respect as well as legitimating their departure from the domestic sphere. As developing women’s agrotourism cooperatives is a much favoured policy for encouraging women to become involved in entrepreneurship, these shall be focused on as a common type of rural tourism development in Greece. Following this, I will describe rural tourism entrepreneurs in Greece with a focus on handicraft tourism entrepreneurs. Whilst I accept that no ‘typical’ entrepreneur exists, in this study, a description of past literature relating to female rural tourism entrepreneurs is used simply to provide context. Thus, having put my study into context - the Greek

---

12 A domestication fetish among middle class Greek women can still be evidenced today, expressed in obsessions with extreme household cleanliness and spoiling of children (Stamiris, 1986).
context - the individual case study areas shall be described in terms of gender and rural tourism development, focusing on handicraft tourism entrepreneurship.

5.1 The political: how policies affect social construction of gender roles

Women in Greece have been present throughout Greek history as significant figures, and some took on highly masculinised roles such as brave Bouboulina who commandeered men in the Greek War of Independence (Angelomatis-Tsougarakis, 2008). Despite women’s ‘glorious’ past, the notion that a woman was not required to work as her husband would provide for her, prevailed up until the 1930s, when literate women over 30 were given the vote and many women started working as a sign of emancipation (Pantazi-Tzifa, 1984). After that, however, unrest in the form of dictatorships and wars suppressed women’s position and the feminist movement did not resurface until after the Junta (Lazaridis, 1994). The Junta was in power from 1967-1974 in Greece. By making family values into a ‘cult’, the Junta stifled any feminist discussions. The Junta ended in 1974 and there was a climate of political euphoria which saw many women’s organisations emerging, mainly affiliated to parties of the Left (Stamiris, 1986).

Shortly after this period, in 1981, Greece entered the EU and many improvements to women’s objective status were made via newly introduced laws that promoted equality. One such change was an overhaul of the Family Law which abolished the dowry system and all discriminatory clauses against women. Another change was the improvements made to employment law which saw the elimination of all direct and indirect forms of discrimination in employment with regards to gender (Kyriazis, 1998). Around the same time, family strategies started to direct women to work in the public service where work was secure and the possibility of extended leave facilitated raising a family. It was the anticipation of securing a job in the public sector that urged many parents to start investing in women’s education as a “quasi-dowry” (Leontidou, 1994, p. 84).

Even though laws promoting equality were passed, attempts to change attitudes regarding women’s roles at the interpersonal level, for example through gender representation in the media,

---

13 Bouboulina was a heroic naval commander in the Greek War for Independence from the 400-years of Turkish occupation.

14 Despite the public service’s reputation, Greeks in general are hardworking putting in on average 2109 work-hours a year (compared to the OECD average of 1749). With regards to gender, there is a gap, with 23% more men being employed than women (OECD, 2012).

15 I myself often heard my (Greek) father half-joke about how my education, which he was funding, was to be my dowry, despite him never being a proponent of public service employment which he believed was responsible for turning intelligent, enthusiastic people into lazy, docile public servants with the sole goal of doing as little as possible.
were not so successful. These endeavours were often met with ridicule, as were the feminists who initiated them, despite a General Secretariat of Gender Equality\textsuperscript{16} being established in the 1980s (Kyriazis, 1998). Within academia, feminism as a theory had rather negative connotations with no funding being given for university gender and equality projects, until about 10 years ago when EU funding made feminism as an approach more visible by supporting research proposals with a feminist focus (Vaiou, 2008).

Perhaps as a result of limited feminist research that uses gender as an analytical category, a recent (2008) EU report into gender equality policies in Greece found that gender stereotypes are seldom questioned and that gender is referred to in its social sense, implying the existence of “a strong biological component” (Pantelidou Maloutas et al., 2008, p. 25). Furthermore, whilst the EU introduced ‘reconciliation’, which was grounded in feminist ideas and was a way of helping women to combine paid work and family work, ‘reconciliation’ was used as an avenue to legitimise flexible work conditions rather than change gender relations within the family (Stratigaki, 2004). So, in effect, EU and national policies intended to increase female participation in the labour market did so without dispelling the norm of the male ‘breadwinner’ worker, and by using ‘co-optation\textsuperscript{17} to undermine the gender equality concept, the policies left stereotyped gender relations unchallenged. However, it is not only policies that form gender roles and relations, it is also social influences such as family structures, religion and deeply ingrained concepts such as shame and honour principles that mould gender roles in Greece.

\subsection*{5.2 The social: How social, religious and cultural structures mould gender roles}

If one is to understand the failure of policies to change attitudes regarding women’s roles, one should first consider the Greek familial ‘ideal’ which sees the family operating as a small enterprise with strong family bonds which historically dates back to the Byzantine era according to some scholars (Vergopoulos, 1975). In this context, working within a family business was acceptable for women and hence, even though they occupied positions related to gendered social reproduction duties such as cooking and cleaning, they became engaged in entrepreneurship, which was previously a man’s domain (Leontidou, 1994).

\footnote{In Greece, the General Secretariat for Equality was created in 1982 and is responsible for promoting and implementing policy measures for gender equality in all fields (political, economic and social).}

\footnote{Co-optation transforms the initial meaning of a concept which is then used in the policy discourse for a different purpose from the original one. In this way the concept deteriorates over time and also works against mobilisation as “it is difficult to mobilise against a claim that appears to be one’s own” (Stratigaki, 2004, p. 36).}
Whilst engagement in entrepreneurship leads to the beginning of negotiations regarding gendered social reproduction duties such as assigning childcare, these social reproduction responsibilities are absorbed by other women, usually the couple’s mothers, as in Vaiou’s (1995) research on tourism entrepreneurs in Naxos, Greece. Similarly, in Kousis’s (1989) study of a Cretan village it is the grandmothers who look after the children when their parents are working. By absorbing the tasks, the grandparents also act to absorb the tension in social reproduction negotiations. This dependence on the family distributing social reproduction tasks amongst its members is more prominent in Greece, as the Greek state plays a minimal role in welfare provision (OECD, 2010). Public day-care provision for example, is scant and although this has improved over the years, the majority of childcare in Greece is still provided by family members (Pantelidou Maloutas et al., 2008). However, it is increasingly the case that many women entering employment can no longer absolutely rely on grandmothers as the grandmothers themselves now often hold full-time jobs.

Furthermore, as families gain the economic strength to fend for themselves and get sucked into neoliberal ideals of individualism, ties of cooperation and mutual aid amongst family members seem to be weakening (Lyberaki and Paraskevopoulos, 2002). As family ties weaken and families’ ability to afford privatised social reproduction help decreases, the question of ‘how is the gap that the absent welfare state created going to be filled?’ arises. In the last 15 years, the state welfare gap in childcare and elderly-care was filled by the influx of low-wage migrants providing privatised social reproduction services and as Lyberaki points out, the family evolved from “exclusive provider to a care supervisor” (2011, p. 118). However, now that salaries have been slashed and taxes are increasing exponentially, many Greeks cannot afford to pay for privatised social reproduction anymore, and with many of the migrants returning to their countries of origin, the question arises of how social reproduction duties will be re-distributed in Greek families.

On the subject of provision of welfare in Greece, one organisation that is active in the terrain of social welfare is the Orthodox Church. The Church is highly influential in Greece and has over 3500 parish charity funds in operation that perform a variety of activities such as providing food and distributing second-hand clothing to the poor (Gal, 2010). Religion has often played the role of defining gender roles and the values attached to them in various countries (Sanday, 1981). In Greece, women are assigned dual religious roles – that of Eve which is connected with the root of all evil and justifies their subordination by men and that of the Virgin Mary. If women fulfil their roles as mothers and wives, they are able to more closely resemble the divine archetype of the Virgin Mary (Du Boulay, 1986).
For Greek rural women, the Orthodox Church has been very much of a controlling element, determining the “correct” way that a woman should act. The ‘correct’ way includes being subservient to her husband, being humble and modest, staying within the household boundaries and being chaste (Dubisch, 1986a). According to Greek tradition, as influenced by the Orthodox Church, a Greek woman’s primary concern is marriage. Hence, womanhood in Greece is to complete “nurturing, cooking, cleaning” tasks where as men are thought to be “unwilling or unable” to perform domestic tasks and take care of children (Lazaridis, 2009, p. 56). Amongst other tasks, a woman is concerned with the family’s spiritual welfare by being involved with rituals and religious observances. This responsibility, is a task that Dubisch (1993) says women claim as their own, excusing men for their lack of participation in religious events such as going to the church, by saying that they are working or too physically active to uphold religious fasts.

With regards to the Church’s ideals about how a ‘correct’ woman should be, many ethnographers have portrayed Greek women as being very much aware of honour and shame principles which govern their behaviour both inside the house and outside (Du Boulay, 1986). Under the watchful eye of the ever-present neighbour, both women and men operate in a self-regulating fashion to uphold the values set out by the honour and shame principle (Mills, 2003). According to this principle, honour is for men to uphold by preventing women from being shameful. As women are thought of as unable to control themselves and considered generally as weak, it is believed that women must restrict public activities, be chaste and cultivate a sense of shame in order to prevent themselves from doing something socially unacceptable (Tagopoulos, 2004). What adhering to this principle of shame translates into, is a pressure for women to act with humility and piety, dress modestly and not look at or return men’s gazes (Costa, 2005). The man’s role is to uphold the family’s honour by preventing women from committing shameful activities, which is why it is more acceptable for women to work where they can be supervised by a family member, such as in a family-owned store. In Greece, the family’s reputation is of great importance and can be undermined by any member, which is why concealing things harmful to the family’s reputation is part of the family pact. Furthermore, a woman is expected to guard the house from intrusions by striving to keep matters such as gossip and family matters within the house, thus maintaining the family’s coherence and purity.

Whilst these principles of honour and shame are present to some extent in contemporary rural Greek society, more recently, guarding the family’s reputation has more to do with maintaining the family’s material status (Dubisch, 1993). However, it is important to note at this point that literature on the current state of gender roles related to social reproduction in Greece is missing. A large body of academic writing refers to notions of Greek gender roles based on articles recording how rural
Greece was in the 1980s and 1990s when a plethora of academic literature on Greek gender roles was produced (Herzfeld, 1991b, Dubisch, 1986a, Dubisch, 1993, Loizos, 1991). However, a couple of studies are emerging which refer to Greek gender roles in the rural context, one of which is Anthopoulou’s (2010) study of Greek agrifood entrepreneurs. In this study, the connection of femininity with primary responsibility for social reproduction in the Greek rural context was high. The fact that 80% of female entrepreneurs’ who were asked to describe what they perceived as ‘free time’, equated it to doing housework, illustrates how the ‘naturalness’ of women being responsible for domestic tasks is embedded in the women’s perceptions of what constitutes ‘work’. Indeed, the women in Anthopoulou’s (2010) study adhere very closely to ideals that connect femininity to caring for the family by stressing how they are proud nothing has changed regarding their caring responsibilities for their family since their involvement in agrifood entrepreneurship. From this evidence, it can be said that women in rural Greece, are still adhering to gender roles that equate femininity to ‘good mother and good wife’ ideals.

5.3 The economic: Greek economic reality and tourism development

Since the economic crisis started in 2010, the Greek economy has been undergoing one of its most difficult periods in the last 50 years. Before the crisis, rapid economic growth and strong productivity rates were indications that Greece had good macroeconomic growth, however this was in opposition to the performance of individuals who exhibited high levels of corruption (Mitsopoulos and Pelagidis, 2011). The economic crisis is blamed not only on the global financial crisis, but also on the hesitation shown by previous Greek governments in dealing with fundamental structural problems in the economy (Karamessini, 2013). Examples of these structural problems are the debt accumulated by hosting the 2004 Olympics and high increases of up to 50% in public service wages from 1999-2007 (BBC News, 2012). This reduced state income, coupled with widespread tax evasion and concealed borrowing, meant that Greece was no longer able to repay the interest on its loans and so was forced to take loans from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). In turn, the IMF imposed severe austerity measures as part of its loan terms. Apart from being severe, there is speculation that the austerity measures, which include the privatisation of state-owned enterprises, may be violating human rights as they affect basic social services (UN News Centre, 2011). With unemployment at 27.8% in the first trimester of 2014 (Greek Statistical Board, 2014) from an average of 12% in 2008 (Trading Economics, 2012) and private and public sector wages being slashed by up to 50%, the economic crisis has deeply affected Greeks and many are migrating (e.g. Germany had an increase of 1245% in migrants of Greek origin arriving during 2010-2011) or thinking of migrating, in search of employment (Spiegel Online International, 2011). Slow economic recovery was expected to
start in 2013 but figures in domestic and outbound tourism are not forecast to return to pre-crisis levels until 2020 (Euromonitor report, 2010).

5.3.1 Greek tourism sector

After 1951, through a series of decrees, various areas in Greece characterised by outstanding natural beauty, archaeological interest or folklore traditions, were proclaimed ‘tourist areas of importance’ (Vlami et al., 2006). The Greek Tourism Organisation at the time owned and managed most of the tourism developments in these ‘areas of importance’, until things changed in the 1980s when EU directives required alignment with their policies. European policies favoured the use of tourism as a strategy for rural development and so the Development Law 1262/82 was created which saw the development of a multitude of privately-owned tourism enterprises. Until the 1980s the focus had been on mass seaside tourism, however new EU policies required better environmental performance and a focus on rural development, so rural tourism was considered the vehicle for adhering to EU policies (Priporas and Kamenidou, 2003). Taking advantage of state- and EU-introduced incentives, many private individuals started developing tourism businesses in rural areas in the 1990s (Gousiou et al., 2001).

Today, the Greek tourist sector comprises different sized enterprises ranging from small to large hotel chains, the later cooperating with foreign tour operators who are particularly active in Greece (Zacharatos, 1992). The largest segment of the tourist sector however, is characterised by small enterprises such as 5-10 bed hotels (40% of hotels) and family-run shops (I.T.E.P, 2001). Whilst small enterprises have the advantage of being more competitive by escaping full-year payrolls and social security payments by employing seasonal workers19, they have the disadvantage of not being able to hire specialised personnel which limits how competitive they can be (Bastakis et al., 2004). Greek tourism is characterised by high seasonality, for example in 2012, 56% of international tourist arrivals were concentrated in the three months of June, July and August (SETE, 2013, SETE, 2012). The Greek summer tourist season usually runs from April through to October, whilst winter tourism attracts low numbers of international tourists (Patiniotis, 2007). Greek tourism is also characterised by very long working hours, flexibility of working relations and fluctuations between periods of intense employment and unemployment.

---

18 Mass tourism is characterised by its limited diffusion of economic benefits to the local community compared with its high impact on the local natural and cultural environments. In Greece, where the summer season attracts many tourists from northern Europe, mass tourism is characterised by high seasonality (Williams, 1997).

19 This is also true for many large hotels who employ their staff for just the summer season.
Despite the current difficult economic situation, the tourist industry is still very strong, contributing 16.4% to national GDP and providing employment for 18.3% of the population in 2012 (SETE, 2012, Papapostolou, 2011). However, whilst international tourist arrivals increased to 17 million in 2011, fuelled by visa facilitation for Russia and other emerging markets, a VAT decrease on tourist accommodation and the Arab Spring, in 2012 international arrivals dropped to 15.5 million (SETE, 2012). In 2011, domestic tourism dropped sharply (Euromonitor, 2012, Papatheodorou et al., 2010). This drop in domestic tourism was because domestic disposable incomes were reduced and there was deep insecurity about future cuts in incomes and the imposition of extra ‘emergency’ taxes, all of which prevented Greek nationals from taking holidays. During 2011, the domestic tourism trends became mainly trips to holiday homes, friends and family. So, destinations relying mainly on domestic tourism were particularly hard hit by prevailing economic conditions.

This paper’s focus is on rural tourism, which equated to ‘agrotourism’ in most literature about Greek rural tourism, and so to follow shall be an analysis of Greek agrotourism development (Aggelopoulou et al., 2008, Iakovidou, 1997).

5.3.2 Agrotourism development

In 1985, agrotourism was promoted as the main type of rural tourism development in Greece by targeting mountainous and peripheral areas such as islands with infrequent transport connections (Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou, 2003, Koutsou et al., 2009). This ambitious project, led by the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Tourism Organisation, aimed at developing pluriactivity amongst farmers, maintaining rural populations (urbanisation is a major problem in Greece where over 50% of the population lives in the capital city of Athens) and protecting the environment and cultural heritage (Ministry of Agricultural Development and Food, 2012a). However, since agrotourism was not part of a greater rural tourism development plan and the regulations and initiatives were used primarily to distribute financial help to eligible people, no agrotourism network exists today (Kizos and Iosifides, 2007). In addition, local development agencies which were responsible for distributing funds for rural tourism became characterised by wide-spread corruption (Green, 2008).

In 2007, according to official statistics there were around 700 agrotourism units with an average of 9.5 beds per unit, however as this figure does not include units funded by EU LEADER programs, the authors of a study on agrotourism development in Greece estimate the number to be 30-50% higher than this (Kizos and Iosifides, 2007). More recent programs to develop agrotourism include the Ministry of Agricultural Development and Food’s promotion of agrotourism via its 2007-2013 strategy by giving subsidies for rural development aimed at increasing the quality of life in
agricultural areas and differentiating the agricultural economy (Ministry of Agricultural Development and Food, 2012b).

5.3.3 EU funding for rural tourism development

Tourism entrepreneurship is promoted as a strategy in rural areas to help alleviate poverty by focusing on reducing women’s unemployment (Robson et al., 2009). As rural tourism development focusing on women is seen as one of the most important strategies currently used for diversification of economic activities in remote areas, a major element of EU development policies has been the development of rural tourism by promoting female involvement (Skuras et al., 2006). These development policies seem to have worked as there has been an increase in the number of female entrepreneurs in Greece when European initiatives such as EQUAL and LEADER that focused more on the inclusion of women in their agendas, where introduced.

Indeed, most funding for female entrepreneurship via rural tourism development in Europe and particularly in Greece, comes from EU programs such as the LEADER programs (LEADER I, LEADER II, LEADER plus) (Aggelopoulos et al., 2008). More specifically, the ‘LEADER approach’, according to the EU rural development website: “involves highly individual projects designed and executed by local partnerships to address specific local problems” (EU, 2012, p.1). The majority (62%) of women’s agrotourism cooperatives and private initiatives in Greece have received funding at some stage of their operation by a LEADER program, so this is quite a commonly used avenue for rural tourism entrepreneurs to create or expand their business (Aggelopoulos et al., 2008). Indication of women’s high take-up rates of LEADER funding for rural tourism, can be seen in a study of LEADER program take-up rates in Northern Greece, where the majority of beneficiaries (54%) were women (Iakovidou et al., 2002).

Interestingly, in Greece, most LEADER funds that were made available by local development agencies became synonymous with tourism rather than with rural development as they were initially intended to be by the EU. In effect, as Koutsouris (2008) argues in his article on sustainable development in Lake Plastira, LEADER programs effectively encouraged farmers’ engagement with tourism to the detriment of agriculture which they began to view as a hard and unprofitable activity.

Apart from LEADER-funded programs, there are various part-state/part-EU funded programs available for entrepreneurs, such as the EU Operation Program of Competitiveness which ran during 2000-2006 and had a program specifically aimed at helping female entrepreneurs. This program offered funding to existing companies to upgrade and modernise as well as providing start-up funds for new entrepreneurs in the form of 50% subsidies. Around 3000 businesses were funded from this
program, out of which 1 in 5 were female entrepreneurs, which is a high ratio for Greek standards (European Commission, 1999).

Other initiatives that aimed at increasing tourism entrepreneurship in Greece include the ESF, Winne8, The Framework Program for Competitiveness and Innovation, the National Fund for Entrepreneurship and Development (ETEAN) and the Development Law (Magoulios and Kydros, 2011). Like the LEADER program, whilst these programs are targeted at entrepreneurs in general, some have a gender focus. For example, the European Social Fund’s (ESF) cross-cutting theme for its 2007-2013 agenda, has a gender-focus in that it aims to develop Greek women’s socio-economic potential via tailored training schemes combined with childcare facilities (European Social Fund, 2007). In 2000, the ESF also created the EQUAL community initiative which aimed to end all forms of labour discrimination, including on the basis of gender. Improving the work-life balance of women and men as well as dismantling gender stereotypes have been among the issues dealt with by the 40 EQUAL initiatives that were in operation in Greece (Stratigaki, 2005).

5.3.4 National strategies encouraging female entrepreneurship

With regards to national efforts to promote rural tourism development, the 2011 Development Laws’ strategic priority is to strengthen regional cohesion through entrepreneurship. The Development Laws do this by proving tax exemptions and subsidies depending on the geographical zone a business is located in and its size (Magoulios and Kydros, 2011). These Laws however do not include any measures which specifically promote entrepreneurship among women. Recently, the Hellenic Fund for Entrepreneurship and Development (ETEAN) was set up to help domestic micro, small and medium sized entrepreneurs gain access to loans and other financial products. ETEAN has a specific fund for rural entrepreneurship development which encourages investments in ‘thematic’ tourism and also gives priority to young entrepreneurs; however it does not mention any specific priority being given to women wanting to borrow from this fund (Hellenic Fund for Entrepreneurship and Development, 2013).

Other organisations providing female entrepreneurs with support over the years to varying degrees include: PASEGES (National Organisation for Agricultural Cooperatives), EOMMEX (Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises and Handicraft Businesses), ATE (Agricultural Bank) and OAED (Greek manpower employment organisation). EOMMEX was often mentioned by this study’s textile handicraft entrepreneur participants for its help in organising joint marketing campaigns, exhibitions where the entrepreneurs could sell their wares and for providing support to small handicraft entrepreneurs. However, now EOMMEX has ceased to exist as an organisation. In 2012 it was incorporated into the new organisation responsible for the development of entrepreneurship, ESEE
(National Organisation for Greek Commerce), however most of its functionality as well as the focus on handicraft entrepreneurship has been lost (Kathimerini Newspaper, 2013).

Since the crisis, there seems to be a sudden spurt in activity regarding subsidies to encourage un- or under-employed rural women to engage in entrepreneurship, as seen in the 2007-2013 Ministry of Development and Competitiveness’ development plan (ESPA, 2013). In 2013, a program that promotes rural female entrepreneurship was created as part of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF), called the “Strategic intervention for the promotion of female employment via entrepreneurship (2007-2013)” program. This is co-funded by the EU and the Greek state and targets unemployed women or self-employed women on very low wages in rural areas such as Crete and Epirus (Ministry of Development Competitiveness Infrastructure Transport and Networks, 2013b). By providing unemployed women with funding for business costs as well as the cost of employing a staff member, this development program claims to promote gender equality as well as economic development via entrepreneurship. Another very recent attempt to promote female entrepreneurship is the 2013 Ministry for Competitiveness’ invitation to unemployed women to submit business plan proposals for which can potentially receive 100% subsidies up to 20,000 euro (Ministry of Development Competitiveness Infrastructure Transport and Networks, 2013a). It is interesting that some of the organisations promoting this invitation have focused specifically on encouraging women to engage in the production of handicrafts at home thus perpetuating gender norms that connect femininity to house-bound social reproductive roles (Municipality of Ampelokipi-Menemeni, 2013).

5.4 Greek female tourism entrepreneurship

With regards to tourism entrepreneur characteristics in Greece, most tourism business owners are male, with only 15% being female which is a low number compared with the European average of 35% (Aggelopoulos et al., 2008). An attempt to define the characteristics of women engaging in entrepreneurship in Greece is seen in an EU report where they are presented as operating micro-size businesses (1-9 employees) with 80% of female entrepreneurs in Greece having a family (Union of Hellenic Chambers of Commerce, 2005). This report indicates that the top three motivations for Greek women wanting to become entrepreneurs are economic profitability, the desire to have freedom in decision-making and the desire for self-achievement. According to the same study, some of the barriers encountered by female entrepreneurs are the lack of information and lack of funding. On the issue of funding, one of the problems is that there are few financial tools which are specifically aimed at helping women entrepreneurs in Greece (Matsaganis, 2011). The banking sector
in particular does not have products specifically designed to support female entrepreneurship which makes obtaining finance harder for women who are already viewed sceptically by bank managers (Magoulios and Kydros, 2011). One further barrier to entrepreneurship in Greece is the bureaucracy which entrepreneurs face when trying to obtain funding from state or EU programs (Sarri and Trihopoulou, 2005). Hence some female entrepreneurs prefer to avoid taking any financial support from the state, both to avoid the time-consuming and soul-destroying state bureaucracy but also to avoid being taken advantage of by middle-men asking for kick-backs in order to secure an EU subsidy.

However, it is not only the lack of finances that limit women from becoming entrepreneurs in Greece. One of Greek women’s constraints for setting up business is the lack of infrastructural support for the elderly and children, as Vlachou and Iakovidou (2005) find in their study of individual female entrepreneurs in Mavrothalassa, Serres. This finding is echoed by Spanoudaki and Iakovidou’s (2009) research into rural female entrepreneurs who experience serious problems combining their entrepreneurial activities with family obligations. Taking into account the delay of young people entering employment and the early retirement of an aging population, a woman’s task can be quite demanding as she is expected to care for both the young and the old as well as work.

Greek female entrepreneurs invariably live very close to where their business is located which may also be related to their need to be close enough to home to undertake social reproduction duties. To this extent, Iakovidou, Koutsou and Partalidou (2009) find that 80% of the female entrepreneurs’ own business premises were close to their homes which was attributed to the entrepreneurs’ need to maintain a “balance between family and work obligations” (p. 177).

Much literature describes tourism employment as gender-separated in Greece with women often working in the informal economy. With regards to the types of work done by women, this is also gender-separated with women frequently undertaking work related to social reproduction duties such as cleaning and cooking (Costa, 2005, Mills, 2003, Leontidou, 1994).

5.4.1 Tourism-specific considerations for female entrepreneurs

For the last 10 years, Greece has been undergoing a phase of rapid transformation in both economic and social spheres and tourism is one of the reasons this transformation is occurring. In areas with high numbers of tourists such as coastal areas, the paternal model is slowly regressing as family members, including women, gain financial and social independence, resulting in what Tsartas (2003) calls a “touristification” (p. 117) of the family’s social structure. In economic terms, capitalist pressures for commodity accumulation have resulted in changes in consumption patterns and wealth accumulation. The intense pressures to increase consumption have resulted in women undertaking
multiple employments, often on an informal or part-time basis. Within tourism, many jobs are extensions of women’s traditional roles as housewives and so maids, cleaners, stewardesses and catering employees are usually women, whereas men occupy positions such as pilots, managers and guides (Hadjimichalis and Vaiou, 1992).

Informal, part-time and seasonal work is particularly common in tourism employment and there is a high probability that the changes in employment law mentioned by Kyriazis (1998), which were meant to promote equality in the workspace, did not actually help women as they continue to work under this type of unstable employment contract. The reasons for women occupying such a high percentage of employment on a seasonal basis may reflect the lack of other types of employment, but also may express women’s choice for employment that minimises interference with social reproduction duties. Seasonal work also means that women who work in tourism are easily accessible when needed and readily returned to the family when the season finishes (Gidarakou et al., 2008).

Women who work still have to adhere to roles regarding social reproduction duties, as Galani-Moutafi (1994) reports in her work on gender and tourism in a Greek island village. She observes that in the village, women who work do not necessarily experience a change in the division of household tasks or the cultural concepts that define a woman’s identity. A similar observation is also made by Costa (2005) who notes that whilst women in the Greek island of Cephalonia are called upon to work in tourism, they still continue being held responsible for household tasks.

5.4.2 Rural female entrepreneurs: invisible and pluriactive

Entrepreneurship among rural women has increased because of the various development programs mentioned earlier and also because modernisation within agriculture reduces the need for labourers, and so women leave the fields to engage in paid employment (Brandth, 2002). Whilst pluriactivity is considered to be an unwanted feature, in rural societies the time allocated to activities is dictated by the needs of each activity rather than a formal work schedule, what Leontidou (1994) refers to as a “quasi-precapitalist” (p. 82) allocation. So pluriactivity is much more common as a household survival strategy in rural rather than in urban populations. Indicative of this pluriactivity is that 52% of rural women working in tourism in Greece also hold a second job, mainly in agriculture (1994).

In addition to engaging in seasonal entrepreneurship, women in rural areas are faced with more sharply defined roles in terms of prioritising the family’s domestic duties over paid work outside the house. Adding to the ways tourism employment influences women’s gender roles and
relations, women who live in a rural environment must ascribe to different gender norms than in urban areas, as illustrated in Fielden and Dawe’s research (2004), which shows that strong gender stereotypes exist in rural areas, and result in women’s partners discouraging them from entering entrepreneurship altogether. Whilst forms of male and female employment in rural areas are closer, with women often helping in the fields alongside the men, women have played an invisible role in the economic development of rural areas as they have been perceived as “helpmates, wives and mothers”, rather than entrepreneurs (Koutsou et al., 2009, p. 191).

### 5.4.3 Women’s agrotourism cooperatives

Women’s agrotourism cooperatives became particularly popular amongst rural women who wanted to become involved in entrepreneurship as the national rural tourism strategy contained an emphasis on gender equality that was manifested in using agrotourism as a vehicle for rural women’s economic involvement. An emphasis was placed on how rural women, many of whom were unemployed, could become financially better-off by entering agrotourism-related entrepreneurship, whilst still being able to maintain a family-work balance, which was meant to address the strategy’s gender equality aspect. These, mainly EU-backed, programs provided initiatives such as tax-free loans subsidies for agrotourism cooperatives’ formation. More specifically, women were encouraged to form agrotourism cooperatives and as a result, rural development in the form of women’s agrotourism cooperatives became one of the most prevalent forms of rural tourism in Greece (Aggelopoulos et al., 2008). Women’s agrotourism cooperatives, of which there are 141 today, aim to fulfil many of rural tourism’s objectives such as the preservation of cultural heritage through making and selling local handicrafts and the establishment of personal relationships with tourists by providing them with accommodation in spare rooms or small hotels (Ministry of Agricultural Development and Food, 2012b). Past literature has analysed Greek women’s agrotourism cooperatives mainly in terms of gendered interpretations of what is significant to be studied in terms of neoclassical interrogations of business structures, such as typologies of female entrepreneurs (Karasavvoglu and Florou, 2006), training support (Petridou and Glaveli, 2008) and success factors (Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou, 2003). Few studies have focused on how women’s agrotourism cooperatives achieve gender equality and it is debatable whether this growth in female entrepreneurship was maintained, as women’s agrotourism cooperatives are now seen as suffering from the ‘subsidy syndrome’ whereby a lack of continued EU-backing has seen a drastic demise of women’s cooperatives (Koutsou et al., 2003, Koutsou et al., 2009).
5.4.4 Women and handicraft tourism

Engagement in tourism via agrotourism cooperatives provided rural women with the opportunity to utilise their already existing skills and knowledge of domestic duties in their new entrepreneurship ventures which mainly had to do with manufacturing local products such as handicrafts and preserved fruits and pasta and providing bed and breakfast accommodation (Anthopoulou, 2010). Whilst handicrafts in many countries form a large part of the tourist product and are promoted as a focal point for tourists (e.g. Murano glass in Italy, lace in Brussels), in Greece no national program for their promotion exists (Perivoliotis, 2002). Despite them being mentioned as ‘existing’ in most Greek agrotourism literature, little research has been done on handicrafts produced and sold within tourism on a national scale. However, a recent (January, 2013) exhibition organised by the largest trade exhibition organisers in Greece, which focused exclusively on Folk Art and Souvenirs, is possibly an indication of increased interest in handicrafts as souvenirs in Greece (Rota AE, 2013).

Since Minoan times, spinning and weaving in Greece were part of women’s social reproduction duties, as these petty commodities were made for the family instead of being bought (Barber, 1994). These textile-making occupations were considered appropriate for women as they were easily interruptible, easily resumeable and did not place children in danger (as for example using fire in silversmithing would). The historic prevalence of these crafts within the Greek home, is shown in excavations in the Minoan village of Myrtos in South Crete, where there is evidence that women spun and wove flax in a variety of places around the house (Barber, 1994). In the present day, specific designs, materials and methods of production are closely associated with specific regions. Examples include silk textiles in Crete and Thrace, woollen carpets in central Greece and fine linen/silk textiles in Southern Greece (Perivoliotis, 2002). In Crete, the majority of textile products purchased as souvenirs range from mass-made T-shirts to hand-made lace and silk products, embroidery and the famous ‘Kalimera’ (which means ‘Goodmorning’ in Greek) wall hangings which are made from silk cocoons (Perivoliotis, 2002). In Epirus, the main handicrafts are related to wool and thus colourful woollen carpets, woven woollen covers and blankets are made by women, whereas intricate wood-carvings are made by men.

5.5 Chapter summary

This chapter has discussed how prevailing historical socio-cultural and politico-economic conditions in Greece have shaped gender roles and relations. Wars and military dictatorships, which
promoted ‘family values’ have influenced the idea that a Greek woman’s primary responsibility is towards her family, (Stamiris, 1986). Even though a Secretariat for Gender Equality was established in 1980, gender representation has been limited, and within academia, feminist studies are criticised as lacking vigour (Vaiou, 2008).

Even though women’s role as workers within family businesses is very much accepted, cultural constraints that view women, outside their role as mothers or wives, as the root of evil are reinforced by the Greek Orthodox Church which is still powerful in Greece (Du Boulay, 1986). Hence womanhood in Greece is to complete nurturing, cooking and cleaning tasks, whereas men are thought of as unable or unwilling to complete these tasks (Lazaridis, 2009). Adherence to these ideals is reinforced by cultural mechanisms such as the ‘honour and shame’ principle that operates like Foucault’s (1972) ‘panopticon’20 which ensures that people act according to prescribed norms out of fear of being gossiped about (Mills, 2003).

With regards to the economy in Greece, the recent economic crisis is transforming society as exceedingly high unemployment rates, especially in masculine occupations such as construction, mean that more men are staying at home (Galanos, 2013). At the same time, crisis-driven policies encourage women to take up paid employment such as entrepreneurship, but welfare spending is dramatically cut, creating a complex negotiation of gender roles (Karamessini, 2013). Despite this, the tourist industry is presented as being very strong and continues to contribute 16% to national GDP and provide employment for 18% of the population (Papapostolou, 2011). As Greek tourism is characterised by high seasonality and is highly dependent on tour operators to attract high numbers of international visitors who come on all-inclusive tours (Patiniotis, 2007), one of the main effects the crisis is having, is on tourist spending at micro-entrepreneurs’ shops that make up a significant number of Greek tourism businesses. However there has been limited research on the crisis’ effect on tourism micro-entrepreneurs specifically (Papatheodorou et al., 2010).

Many tourism micro-entrepreneurs in Greece have been assisted by EU funding such as that available for the development of rural tourism via LEADER programs (Aggelopoulos et al., 2008) and by national programs such as the 2011 Development Law which aimed to increase entrepreneurship rates by providing tax subsidies (Magoulios and Kydros, 2011). Many of the beneficiaries for these

---

20 Foucault’s Panopticon is described as a tower from where all the prisoners in a prison can be monitored at any time of the day. Despite not being able to accurately know if someone was in the ‘Panopticon’ tower, all prisoners acted as though they were in constant surveillance, The ‘Panopticon’ tower is often used to draw parallels between the way it operates within a prison, and the way in which social criticism operates within societies. Whilst not necessarily physically present, the fear of recrimination from neighbours, friends or relatives constantly surrounds people, whose actions are also determined by this often inhibitory social control mechanism, an example of which is the shame and honour mechanism operating within Greek society.
funding programs are women, thus female entrepreneurship rates in Greece have increased (European Commission, 1999), although there is some doubt regarding the actual numbers of active female entrepreneurs, as businesses are often registered to women’s names for tax reasons (Nastis, 2009). However, despite this increase in female activity in the productive economy, Greek female entrepreneurs are still perceived as “helpmates, wives and mothers” (Koutsou et al., 2009, p. 191), a phenomenon which is more marked in rural locations. Women’s’ cooperatives have been presented as a solution to achieve more gender equality and there was a proliferation of women’s agrotourism cooperatives in the last 20 years, many of which relied on women’s ‘natural’ prowess in making handicrafts and traditional sweets or hosting guests (Aggelopoulos et al., 2008). However as many women’s cooperatives depended on subsidies, a lack of continued EU-backing has seen a drastic decline in their numbers, questioning the sustainability of these structures (Koutsou et al., 2003).

Having described and discussed the socio-cultural and politico-economic context within which tourism entrepreneurs are situated in Greece, I have provided the background needed to analyse the ways in which gender roles and relations operate within tourism entrepreneurship. I start this analysis by providing a description of the entrepreneurial structures found within the ethnographic areas studied, followed by an analysis of how gender permeates these economic structures and how entrepreneurs’ conceptualisations of entrepreneurship are transformed by the politico-economic and socio-cultural frameworks they find themselves in.
Chapter Six

6 Conceptualisations of entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is often viewed as a way of achieving greater gender equality and reducing feminised poverty by creating opportunities for women to earn money, because of its flexibility in allowing women to combine housework with working (Calas et al., 2009). Despite the obvious connection this statement has with using gender as synonymous with ‘woman’, this is a useful way of conceptualising why many development programs focus their efforts on encouraging women’s participation in entrepreneurship. Microcredit programs (Selinger, 2008) and microenterprise programs (Strier and Abdeen, 2009), are examples of these programs but are of debatable effectiveness in reaching the goals of increased gender equality and poverty reduction as local contexts are rarely considered when applying globalised development policies. One of the key elements in considering the local context is the issue of how gender permeates performances of the economic and thus also transforms conceptualisations of entrepreneurship with varying effects (Welter, 2011). The role gender plays within interpretations of entrepreneurship is significant to the outcome of development projects as noted by Ferguson (2010b) in her research on a World Bank-instigated tourism development program in Honduras. However, by simply constituting the gender element of the tourism development policy as being to support women in their productive roles as entrepreneurs, Ferguson argues that the broader issues of these women’s lives are not taken into consideration and the policy was detrimental in disrupting village power relations.

One of the reasons that gender plays such a significant role in the success or failure of development programs using entrepreneurship as their vehicle to ‘empower’ women relates to how entrepreneurship is interpreted and situated within the “symbolic domain of the male” (Bruni et al., 2005, p. 1). Although entrepreneurship purports to be gender-neutral, by making its connection to hegemonic masculinity natural and thus invisible, it requires people who engage in it to aspire to masculine values of maximising profit at the detriment of family relationships, risk-taking and innovation, that are embedded within entrepreneurship discourse (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). At the same time, entrepreneurship theory takes for granted the sharp distinction between work and family, drawing on economic ‘rational man’ theorising that posits economically active individuals as operating independently from their environment and surroundings (Walby, 2000), despite the family...
embeddedness (Aldrich and Cliff, 2003) that characterises many micro-entrepreneurs, who are the type of entrepreneur focused upon in the current study. An example of the role gender plays in entrepreneurship is seen in a recent study which challenges “the myth” (p. 115) of under-performing female entrepreneurs finding it to be closely related to women’s gendered social reproductive responsibilities such as childcare and thus not acting ‘rationally’ as such. In fact, the study shows that the majority of female entrepreneurs’ experiences of entrepreneurship departs from entrepreneurial norms of rationality (Marlow and McAdam, 2013). Recently there has been a rise in the number of authors who focus on exactly this criticism of entrepreneurship theory, by actively suggesting alternative ways of conceptualising entrepreneurship that are more inclusive in terms of gender. Many such authors use feminism to criticise dominant theories, which is how the current study also aims to progress, thus contributing to research on the lived experiences of female entrepreneurship (Calas et al., 2009, Calas et al., 2007, Ahl, 2006, Ahl and Marlow, 2012, Ahl and Nelson, 2010, De Bruin et al., 2007, Hughes and Jennings, 2012).

In order to do this, I shall progress to describe the entrepreneurs who participate in this study in terms of how the businesses structures that they are located within act to define interpretations of entrepreneurship as affected by gendered constraints and facilitators that are in turn influenced by the cultural and politico-economic contexts within which the entrepreneurs are located. Compartmentalising participant-entrepreneurs into business structures such as cooperatives and individual entrepreneurs is useful in highlighting the differences in perception of entrepreneurship according to the type of development program the entrepreneurs have made use of in order to enter entrepreneurship.

Participant-entrepreneurs in this study are engaged in the production and/or sale of various handicrafts as souvenirs within tourism and include potters, silversmiths, felters, weavers, knitters, cooks and crocheters. To follow, I will describe the business structures I encountered in terms of tourism development, giving a snapshot of one of the entrepreneurs found within each structure in order to provide the reader with a picture of these entrepreneurial structures in the current context. Then, I shall progress to explore how entrepreneurs negotiate concepts of entrepreneurship using themes generated within conversations relating to what benefits the entrepreneurs feel entrepreneurship has provided them with and what the difficulties associated with their entrepreneurial involvement are. I analyse how entrepreneurship creates feelings of visibility, doing something ‘natural’, freedom from control and guilt, and how these feelings are maintained by gendered cultural and politico-economic constructs. Thus, I further deconstruct how entrepreneurship facilitates the formation of hybrid gendered entrepreneurial subjectivities under the influence of neoliberalism that constitutes people as gender-neutral economically productive
citizens (Nairn et al., 2012). To follow this focus on how gender permeates entrepreneurial performances, I analyse the role of children within the entrepreneurial process in terms of how tourism entrepreneurship transforms children’s roles.

6.1 Tourism development structures

Tourism is often used by governments as a development vehicle via the creation of direct and indirect employment, but tourism also perpetuates gendered inequalities by not making visible contextual interpretations of gender in state plans (Ferguson, 2011a). The EU, from which Greece gets many of its directives and funding for tourism development, has been criticised as only superficially including gender within its gender mainstreaming policies, by, for example, focusing simply on raising overall employment rates rather than on achieving more gender equity with regards to entry into the labour force (Andriotis, 2004, Karamessini and Rubery, 2013). Despite these criticisms, tourism does act to improve women’s earning capacity (Le Mare, 2012, Lew et al., 2004), which encourages women to question their position in society. For example, when women enter the largely masculine domain of employment, they question public-private space restrictions (Tucker, 2007). Gender within entrepreneurship is often concealed by tourism development, an example of this being the way in which a connection between femininity and weakness is embedded within programs that offer business advice, training and support structures (e.g. cooperatives), which Ahl and Marlow (2012) argue perpetuate the idea of “gender deficiencies” (p. 546) and that women lack these skills. Hence the type of tourism development offered is instrumental in how gendered entrepreneurial subjectivities are negotiated with different effects being observed between, for example, micro-financing (Kabeer, 2005) that promotes individual entrepreneurial activity and women’s cooperatives (Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou, 2003) that promote collective entry and participation in tourism entrepreneurship.

As to the make-up of this study’s entrepreneurs, the majority of tourism handicraft entrepreneurs are individual entrepreneurs who own and operate their business as well as making the products they sell, so they are perceived as one group, called here the ‘owner-producers’. Other business structures investigated in the case study areas include an association of home-based female entrepreneurs, a women’s cooperative, and a handicraft school. To follow, shall be a description of each business structure in terms of structure, participation and tourism development programs’ interaction with the entrepreneurs who form them.
6.1.1 Rizarios handicraft school

One business structure where women work producing handicrafts for the tourism industry in Greece is the handicraft school. Women who work in handicraft schools engage in tourism handicraft entrepreneurship indirectly as they produce handicrafts which are then sold via shops and the internet. Born out of a requirement to industrialise the production of handicrafts, as fewer women had the time to both work and produce handicrafts, many handicraft schools throughout Greece were established under the auspices of the Hellenic Organisation for Small and Medium Sized Enterprises and Handicrafts (EOMMEX) (Economou and Stylios, 2006). In 2013, handicraft schools were on the verge of extinction, indicated by the severe drop in numbers of women working in these schools. Specifically in Epirus, where this study’s handicraft school is located, the number of women working in handicraft schools dropped from a total of 309 women in the year of foundation in the 1960s, to just 79 women in 2007 (Economou and Stylios, 2006). The demise in the number of handicraft schools in Zagori specifically is indicated by the closure of three out of four handicraft schools operating in the Zagori area in the last five years (participant communication). Support for the handicraft sectors in Greece has severely diminished since the closure of EOMMEX in 2012, which also resulted in the closure of the Greek Centre for Silversmithing, the Greek Fur Centre and the Greek Centre for Pottery Clay (so now all packaged clay is imported from countries such as Italy, instead of being made in Greece) (Economidou, 2012).

Whilst handicraft schools are not the specific target of tourism development programs and are mainly funded by Ministry of Development and Competitiveness initiatives, the Rizarios Handicraft School has a unique connection to tourism. Utilising funding from an EU Interegg II program and the charitable foundation ‘Stavros Niarchos Foundation’, the Rizarios Foundation opened an exhibition centre for the school within Monodendri village which acts as the only handicraft-souvenir shop in the area (Rizarios Foundation, 2009). With regards to funding for the Rizarios Handicraft Centre, one of the reasons it is still able to survive despite the cuts in funding in the handicraft sector is because it receives independent funding for most its operations, relying majorly on a trust fund set up by a wealthy local individual.
Located in the mountainous, touristic village of Monodendri in Zagori, the Rizarios Handicraft school is currently the last remaining school in Zagori which teaches weaving, carpet-making, sewing and knitting. Receiving funding from a Foundation set up initially by a local from Monodendri village with strong connections to the Church, this school offers students two-year courses in these handicrafts free of charge, with the option of full-board also for free. After the two-year course, students have the option of weaving at home with threads from the school, or of continuing weaving at the school itself, both for pay. The women here are considered to engage in tourism handicraft entrepreneurship via their production of handicrafts for the nearby Rizarios handicraft exhibition centre which is located a couple of minutes’ walk from the school. The exhibition centre sells directly to tourists and also acts as a tourist attraction together with the Rizarios photographic exhibition hall. Only rarely will the handicrafters from the school come into contact with a customer who has a specific order, and these are in the majority older women “who know the value” (Anthoula, interview) of this type of handicraft.

With regards to its make-up, the school is all-female (apart from the male accountant) and has a mix of young Albanian girls (up to 17 years old) who all live in the dorms; teacher-workers who are all of Greek origin and over 30 years old; and a new batch of Greek women in their 30s who joined because of recent, crisis-induced, high unemployment rates. These three groups seem to keep to themselves and seldom mix. Participants for this study are drawn from one of the groups of over 17 year-olds, the Greek women who are teacher-workers and in their early thirties. When I visited the school there was obvious unrest and disenchantment about changes in its operation which were occurring because of the economic crisis. One of the complaints I heard most often from the girls was
about the quality of food which had dropped in an attempt to save money on costs. In addition, a cut of 50% had been applied to the stipend both the students and the teacher-workers received which caused further resentment. However the majority of teacher-workers I spent time with were happy to still have a job despite the reduction in salary. One of the teacher-workers at the school is Anthoula (Figure 6.2), whose brief narrative of involvement with handicraft entrepreneurship follows in order to provide a snapshot of the handicraft school entrepreneurs.

*Anthoula: a worker and teacher at the Rizarios Handicraft School, Monodendri, Zagori*

*Figure 6-2: Anthoula at her loom in the Rizarios Handicraft School (author’s picture, December 2012)*

**Anthoula** is a single 30-year old woman employed as a worker and a teacher at the Rizarios Handicraft School, and is originally from Tzoumerka, one of the nearby village complexes in the Zagori region. Her family’s financial situation did not allow her to finish secondary school as they could not financially support her anymore.
and so, after attending just two years of secondary school, she joined the Rizarios Handicraft School at the age of 13. Her engagement with weaving was out of necessity as she says: “I had no other choice, my parents didn’t have money”. After learning how to weave at the Rizarios School, she worked for seven-eight years for another handicraft school which has now closed, Mekeio school, after which she transferred back to Rizarios where now she has the added responsibility of teaching the younger girls and also does sewing, embroidery and finishing-off items for sale. Her family includes a brother who works, her mother whose disability pension was recently cut due to new policies regarding eligibility for disability pensions and her father who is bedridden and on an oxygen machine. She likes working at the handicraft school as she says there is understanding because if you need to run an errand in the morning, you can just stay for a bit longer in the evening. Also it is quite a social environment as they are all women and although this means there is more gossiping, they have a laugh and give and take advice. She describes her involvement in entrepreneurship as giving her independence, allowing her to feel more dynamically in charge of her life and making her happy that she can pay for her family’s various expenses, despite her wage being enough just for the bills and not much else. In the house, her mother does most of the household work with Anthoula acting as secondary carer, whereas her brother enjoys the free social reproductive labour provided to him, because as Anthoula says “with two women in the house, it is not right [for him to do any housework]”.

Drawing parallels between the Rizarios handicraft school and the various craft-making groups around the world is useful in conceptualising how this structure influences gendered attitudes to entrepreneurship. Like many craft producers, the women who tend to enter this type of entrepreneurship are from very poor families, have low formal education levels, thus having little understanding of the structural causes of their subordination and tend to adhere to more ‘traditional’ narratives of femininity such as those that constitute them as primary caregivers (Le Mare, 2012). Furthermore, especially in the case of the Rizarios Handicraft School, which is located in an isolated rural area, where alternative methods of employment are limited, being part of a group is of particular significance in terms of income-generation (Petrzelka et al., 2005). As seen in research on Andean women’s craft groups (Forstner, 2012), group membership also brings benefits such as training, social interaction and leadership which lead to more confidence in negotiating gender roles. Women’s groups are inherently gendered by excluding men, affecting interpretations of entrepreneurship as peoples’ involvement in this type of entrepreneurship is seen as feminised and
as an extension of feminised social reproductive activities (Cohen, 2001). Compounding the gendered effect is the fact that the Rizarios Handicraft school entrepreneurs have little or no direct contact with tourists and hence their presence as entrepreneurs is less visible. The invisibility conferred by this lack of contact with tourists is similar to the invisibility social reproductive work carries by being carried out in private rather than in public (Tucker, 2007). In addition, as this is group work, it departs from stereotypical conceptualisations of entrepreneurs as ‘independent’ (De Bruin et al., 2007).

Accordingly, the participant entrepreneurs at the Rizarios Handicraft School exhibit highly gendered attitudes about how their entrepreneurial activity is only for women and exclude men by saying for example that: “weaving-it seems to me a bit strange for men to do it. No, it doesn’t stick by any measure, no way, I couldn’t think about it” (Anthoula, interview) or expressing how ridiculous the sight of a man weaving would be, by saying: “if I heard about a man with a loom, I would laugh!” (Anna, interview). Furthermore they adhere to stereotypical gender roles regarding their roles as primary carers illustrated in how Anna is shocked at the thought of her husband being a stay-at-home dad, by saying : “A pa, pa, pa no, no – I wouldn’t like that thing, it’s better if I stay at home. For a man to take such a role? No way.” As the handicraft school entrepreneurs adhere to ‘traditional’ gender roles, they draw on feminised roles of their primary concern being their family to explain their involvement in entrepreneurship but simultaneously draw on concepts of self-worth derived through breadwinning to explain what they consider as positive aspects of their work, thus drawing on gender role resources (Leung, 2011) to create novel hybrid entrepreneurial identities as shall be discussed in more detail further on in the chapter.

6.1.2 Women’s Epirot Cooperative (GIS)

The Women’s Epirot Cooperative (GIS) located in Katsikas, Zagori, uses a play on words to signify their presence in Greek tourism by using the initials GIS which in Greek means ‘earth’, as their brand name. The GIS production area is located at the back of the shop area, thus allowing the women to work whilst simultaneously monitoring the shop-front. However, as the shop is located in an area with no tourism development, it operates more as an exhibition area with occasional visits from tourists who have tried their products in the nearby hotels. Their main customers are a shop on the island in Ioannina lake, hotels in Zagori, shops and hotels in close-by islands such as Lefkada and Kerkira, domestic tourists, local businesses and locals who want catering for a wedding, baptism, funeral etc. They also have their products on a Greek e-commerce website called ‘ebloko’ and supply local supermarkets, however they are not able to export as they do not have the certification to do so (this is a bureaucratic procedure, not geared towards small producers). With regards to their location on the supply chain the women in the cooperative are located away from the interface with
tourists, acting as producers of goods with middlemen selling on their products. Women eligible to create such an ‘agrotourism’ cooperative are rural women with some connection to farming. The participants all met when completing courses subsidised by the Ministry of Agriculture in 1996/97, which were meant to help women become more involved in the productive economy by learning how to utilise skills such as cooking, arranging dried flowers and painting in a business environment. Whilst the formation of women’s cooperatives was part of the policies created by the Gender Equality Secretariat to promote greater gender equality, frequent changes in leadership of the Secretariat meant that the inclusion of gender in the support services for the creation of women’s cooperatives was fragmented (Koutsou et al., 2003). The most instrumental strategy in creating women’s cooperatives was the Ministry of Agriculture’s agrotourism development strategy promoting the subsidised courses mentioned by participants which were part of a national effort to develop rural tourism. This was largely implemented through the creation of women’s cooperatives that provide accommodation, handicraft and catering services (Aggelopoulos et al., 2008).

As the participants narrate, regarding the formation of the GIS cooperative, the group of women who were keen on learning and were not there simply to get the subsidy from attending the classes, were encouraged by a local female agriculturalist to form an agrotourism cooperative when these were ‘in fashion’. Whilst they were ‘taught’ how to make various products to be sold in the cooperative shop such as traditional pasta made with sheep’s milk (‘trahanas’), jams, fruits preserved in syrup and pies, the cooperative women now use their own time-tested recipes as these yield better results. Now, they have kept the most successful recipes from each member and use those each time to ensure continuity in quality and taste. In the 20 years of their operation they have got support in the form of government/EU (Leader 2) funding to buy some of the larger machinery which they need like large ovens and a pasta-making machine and are proud not to have taken any loans out. Whilst this pride in not taking out loans may relate to positive perceptions of self-sufficiency, current market conditions mean that reduced willingness to risk by taking out a loan, potentially reduces the possibilities of business development (Magoulios and Kydros, 2011). Willingness to risk is considered one of the main tenets of entrepreneurship and as the cooperative women are adverse to this risk, they are considered as lacking in this entrepreneurial skill as Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou (2003) point out in their analysis of various women’s cooperatives around Greece.

From the initial 13 women who founded the cooperative, now only six active members remain, who are paid by the hour for their work and separate the profits evenly amongst themselves. Working at the cooperative is a flexible arrangement which helps the women to combine cooperative work with other jobs such as tending to animals or taking care of children. For the cooperative women, their entry into entrepreneurship has been facilitated by encouragement from an already
established female business woman (the agriculturalist), meeting similarly-minded women who were also farmers via the courses, and importantly, the resemblance of the tasks to social reproduction duties that they are familiar with.

One of the cooperative women who participate in this study is Dina (Figure 6.3) whose story below provides a snapshot into the cooperative women’s entrepreneurial experience.

*Dina, one of the co-owners/producers at the ‘GIS’ women’s cooperative, Zagori*

![Dina, one of the co-owners/producers at the ‘GIS’ women’s cooperative, Zagori](image)

**Figure 6-3: Dina, a co-owner of the Women's Epirot Cooperative making preserved apples (author’s picture, December 2012)**

Dina is one of the six women who co-own and operate the Women’s Epirot Cooperative. She is married with children and entered the cooperative when her children grew up as she was searching for something to do with her time. As with all the women in the cooperative, she is a farmer and at the time (1997) she was looking for employment, there were some subsidised workshops from the Ministry of Agriculture on cooking, making dried flowers, learning about aromatic and medicinal herbs and painting which she enrolled in. It was there that the women who formed the cooperative got to know one another, and formed the cooperative which Dina feels is a big help to female farmers. Whilst the first two
years were hard because as Dina says they didn’t “bring even a drachma\textsuperscript{21} home, we only took”, after that, they started making a profit and bringing money home. She feels the environment a good place to work in as it offers flexibility and the women are able to complete all their jobs – housework and cooperative work – even if that means starting at 5am and finishing at midnight some days. As Dina says: “some days we may come from five in the morning to make pies”. Dina likes working at the cooperative because although she feels it as a feminised occupation with not much value by saying: “even I who make pies and am not in a superior employment position, I’ll tell you I am working, yes”, she feels that her productive engagement has social benefits as “people see you differently” and she feels justified for the work she puts in by being paid for it. However, now she is worried about how they will pay the large taxes that have increased since the economic crisis, whilst their incomes have decreased due to the staggering drop in tourism, which she estimates to be about an 80% drop.

Groups such as cooperatives can be helpful for women to negotiate gendered economic barriers as they can challenge gender inequalities in a safe environment whilst working towards improvements in their economic status (Kabeer, 1999, Grimes and Milgram, 2000). However, it is often the case that although women earn money through tourism, they rarely spend it on themselves, prioritising their children’s needs over theirs, thus the potential to turn their personal autonomy into empowerment is restricted. For example the female workers at CASEM cooperative in Central America (Ferguson, 2011b) spent most of their money on sending their children to private schools, which shows women’s integration into circuits of capitalist consumption can influence gender roles within cooperatives as well.

The feeling of solidarity as a cooperative structure is demonstrated by the participants’ insistence that I interview them together and never separately. The collective nature these entrepreneurs operate within does however clash with ‘classic’ entrepreneurial interpretations of an entrepreneur being independent, thus suggesting that different interpretations of entrepreneurship are possible (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). However at the same time, this type of collective structure for women exclusively often acts to devalue the work done within it by being gendered in that it is known as a ‘woman’s group’. As Forstner (2012) points out in her work on women’s groups in the Peruvian Andes, it is seen as a “woman’s thing” (p. 9) which feminises not only the occupation, but also the business structure, thus potentially devaluing it. This perception of women’s groups being a

\textsuperscript{21} The ‘drachma’ was what Greek currency was called, before being replaced by the euro in 2000 and is still widely used in expressions.
devalued operation can change when the structure becomes more powerful by attracting funding and income as in the case of the women’s weaving cooperatives in Oaxaca. There, women’s participation was discouraged as soon as women started to challenge male dominance by attending the all-male decision-panels (Stephen, 2005). In the case of Greek cooperatives where decisions regarding the operation of their cooperative are taken by the female members and the members’ income levels remain low, thus also contributing to the perception that women’s cooperatives are more of an “amateur, leisure type of employment” (Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou, 2003, p. 35) than ‘real’ employment, cooperative involvement is thus not seen to be a threat to male breadwinner models, with women still occupying the position of ‘helper’.

For Dina and the other cooperative women prior to involvement with the cooperative, their time was taken up by acting according to the gendered responsibility to be the farmer’s invisible ‘helper’ as is common in rural farming communities (Brandth and Haugen, 2010). However, joining a cooperative has helped these farmer women to become more visible by earning a wage and being part of a legitimate business structure, which has resulted in increased feelings of self-worth, as one of the cooperative women, DarkK says: “The woman has a different worth when she works”. Apart from the value that the cooperative women feel they gain from working, one of the main ways that women within the cooperative view their engagement in this type of entrepreneurship is that they feel they are more suited to this type of occupation. Accordingly, the cooperative’s women are proud to be part of a cooperative as it is ‘different’, but also because people are ‘positive’ to women engaging in this type of occupation which mimics feminine social reproductive duties. As Dina says: “saying we work in a cooperative making sweets has positive responses from people around you, it is something different”. This attitude shows how gendered norms regarding women’s worth are closely associated with cultural norms that connect femininity to performing social reproductive tasks such as making sweets, and how these gender norms permeate performances of the economic by allowing women to engage in the masculinised domain of entrepreneurship without jolting their adherence to femininity. The inextricable connection of cooking and femininity in Greek society is emphasised by Dubisch (1986b) who notes that the only ‘real’ food for a Greek is the cooked (‘magirefto’ in Greek) food.

Connection between entrepreneurship involvement that mimics social reproductive tasks is also seen in Lazarides’ (2009) silk cocoon entrepreneurs who state how completing a feminised task enhances their acceptability as entrepreneurs. Adhering to social gender norms, the cooperative entrepreneurs justify their involvement with entrepreneurship as being because they are more capable at this work than men, who according to DarkK, are unable to do this work as a man “doesn’t have such fine tastes” and is not “organised” enough to undertake the task. Contradiction in these
statements and with the cooperative women’s justification for involvement in this type of occupation is however found in Dina’s admittance that “some of the best chefs are men” which points towards how gender is in fact socially constructed and not based on biological differences (Fenstermaker and West, 2013). It also reveals how the cooperative women commit themselves to subjectivities connecting femininity to superiority in social reproductive tasks such as cooking in order to carve out their place within entrepreneurial discourse (Bruni et al., 2005).

The connection between feminisation of labour and value both in economic and social terms is well illustrated by how both caring work and the people doing caring work are devalued (Folbre, 2003). On the subject of how men contribute to the devaluation of feminised activities, DarkK says that “men see these traditional stuff in a kind of racist light, they believe that this is a woman’s domain and don’t want to get involved.”. Whilst the term ‘racist’ is used erroneously and would translate better into ‘discriminatory’, this statement also brings to the fore how femininity is connected with the upholding of traditions (Lazaridis, 2009) and how masculinity is connected with modernity and innovation (Heynen, 2005), but also how these gendered subjectivities may contribute to the gendering of entrepreneurial involvement. Political statements such as the Minister for Agriculture’s encouragement for women to join cooperatives “to support the farming family and the community” and “in parallel contribute to the continuation of traditions” (Economou and Stylios, 2006, p. 182), act to further gender what women perceive their involvement in entrepreneurship should achieve, basing it on stereotypical interpretations of femininity being connected to altruistic care-giving (Brickell and Chant, 2010). Complexity in this gendering is encountered when male participant entrepreneurs also explain their involvement in handicraft entrepreneurship as being partly because they feel their occupation acts to maintain traditions as seen in how Giorgos, another participant in this study who is a male potter from Maragrites village, expresses the importance of the traditional character of his products as being part of his motivation for engaging in entrepreneurship.

However in order to get a better understanding of the role that cooperative structures play in the interpretations of what entrepreneurial behaviour entails, and how this is moulded by gendered socio-political factors, a description of individual entrepreneurs is warranted in order to provide a meter of comparison.

6.1.3 ‘Owner-producer’ micro entrepreneurs

The majority of participant entrepreneurs are micro-entrepreneurs (Strier and Abdeen, 2009) who make their own handicrafts, sell them within tourism and own their business. These shall be referred to as ‘owner-producer’ entrepreneurs within this study. Micro-entrepreneurs form the
back-bone of the Greek handicraft tourism sector (Perivoliotis, 2002) and SMEs account for the majority of tourism enterprises within Greek tourism (Sarri and Trihopoulou, 2005) which corresponds with EU statistics that show microenterprises consisting of fewer than ten employees account for 92% of total non-financial businesses in 2009 (Magoulios and Kydros, 2011). However, policies aiming specifically at helping tourism handicraft micro-entrepreneurs are almost non-existent. The majority of tourism development policies are aimed at hotels, with little consideration for the other sectors that enhance the tourist experience (Tsartas and Lagos, 2013). This lack in the promotion of handicraft tourism is echoed by the majority of participants, who state that they created their businesses with their own funds and then bought equipment through various programs aimed at ‘upgrading’ businesses in general. Participant entrepreneurs such as Hara, a female silversmith and Frosso, a female potter, have taken advantage of funding available for the improvement of IT literacy and e-communication to improve their ability to promote their businesses online. Some entrepreneurs, such as Katerina, a female potter in Margarites village, has taken advantage of an EU-funded LEADER program aimed at increasing rural tourism to help her renovate her parents’ house into a shop and buy equipment. However, other potters in the same village such as Kostis, are very wary of this kind of funding as it often entails bureaucratic procedures, political affiliations and money-thirsty ‘mediators’. The perception of EU development money being distributed in this unjust way frequently discourages eligible beneficiaries, who are often uneducated, poor and with few political connections, from applying as seen in work by Green (2008) who observes that in Epirus few people are able to “negotiate the minefield of paperwork” (p. 270) associated with applying for such funding, resulting in uneven and sometimes irrational development projects being carried out.

Other ‘owner-producer’ tourism handicraft entrepreneurs such as Giota, a co-owner of a felt shop in Zagori and Liana, a wedding favour maker in Rethymno, have utilised funding provided by the unemployment bureau (OAED) in order to open their businesses. This initiative consists of funding in the form of a lump sum (of around €12,000) distributed in instalments offered to unemployed women aged 22-64 years old in order for them to open their own business without however specifying what kind of business and hence being a policy to simply increase employment rather than focusing on increasing tourism entrepreneurship. Referring specifically to the handicraft sector of tourism entrepreneurship, one of the participants mentioned how in Rethymno, the now defunct

22 Green (2008) gives the example of how a horse trail and a new lake were planned between two villages in Epirus, Aristi and Doliana, by the village presidents who envisioned this as a great way to attract tourists. After obtaining the EU-funding for this project however, permission was not granted by the Forestry Commission and so the workers who were hired to open the track were employed to clean the village and although the lake was dug-out it was unsuccessful in collecting water and also destroyed what used to be sheep-grazing areas. This was an utter disaster and a prime example of how money is ‘eaten’ by officials.
EOMMEX tried to promote individual entrepreneurs’ handicrafts by operating an exhibition area, but this failed not only because the exhibition was open only until 2pm and only on weekdays, but also because the salesperson spoke no foreign languages in a tourist destination predominantly visited by international tourists (Frosso, interview).

Another characteristic that many of the owner-producer entrepreneurs have is that they are often pluriactive which is in some cases due to some entrepreneurs’ semi-agricultural background which means they engage in agricultural work during the tourist shoulder season. For other entrepreneurs, pluriactivity is seen in the form of teaching their craft to children (Giorgos); university students (Kostis); or people on the Leonardo da Vinci program (Frosso). Pluriactivity is common among peasant entrepreneurs who continue to maintain connections with subsistence farming and the land (Tucker, 2010) and this characterisation relates to some of the tourism entrepreneurs’ background who from farmers became tourism entrepreneurs. But for the other non-peasant entrepreneurs, this indicates how owner-producers’ highly seasonal occupations urge them to search for funding through alternative employment in order to supplement their income. With this multiple employment pattern come the associated gender role implications, as masculinity is associated with full-time work, whereas part-time work is feminised. This is seen in research that relates hegemonic masculinity to ambition, where feminised part-time work is not considered ‘ambitious’ (Benschop et al., 2013).

Most of the ‘owner-producer’ entrepreneurs feel that engaging in entrepreneurship is a positive experience, however there is a distinction between male and female entrepreneurs regarding the reasons why they have this perception. Male participant entrepreneurs focus more on elements of innovation, productivity, networking and recognition, whereas female participant entrepreneurs focus more on feelings of contributing to the family income, being able to combine their work with their family life, being able to contribute to the community and independence from being supported by their husband’s wage. These differences in interpretations of entrepreneurship seem to concur with current debates on the role gender plays within entrepreneurship (Ahl and Marlow, 2012, Calas et al., 2009) such as the idiomorphic time-pressures that female tourism entrepreneurs in particular face, as they continue to be held responsible for social reproductive activities even when they work 12-14 hour days, seven days a week.

In order to add nuance and interest to this study, the stories of involvement of four ‘owner-producer’ participant-entrepreneurs are presented next, focusing on how they interpret entrepreneurship engagement. These participant-entrepreneurs have been chosen to highlight how similar and yet different entrepreneurs can be in terms of: their city-of-birth (Frosso); being an
immigrant (Ioanna), being a single male (Kostis) and being part of an entrepreneurial couple (Giorgos and Mariniki). All the above characteristics shall be discussed in terms of how they contribute to gendered conceptualisations of entrepreneurship. Finally, I will investigate the role that the type of tourism development plays in transforming gendered interpretations of entrepreneurship by comparing collective entrepreneurial structures to individual structures.

6.1.3.1 The non-local owner-producer

**Frosso – female potter, Old Town, Rethymno, Crete**

Figure 6-4: Frosso, a female potter in Rethymno at her studio glazing clay figures before firing in a wood-fired oven in the tradition of Raku pottery. (author’s picture, August 2012)

**Frosso** is a female potter who has her studio-shop-home in the Old Town, close to the old Venetian Fort, “Forteza”. As well as potting and selling her wares, she also rents out four rooms and two small apartments to tourists. Frosso is pluriactive, teaching pottery during the winter in a local art school and accepting Leonardo Da Vinci students for three-month periods in the autumn whom she teaches how to
Frosso, a female potter in Rethymno’s Old Town whose story is presented above, is non-local to the area having moved to Rethymno from Athens to be with her husband who originates from Rethymno. So, in Rethymno, although a Greek, Frosso is still a ‘kseni’ (Greek for ‘foreigner’) and thus faces different types of social pressure to what local women would. Women strive to keep the inside intact from ‘outside’ polluting influences such as those from ‘ksenes’ (Greek for ‘foreigners’), thus treating outsiders differently, for example as troublemakers (Dubisch, 1993). Furthermore, when a local brings a non-local into the community through marriage, this opposition between inside and outside creates disruption as locals struggle to accept this ‘polluting’ influence (Loizos, 1991).

Indeed women in virilocal contexts such as Frosso, often experience a type of dislocation from their supporting kin structures which draws them into muteness as their kin-based identify is shaken (Loizos, 1991). Two other female entrepreneur participants, Giota and Lena who own a shop in the ecotourism destination of Elati in Zagori, also comment on the difficulties they faced when they tried to enter a village community with which they had no virilocal ties, by saying “they kicked us out from...
In a previous village, because we were two girls living together and we laughed too much!” This explanation hides the villagers’ distrust for anything new and different, i.e. 30-year-old women living together, not being married and adhering to a somewhat alternative lifestyle which is illustrated in how Lena says that the villagers “thought us crazy to be interested in looms and weaving”. The hostility experienced by Giota and Lena may be attributed to the fact that indigenous women in rural locations in Greece are more prone to traditional ideas concerning the importance of marriage, nuclear families and honour and shame principles according to which women who “laugh a lot” and have parties with men they are not married to, are considered to ignore these principles and thus are distrusted (Castelberg-Koulma, 2013). This explains why Giota and Lena emphasise how engaging in entrepreneurship is important to them in terms of being accepted within the village as ‘proper’ women even though they do not adhere to versions of femininity connected to mothering. They supersede these versions of femininity by becoming economically active and visible as they now have a shop-front, rather than working from home as they did before. This variation in social perception speaks to the difference in perception between feminised occupations such as part-time and home-based work and owning a shop which is a more masculine endeavour, as seen in studies that illustrate how sex discrimination works to gender productive engagement within the labour market (Hersch, 2006). Hence for Giota and Lena, becoming entrepreneurs means a transformation of their roles from roles that are unacceptable for women, to roles that are more understandable and acceptable to interpreters of what traditional gendered roles should be (i.e. the villagers). Giota and Lena take on the subjectivities of ‘real’ entrepreneurs and thus occupy positions that have already been normalised by the dominant masculinity present in classic narrations of entrepreneurship (Ahl and Marlow, 2012) which relate to economic theorisations of the concept of ‘rational man’ legitimising entrepreneurship involvement (Walby, 2000).

For Frosso, the ‘kseni’ entering the Rethymno entrepreneurial community, adaptation comes in the form of maintaining the boundaries between entrepreneurship and caring to her best ability, by adhering both to intensive mothering (Fox, 2006) and intensive entrepreneurship ideals (Marlow and McAdam, 2013). One of the reasons Frosso needs to adapt relates to the importance of social capital and social networks in female entrepreneurship, which when the entrepreneur relocates from her home-town are reduced, as discussed in recent ethnographic research on women targeted by microfinance development programs in Bolivia (Maclean, 2010). Motivated by the absence of local social capital resources, and by the need to be accepted, Frosso purposefully keeps her business small and combines studio, shop and home in one in order to be able to care for her children. However, as Frosso does not have the characteristics of a ‘conventional’ female entrepreneur who

---

23 Social capital is the trust, norms and networks that people utilise in order to reach their objectives (Laurie, Andolina and Radcliffe, 2005).
engages in entrepreneurship just as part of the family strategy (Iakovidou et al., 2009), she constantly trains herself in new skills such as using new firing techniques and learning how to make jewellery; has created a website; invests in her business; and adds value to her entrepreneurial venture by attracting customers to her rooms-to-let.

Her husband has helped her to enter tourism entrepreneurship by completing renovation and restoration activities and dealing with bureaucratic matters, thus acting as an invisible business-partner or as Frosso says: “it is like we are two people but he is invisible”. This points to a highly gendered separation of entrepreneurial activities, whereby Frosso is basically left to do all the home/studio-based activities and her husband deals with the external jobs. Frosso justifies this separation by drawing on the connection between masculinity and externality, which her husband has internalised in ‘liking’ these particular activities, by saying: “he does whatever has to do with external jobs because he likes them”. Complexity arises however when looking at Frosso’s husband’s contribution to entrepreneurship from a cultural identity angle. By engaging in bureaucratic procedures, an activity which has an inherent link with masculinity (Ionescu, 2012), Frosso’s husband’s adherence to masculine subjectivities may be the motivator for this involvement. However, looking at the cultural context specifically, in Greece, dealing with bureaucracy is based on political clientalism regimes (Michas, 2011), and has as a pre-requisite social capital in the form of ‘knowing people’ as Frosso says. This leads me to suggest that whilst adhering to a masculine conception, he is also assisting Frosso to make up for her lack in social capital in order to enhance her entrepreneurial venture and this contributes to the family’s survival.

Men’s roles within handicraft tourism entrepreneurship have received scant attention within current literature, so now I introduce a male potter who participated in this study and discuss how gender permeates his conceptualisations of entrepreneurship.
6.1.3.2 *The male owner-producer*

Kostis, male potter in Margarites village, Rethymno, Crete

![Image of Kostis making ceramic pots](image)

Figure 6-5: Kostis, a male potter at work making ceramic pots at his studio in Margarites village in Rethymno, Crete. (author’s picture, July 2012)

Kostis is a 50-year-old male potter in the village of Margarites in Rethymno, Crete who is divorced with one daughter who visits during the summer. Having converted part of his parental house in Margarites into a studio and shop, Kostis lives in this complex of studio and house spaces with his mother and sister’s family. His involvement with pottery started at what he considers to be a late age, when he was 39, and he explains his involvement in the creation of pottery artefacts as being motivated by his divorce. He explains his motivation as being based on three tenets: a need to keep occupied and out of trouble (e.g. drinking, gambling); a need for him to have an occupation his daughter would look-up to him for; and a need to occupy himself with something that he can do anytime of the day or night. Kostis did not get funding from any of the rural tourism development funding opportunities that were available because in the first instance the in-between was asking for 50% of the funds for himself and in the second instance Kostis says he does not want to get involved in these programs because he is *“an honest man”*, indicating the corrupt image many EU-funded tourism development programs have in Greece. Despite his late entry into
the profession and the lack of external funding, Kostis has the reputation of being an excellent craftsman (gauged by talking to other potters) and exports his pots to the UK and Germany as well as teaching university students during the autumn and winter months. One of the reasons he is considered by some of the other potters, (e.g. Manolis) as a “genius”, is that Kostis makes all his own tools, the potting wheels and even the wood-fired oven structure. Furthermore Kostis strives for innovation in his products which he achieves by networking with other artists who come and work with him over the summer. On one occasion I met an acclaimed female painter and sculptor who was painting some ceramic bowls and jugs Kostis had made, thus creating value-added and original products. In terms of gender role perception, Kostis is quite traditional in his views, viewing biological sex as a determinant of behaviour such as the concept that men are quite naïve and women are smarter because they use both sides of the brain as well as believing that women are better suited to childcare than men. However he does strive to be perceived as a ‘modern’ man in terms of undertaking his own social reproduction duties and on various occasions comparing himself to some of his other friends I met to prove this to me. He attributes his increased participation in household tasks to having felt sorry for his mother who both worked on the farm and in the house for long hours.

Presenting the story of one of the male participants serves to highlight how some male interpretations of involvement in entrepreneurship differ from the interpretations of female participants in some ways, but are very similar in others, an observation that questions the male normative in entrepreneurship theorising (Calas et al., 2009). Whilst Hamilton (2013) talks about the role media and academia have in projecting the male norm within entrepreneurship by focusing on studies of male entrepreneurs, she also suggests that cultural aspects of the community such as honour and shame mechanisms, perpetuate stereotyped notions of masculinity as being associated with autonomy, innovation, risk-taking and profit-maximising.

Taking the snapshot story of Kostis, a male potter from Margarites village as an example of the male handicraft entrepreneurs encountered in this study, assists in conceptualising how men negotiate the entrepreneurial landscape by drawing on emerging masculinities that are characterised by hybridity in terms of old and new gender roles. Masculinity and the rural environment in which Kostis lives, are connected by both being equated with physical strength and aggressiveness, which partly explains the enduring nature of traditional gender roles in rural settings such as in Margarites village (Little and Jones, 2000). Whilst for the majority of male entrepreneurs, engagement in entrepreneurship is a ‘natural’ thing to do which allows them to fulfil gendered breadwinner role
aspirations, recognition of masculinity’s invisibility within the universal entrepreneurial model is warranted in order to deconstruct the ways in which male interpretations of entrepreneurship are also affected by gender (Bruni et al., 2005). By looking at how male entrepreneurs perform gender through their involvement in entrepreneurship, I can investigate the border between dualities such as feminine/masculine to provide an account of how gender permeates performances of even the ‘privileged’ male entrepreneurs.

The way in which Kostis presents himself as an entrepreneur is in terms of being respected by his daughter and social circle which constitutes one of the main reasons he is involved in pottery production. As men within Greek society are perceived as the ‘head of the family’, commanding respect is an important aspect of masculinity (Dubisch, 1986a) that Kostis achieves through his involvement with handicraft entrepreneurship. However, the need to be perceived as an honest man through his involvement with entrepreneurship reveals the workings of cultural mechanisms operating to construct masculinity, such as the ‘honour and shame’ social control model operating in Greek society which dictates a link between masculinity and guarding a woman’s honour, but also links into being able to financially provide for one’s family (Lazaridis, 2009). Together with hierarchal respect, characteristics such as independence and innovation are also displayed by Kostis who strives to be perceived as an autonomous person receiving little help from either his mother, in terms of social reproductive care; or tourism development programs, in terms of funding. Further autonomy and also innovation are displayed in the way Kostis makes his own tools, pottery wheels and oven and has built his studio and a room housing pottery wheels where his winter students learn pottery techniques. Looking at literature on how classic entrepreneurial literature describes autonomy and innovation as distinctive features of entrepreneurship (Gupta et al., 2009), there is an association of these characteristics with hegemonic masculinity (Murgia and Poggio, 2009).

Similarly, other male entrepreneur-participants express their involvement in entrepreneurship as being in terms of innovation such as Manolis, a male potter in Margarites who stresses how he is able to produce innovative designs by using techniques learnt whilst studying pottery in Thessaloniki. Studying makes Manolis feel he is at an advantage compared with many of the other potters in the village who have had little or no institutional training. Whilst innovation is important for Manolis, for another male potter, Giorgos, recognition is a more prominent feature of his entrepreneurial experience. Accordingly, recognition in the form of being part of a Panhellenic organisation for potters and travelling abroad to meet artists as well as hosting artists are what is important for Giorgos. Recognition in particular is highly gendered in its interpretation. For example Giorgos explains ‘recognition’ in terms of being recognised for his high craftsmanship and good networking, whereas for many of the female entrepreneurs, ‘recognition’ translates into being able to combine
family and work responsibilities successfully as also seen in research highlighting the importance of social embeddedness for female entrepreneurs in particular (De Bruin et al., 2007).

However the variety of ways in which male participants express their involvement in entrepreneurship, indicates a plurality of voices within masculinity that accounts for the hybrid images of masculine involvement within entrepreneurship that emerge. An example of this happening is Giorgos’ admittance of not being completely autonomous as he also has to take on social reproductive tasks, which makes him feel like he is ‘in the middle’ as it is “difficult to balance the time you give to your family and work” . This ambivalence between roles challenges economic theorising around competitive advantage according to which each family member performs the tasks they are trained to do through socialisation, as Giorgos feels the responsibility to contribute to familial social reproductions tasks, thus facing similar dilemmas to most female entrepreneurs (Pujol, 2003).
6.1.3.3 *The migrant owner-producer*

Ioanna who makes and sells textile handicrafts in Rethymno, Crete

![Ioanna, a migrant handicraft entrepreneur embroidering at her shop in Rethymno. (author’s picture, August 2012)](image)

Ioanna is an immigrant from Albania who is trained as a primary school teacher but is unable to teach in Greece and so together with a friend decided to open a shop with fabrics and crocheted items in Rethymno’s ‘Old Town’ area, in 2002. After the success of her first shop, she opened a second shop in 2009 which her husband is in charge of. She has two teenage children, one of whom started university in Germany shortly after I got to know her, a process which we discussed at length. As well as being a good sales-person, Ioanna also crochets, a skill she learnt from her mother and grandmother. One of her best-selling products are small lacy curtains with ‘azure’ sewing that she made initially to meet demand from Scandinavian tourists as they have small windows, and now considers the curtains as one of her innovations, unique to the Rethymno souvenir market. Her parents come over each summer to help her out with the house and take care of the children which provides Ioanna with some relief from the household duties, especially because since the financial crisis she is no longer able to employ a ‘girl’ to help on a part-time basis (four hours a day). Often working 12-14 hour days, six days a week (Sundays she takes the afternoons off), Ioanna particularly looks
forward to the winter season when everything returns “to normal”, as she says, in her household and she will be able to invite people for dinner, cook and help her daughter with her homework.

Ioanna is the only migrant tourism handicraft entrepreneur who participated in this study and indeed she is a rare kind of entrepreneur in Greece as indicated by a recent study that found only 4% of so called ‘ethnic’ entrepreneurs are female (Piperopoulos, 2010). The use of the term ‘ethnic’ entrepreneurs is used by various authors investigating immigrant entrepreneurship such as Lazaridis (2003) and Piperopoulos (2010) to describe immigrant entrepreneurship, however as the term ‘ethnic’ is problematic in terms of its connection to Othering (Urry and Larsen, 2011) and exoticising people of different nationality to their host country, ‘immigrant’ entrepreneurship shall be preferred as a term in the current study.

Immigrant entrepreneurs’ interpretations of entrepreneurship are particularly interesting when looking at how gender permeates performances of the economic because as ‘outsiders’, these women reject many tenets of economic theorising, thus challenging familiar conventions and creating new interpretations of economic theorising related to entrepreneurship (Godwyn and Stoddard, 2011). The Greek population consists of about 10% of immigrants and of these, 55% are Albanian, thus making Albanians the dominant group of immigrants in Greece (Piperopoulos, 2010). Ioanna, the immigrant entrepreneur participant is Albanian and her motivation for entering entrepreneurship is because of limited alternative work opportunities. Even though she is trained as a primary school teacher, the cumbersome and sometimes inflexible system regulating recognition of her qualifications by the Greek authorities presents a barrier to her engagement with teaching. As seen in her story, Ioanna’s entrance into entrepreneurship is facilitated by a friend whom she opens a shop with, thus showing that Ioanna utilised her social network in order to become an entrepreneur which is a trend particularly visible in immigrant entrepreneurship according to Lyberaki (2011). As Ioanna already has been trained in crocheting and embroidering from her mother, she has a comparative advantage to enter this handicraft entrepreneurship. Indeed, Ioanna points out that one of her motivations to enter tourism handicraft entrepreneurship is she can crochet as she says “I have an advantage because I crochet as well”. Furthermore, Ioanna’s entry in entrepreneurship can be explained by the high-rate of employment in Rethymno’s tourism sector which opens up opportunities for employment of immigrants as well, hence indicating tourism’s role in promoting immigrant entrepreneurship (Liargovas and Skandalis, 2012). Indeed, the niche created by tourism contributes to her involvement with entrepreneurship as Ioanna’s entry into entrepreneurship was made using her own funds which may be a result of the fact that few EU or
state programs for entrepreneurship target immigrants by, for example, offering favourable conditions for immigrants’ involvement in entrepreneurship (Hatziprokopiou, 2008).

One of immigrants’ important motives to enter entrepreneurship is also the enhancement of social status within the local community, as instead of being bundled into the group of immigrants who complete feminised caring activities such as elderly-care and cleaning, by entering entrepreneurship immigrants can have a better social standing (Liargovas and Skandalis, 2012). Furthermore, Ioanna engages in a type of entrepreneurship that native entrepreneurs also engage in and so rather than utilising ethnic market enclaves that Lazaridis’ (2003) participants utilise, such as African women providing hairdressing for other Africans, Ioanna is able to more successfully become integrated into society (Hatziprokopiou and Frangopoulos, 2013). In terms of integration into Greek society, Ioanna has made an almost seamless transition, illustrated partly by the fact that on meeting her, her nationality was not evident in her accent and she has adapted her vocabulary to match locals’ tendency to often refer to God by saying “Doxa to Theo” (‘Praise God’ in Greek). This type of expression is common in ‘traditional’ Greek women’s speech and illustrates the importance of religion in Greek life, as well as the link between femininity and religiosity which Dubisch (1986a) refers to.

However, whilst entrepreneurship has been the vehicle through which Ioanna has been assimilated into Greek society, at the same time she seems less bound by local etiquette surrounding gendered interpretations of entrepreneurship. This is illustrated in a couple of instances, one being that she is innovative as she produces miniature lace curtains for her Scandinavian tourists, which are unique in Rethymno despite the large number of women who have shops and crochet, indicating how Ioanna innovatively adapts to market needs. Another instance of entrepreneurial adherence is when Ioanna takes the risk to open another shop in the same town, which her husband (who became underemployed at the beginnings of the economic crisis) now runs. This move shows not only how Ioanna adheres to more masculine interpretations of entrepreneurship such as risk-taking, which Yordanova (2011) also found to be gendered in her study on Bulgarian entrepreneurs, but also in terms of effectively ‘recruiting’ her husband into entrepreneurship. Her husband’s successful entry into the largely female-dominated field of textile crafts (Le Mare, 2012), demonstrates a departure from social norms that require the man to be main breadwinner (rather than effectively working for his wife) and be engaged in something ‘suitably’ masculine (England, 2010). Although Ioanna’s husband can justify his involvement in this type of entrepreneurship by taking the role of ‘middleman’ which is a masculine occupation as seen in the Oaxaca weavers that Cohen (2001) studied, he is aware of his presence in a feminised occupation. This is illustrated by his self-exclusion from this occupation and not participating in the current study, because as he feels he cannot impart
relevant information, as he characteristically said when asked to participate “I don’t know about these kind of things, ask Ioanna”.

Apart from engaging in entrepreneurship and using novel ways to expand her business, Ioanna also shows how she is free from gendered social constraints which act to maintain boundaries between the division of household and productive work by sharing most of the tasks with her husband and children, because as she says “a woman can’t do everything!”

This perception differs to many of the Greek female entrepreneur participants who indeed try to be perfect housewives, refusing to delegate household tasks to their husbands or sons, which comes about because of internalised perceptions connecting femininity to caring which makes them believe in men’s incapability to perform these tasks. This will be discussed at more length in Chapter Seven.

Another difference in Ioanna’s entrepreneurial experience that can be perhaps attributed to her immigrant status is how she is very lenient in getting her thirteen-year old daughter to help her in the shop as she perceives her daughter to be too innocent to survive in a sales environment. This is very different to other handicraft entrepreneurs, such as Katerina who leaves her similar-aged daughter to look after the shop while she eats at midday. However, Ioanna justifies her different attitude to getting her child involved in the productive economy as being because her neighbour’s daughter who worked in the shop next door since she was six years old, now wants to get as far away from the area as possible. Aversion to this happening to her daughter perhaps reveals a wish for Ioanna’s daughter to take on the family business which is common in Greek society (Koutsou et al., 2009) but also among immigrant entrepreneurs (Hatziprokopiou and Frangopoulos, 2013). However, this action may also speak to feelings of distrust that Ioanna experiences by being an immigrant and thus an outsider in the Rethymno community, which affects her entrepreneurial experience by not being able to delegate productive tasks to her daughter and thus working exhausting hours to make up for her protective behaviour. This is perhaps an indication of Ioanna adhering to “intensive mothering” (Fox, 2006, p. 237) ideals of femininity that require a mother to supply constant nurturing, elevating the child’s needs over the mother’s.
6.1.3.4 The owner-producer couple

Mariniki and Giorgos, pottery-makers and sellers in Margarites village, Rethymno, Crete

Mariniki and Giorgos are a couple in their 30s with three young daughters (aged from four to ten years old), who own a shop that sells pottery in Margarites village and their clientele are predominantly tourists. Both national and international tourists visit them during the summer whereas in winter their shop is closed, as Margarites village like many Greek tourism destinations exhibits high seasonality. During the winter, they tend to their olive trees and other crops, rest and see friends. In addition, Mariniki helps her daughters ‘study’ as is common for Greek mothers to do, whereas Giorgos teaches traditional potting techniques to school children, university students and other potters; produces pottery items for sale during the summer; and networks with other potters. Giorgos appears as the primary entrepreneur in this business which he has had for 17 years now, opening it after studying pottery in Athens, whereas Mariniki who is a historic restoration expert got involved in the business out of necessity initially because as she says “there are not many people in the village so there was no one to help” and then out of a different type of necessity as the economic crisis removed their ability to hire someone to help with pottery production and household tasks. Mariniki’s
Engagement with entrepreneurship has been majorly formed by the gendered requirement for her to have primary responsibility for childcare, which led her to transform her self-expectations from working which she expresses by saying how she “settled to finishing items and selling because of the children”. She used to make more creative items such as ancient clay toys, taking inspiration from the museum where she used to work, but now she is too tired to create these items anymore. Both Mariniki’s and Giorgos’ parents help maintain the business and the family during the summer, by for example keeping the shop open when Mariniki and family need to go out, babysitting, cleaning the shop and house and cooking. Giorgos and Mariniki have quite a traditional division of household tasks with Mariniki taking the largest share which she largely accepts as she says “classically, most household jobs fall to the housewife”, but Giorgos does help “in need”. To this extent, Mariniki feels that the arrangement they have which means their studio, shop and house are all located in the same building is a big help in her being able to combine family and work life. Giorgos describes his role as primary entrepreneur as including tasks such as talking to suppliers, arranging production patterns and promoting the business via, for example, an international pottery colloquium called ‘Magarika’ that he helped organise in 2007. He is an active member of the community, partaking in and helping organise a large annual satirical theatrical performance called ‘Boudaleia’ and recently initiating the creation of a Christmas bazaar where potters from all over Crete exhibit and sell their wares to the public. In terms of tourism development programs, Giorgos says he was not able to get any subsidies to help in the creation of his business.

In this section I take the example of Mariniki and Giorgos, an owner-producer couple who make and sell pottery in Margarites, Rethymno, to illustrate the gender dynamics present within family businesses and how these affect interpretations of entrepreneurship for both Giorgos and Mariniki. Family businesses are a common characteristic of Greek tourism (Tsartas, 2003), and women’s entry into the market was initially facilitated by their engagement in this kind of business, as their engagement was considered part of the family strategy, rather than a way of women gaining greater autonomy (Kyriazis, 1998). However, when women remain within the family and complete entrepreneurial tasks which are a continuation of their domestic roles, their entrepreneurial activity is often devalued as they continue to engage in what is perceived as a feminised activity (Grossman, 2012). The importance of the family within Greek society and how the ‘family’ permeates performances of the economic has been noted by various authors some of whom refer to this phenomenon as being a “familistic” (Papadopoulos and Roumpakis, 2009, p. 5) model of entrepreneurship which is characterised by high dependence on family members’ often feminised
and unpaid work in order for the family business to operate profitably. Hence, Greek women’s entry into entrepreneurship within tourism is often perceived as being part of the familial strategy to increase family income, rather than a woman’s agentic entry into entrepreneurship, thus leaving gender roles and relations relatively unchallenged (Kyriazis, 1998). However, ‘familistic’ motives and justifications for women engaging in entrepreneurship are based on having a network of extended kin and family, which in Greece is changing. As pointed out by Kenna (2011), the Greek family model is starting to look more like a “beanpole” (p. 534) as there are more kinship relationships across generations than within them, thus making dependence on intra-generational kinships for the operation of the familialistic model, less possible. Because of this, progressively, tourism entrepreneurs with children have fewer people to turn to for help with either the family business or the housework. from the kin that they can turn to for help, that is their parents, are often torn between caring for their elderly parents and their grandchildren, so the need for negotiation of who will do the work previously allocated to kin, emerges. Changes in family structure, which encourage social reproductive gender role negotiations to occur by increasing the equality in how household tasks are distributed, urge us to re-consider the assumption that female entrepreneurs in Greece are motivated to enter entrepreneurship purely as an extension of their gendered domestic role. This is because in the light of these changes, we cannot simply assume that women adhere to stereotyped versions of femininity that prioritise primart responsibility for social reproduction.

Within family businesses, women’s involvement is often made invisible as women are constituted as helpers, even though they are instrumental to the venture’s success. This is illustrated by Ahl and Marlow (2012) who draw on the example of how in the creation of a new toy-shop entrepreneurial venture, although it was the wives that invested both financially and in terms of labour in their husbands’ new toy-shop venture, the wives were assumed to be incapable of grasping business ideas as a ‘real’ entrepreneur would and thus are not consulted when more capital needed to be injected into the business. In this example, by being perceived as mere helpers, the wives are given a secondary role within the entrepreneurial venture, despite the wives’ contribution in terms of labour and finances. This shows how gender roles that constitute women as ‘helpers’ permeate into entrepreneurship. Similarly, Giorgos constitutes Mariniki as his helper saying: “Mariniki assists with production”, even though the majority of times I visited, Mariniki was either making pottery items or was fully active as a sales-woman.

Whilst women who work within family businesses are subjected to more traditional gender roles than women who work outside the family business (Lerner and Malach-Pines, 2011), the physical link between home and work place is significant in two contradictory ways. It makes Mariniki’s domestic work more visible and simultaneously makes Giorgos’ work more visible, so the
couple cannot in fact ‘pretend’ that one is doing more work than the other. The shop’s physical proximity to the house may act to reproduce gender norms but it also leads to performances that question the male norm of entrepreneurship as although Mariniki’s involvement in handicraft entrepreneurship is mainly in terms of finishing pottery items Giorgos has made by polishing or painting them, she indicates how she feels to be an equal partner in the business by saying that it is “time for men to realise that whatever ‘I do, my wife does’”. This interpretation of entrepreneurship is fuelled by the inextricable link between “physical contiguity” and “temporal continuity” (Bruni et al., 2005, p. 192) which acts to create a harmonisation of work and family roles that interact to create Mariniki’s interpretation of her entrepreneurial role as being equal to her husband’s.

With regards to her involvement in entrepreneurship, Mariniki demonstrates an informed opinion about the tourism market. To this extent she comments at length on the type of tourists who visit and on tourism-related policies affecting Greek tourism in general, an example of which is her exasperation regarding the nearby archaeological site of Knossos closing at 5pm in the summer. This shows how Mariniki crafts her entrepreneurial role by engaging in conversation regarding the economic and political realms, similar to how Turkish female tourism entrepreneurs in Goreme who although spatially restricted from entering the realm of politics, by entering into conversation about politics are “metaphorically stepping outside” (Tucker, 2007, p. 100) these spaces and asserting their entrepreneurial role. These observations point to how women do contribute to family businesses, despite being often rendered invisible or problematic. (2011)One of the main reasons for Mariniki entering tourism entrepreneurship is her identity as altruistic mother as she leaves her own job as historic restoration expert in order to join her husband and become primary carer for their children. This indicates how adherence to motherhood ideals can enable engagement in entrepreneurship, as seen in Leung’s (2011) analysis of Japanese entrepreneurs who have capitalised on the gendered social reproductive role working women still have by providing ‘emergency’ child-care services. However at the same time, the absence of any state help for entrepreneurial couples such as Mariniki and Giorgos in terms of state childcare, does indicate how entrepreneurs are “responsibilised” (Colvin et al., 2010, p. 1183) for social reproductive activities, which limits negotiations of gendered responsibility for social reproduction and hence also transforms the entrepreneurial role women can play within a family business.

When looking at Mariniki’s involvement in entrepreneurship from a feminist economics perspective, her participation in terms of ‘opportunity cost’ (England, 2010) is complex as she could potentially add value to the business by using her historic restoration background to create innovative and unique pottery, however instead she engages in the more mundane procedures of “finishing off Giorgos’ items”. However, considering the lack of other alternatives for productive
assistance and her input in terms of childcare she has accepted that the combination of these two activities are of greater value than her devoting her time to creating new designs. Mariniki indeed has been de-motivated to create new designs as she says she “is tired”, indicating how gender permeates performances of the economic as her entrepreneurial role in terms of innovation is restricted by her gendered childcare role which means she has limited time to engage in entrepreneurship. The issue of “time poverty” (Bardasi and Wodon, 2010, p. 47) which is more common when both parents work, is what Mariniki seems to be experiencing in terms of her involvement in entrepreneurship and is relevant here as it is affecting her involvement in entrepreneurship as it has an effect on her contribution in terms of ‘opportunity cost’. The alteration in ‘opportunity cost’ occurs because Mariniki gets trained in lower value work (finishing off items rather than creating them) and so the financial worth of her hours remain low, thus perpetuating gendered involvement in entrepreneurship. This phenomenon is especially evident in family businesses where in the context of the new world economy’s heavy reliance on disinvestment in the process of social reproduction, familial survival strategies become dependent on women’s social reproductive input (Federici, 2012) and are easier to be manipulated when keeping both production and social reproduction distribution ‘in the family’ as productive task distribution remains gendered along the lines of social reproductive task gendering.

6.1.4 Collective versus individual entrepreneurship

Having painted the picture of what collective and individual structures of entrepreneurship look like within the context of this study, I proceed to make a comparison between these two types of tourism development in terms of entrepreneurial experiences. Hence, in this section I shall provide an account of how gender permeates performances of the economic, focusing on how gender acts within tourism development policies that encourage forms of collective entrepreneurship (e.g. cooperatives) versus individual entrepreneurial structures.

Literature about collective entrepreneurship is fairly marginal and can be attributed to the interpretation of entrepreneurship often being associated with individuals that have more than 50% business ownership (Malo et al., 2012) and also because Western concepts of neoliberal independence do not adequately recognise collective forms of entrepreneurship (Comeche and Loras, 2010) as they depart from the neoclassical economic view of a capitalist economy that relies on individualism (Bruni et al., 2005). Specifically within tourism, a reason why collective entrepreneurship as a topic is not adequately researched is because the majority of collective tourism entrepreneurs are female, thus more research is focused on feminised versions of collective entrepreneurship such as women’s agrotourism cooperatives (Koutsou et al., 2003) and women’s
This gap in literature, as well as the often gendered association tourism cooperatives in Greece have to femininity, makes it interesting to explore the role gender plays in constructions of entrepreneurship for women engaged in collective and individual entrepreneurship.

The main reason for wanting to compare these two types of entrepreneurial structures is related to the differences in terms of time flexibility that female participant entrepreneurs say they experience. Time flexibility is significant as entrepreneurship is often promoted as a good way for women to achieve a work-family balance, a goal not only gendered but of questionable achievability. This is seen in a study on Irish female entrepreneurs by McGown et al. (2011) who have varying experiences but all agree that their work hours increased despite them being more in control of how they manage their hours. This observation regarding time-flexibility highlights how within productive work, conceptualisations of time have changed since industrial capitalism, when flexible work arrangements (e.g. working from home) were rare, to today’s corporate capitalism where time is starting to have a more abstract value as time spent working is intricately woven in to life processes for an increasing number of people, thus making it harder to distinguish between working and non-working time (Adkins, 2009). In terms of gender, conceptualisation of time has a particular relationship to femininity as capitalism relies on gendered social reproductive tasks being carried out by women, and limited economic value being given to the time spent completing the tasks for example by introducing mandatory parental leave provisions, as illustrated by feminist efforts to give wages to housewives in order to make this time visible (Federici, 2012). Furthermore, the concept of “time-poverty” (p. 47) is related to the gender-specific demands of domestic work, thus making time significant in feminine interpretations of entrepreneurship as seen in research in Guinea which found women to be more likely to experience time-poverty than men (Bardasi and Wodon, 2010).

In the current context of participants who engage in collective entrepreneurship, that is the female entrepreneurs in the handicraft school and the women’s cooperative, time flexibility is an advantage noted by these participants but is not mentioned as one of the major advantages to involvement in collective entrepreneurship. This presents a departure from tourism development literature that promotes the view that cooperative involvement is especially good for women, because of the time-flexibility they offer (Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou, 2003). Whilst flexible employment arrangements are often criticised for perpetuating entrenched gender roles regarding women’s roles as secondary breadwinners and primary carers, by often being low-paid and precarious (Plantenga and Remery, 2013), they are presented as an opportunity for women to secure an income without challenging current gender norms. In the case of the women’s cooperative and the handicraft school, wages are low and involvement is precarious because of the dependence on
seasonal tourism and oft-changing government policies regarding the continuation of state funding for these cooperative structures, but time-flexibility refers more to the ability of women to swap shifts amongst themselves than at the whim of their employer. As one of the women from the women’s cooperative, Dina, says, they are able to combine work and family easier as they have known each other for so long that they are able to swap shifts, or work intensively as needed: “It’s been a number of years, we can organise our jobs, both housework and work. Of course sometimes we may all need to come at 5am to make pies”. This ability for women to swap shifts amongst themselves is the crucial difference between entrepreneurs belonging to collective structures and individual structures, due to the later group’s inability to swap shifts. Hence individual entrepreneurs’ perception of entrepreneurship is heavily influenced by the gendered restriction in time as for example Ioanna illustrates by saying “that is the problem, we work full-on, it’s not like you have your midday free” whereas other individual entrepreneurs have to outsource some of their tasks in order have more time, as Liana says: “I used to do my own books, but now I give my accounting out so that that does not weigh down on me as well”.

The cooperative participants’ lack in emphasis of the advantage of time flexibility to their entrepreneurial experience may be explained both by the fact that the women would not have entered this occupation if they did not have the option of balancing work and family obligations and also because of the limited alternative options available to them to generate income (Gidarakou et al., 2008). However, as noted in Moller’s (2011) work on female entrepreneurs in Latvia who are lured to enter tourism entrepreneurship on the premise that by working from home they will be able to manage work and family, time-flexibility is a bit of a myth as especially at high-season, female entrepreneurs have to work very long hours with little flexibility to leave their work-place. Similarly, the cooperative women mention how during high season they are unable to maintain a work-home balance and in absence of someone else to take on their familial responsibilities, these activities are simply not done, as Dina says: “when there is a lot of work, we say that it doesn’t matter if the house stays behind as I have work. Or we do the housework at night”. This juxtaposition of tourism development objectives versus women’s actual experience, points to the emergence of new entrepreneurial interpretations albeit on a seasonal basis as women prioritise entrepreneurship over domestic tasks, thus adhering to more masculine interpretations of entrepreneurship by acting as ‘rational men’ in order to maximise profit during the high tourist season (Barker, 2005). Complexity in this gendered interpretation of entrepreneurship arises however when the women justify their increased involvement in entrepreneurship in the high season as being influenced by external factors that appeal to their caring nature. An instance of this happening is when DarkK justifies her prioritisation of entrepreneurial activities as being because “the tourists need to eat!”. So a complex and contradictory interpretation of entrepreneurship arises as women prioritise entrepreneurship
over gendered responsibilities for housework but at the same time justify this prioritisation by drawing on feminine subjectivities of caring, thus illustrating the fluid nature which both gender roles and entrepreneurial roles assume.

Another difference in the interpretations of entrepreneurship between collective and individual entrepreneurship structures refers to how collective structures such as cooperatives offer less risk in investment than the personal investment individual entrepreneurs make. Whilst this decreased risk in investment encourages women to enter cooperative structures, backed by the perception of femininity being associated with risk-adversity (Ahl and Marlow, 2012) and women being less business-oriented by exhibiting less “economic rationality” (Beneria, 2003, p. 124), women who enter these groups continue to be viewed as ‘helpers’ rather than ‘real’ entrepreneurs (Ahl, 2006). This view is supported by research into women’s cooperatives in Greece that concludes that female entrepreneurs working within the cooperatives are engaging in an “amateur” (p. 35) type of employment (Kazakopoulos and Gidarakou, 2003). The perception that women are construed as ‘helpers’ within collective structures, is an indication of how gendered roles transcend the boundaries of the household into the productive as women are often construed as ‘invisible helpers’ within economics literature (Pujol, 2003). The cooperative women seem to adhere to this interpretation of their role of being an assistant as they say how they primarily work to help their families, as Dina says “the cooperatives helped, because we added an income to the family” and BlondeK says “we are working to collect money for our children to study”, which the individual entrepreneurs do to a lesser extent. Furthermore, the individual entrepreneurs who do refer to contributing to the family income, relate this activity to concepts of time available to do domestic work expressing how they are able to put off doing domestic tasks, as for example Frosso says: “I am more respected in the sense that I bring money to the family...since I work so many hours, they turn a blind eye to whatever has to do with the house”. This subtle difference in interpretation of entrepreneurship highlights the significance of time within gendered discourses surrounding femininity. As cooperative women are able to re-arrange their productive tasks amongst them, the issue of managing their time is less prominent than for individual entrepreneurs who do not have this option and thus revert to a more distinct division between home and work and thus their role within entrepreneurship is less that of a helper as they become disassociated from the permeation of gender roles linking femininity and caring, into entrepreneurial interpretations. The subtle difference between having more time and being able to manipulate the time you have available is significant to entrepreneurship interpretations and is noted in a recent study that focuses on female entrepreneurs’ motivations to enter entrepreneurship as being because women have been pushed out of employment structures that do not take into account gendered time constraints (McGowan et al., 2011).
Viewing entrepreneurship as more than just an economic function but as an agent of social change (Calas et al., 2009) I now focus on the social aspect of entrepreneurship by investigating its significance for participants. I discuss how entrepreneurs as social actors navigate through the gendered landscape to create new hybrid interpretations of entrepreneurship by exploring how concepts of invisibility, community, freedom from control and guilt mould the entrepreneurial experience.

6.2 Entrepreneurial hybrid realities

The connection of masculinity with entrepreneurship is criticized within feminist literature as being one of the reasons why entrepreneurship theories do not fully capture and explain women’s experiences of entrepreneurship. By measuring female entrepreneurs according to masculine values, female entrepreneurs are constituted as ‘underperforming’, without however looking at the underlying gendered reasons contributing to this appearance (Marlow and McAdam, 2013). As gender is a marker which gives visibility to humans by constructing them as credible members of society, when they adhere to gender roles that have been assigned to them, it is useful in theorising the relationship between entrepreneurship and gender roles (Butler, 2004). Concentrating more specifically on the concept of ‘visibility’, is particularly significant as female entrepreneurs often strive to achieve invisibility within entrepreneurship by adhering to masculine entrepreneurship norms, that is, by adopting and reproducing supposedly gender-neutral entrepreneurial behaviours and attitudes (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). The concept of invisibility is a common one to women whose contributions to the social reproduction of society have long been unrecognised and thus rendered invisible, despite them being vital to the reproduction of the labour force (Federici, 2012). The invisibility of women’s contributions to the economy is reinforced by neoclassical economic claims that social reproductive tasks are something that women do ‘naturally’, thus giving women what new home economics calls a “comparative advantage” (p. 29) in the performance of these duties (Pujol, 2003). The connection between the invisibility women experience when completing social reproductive tasks and when working, is significant as this is internalised as a way of being and subsequently transcends the domestic boundary, contaminating women’s entrepreneurial interpretations. Also, many of the female entrepreneurs in this study show signs of how their ‘natural’ role as domestic carers affects their interpretations of entrepreneurship by for example projecting how significant it is for them to help their family by engaging in entrepreneurship, however at the same time they strive to adhere to more masculine concepts of entrepreneurship by stating the importance of being independent and making a profit.
6.2.1 Visible invisibles: Feminine hybrid entrepreneurial interpretations

Relating the concept of visibility to tourism development programs, it is important for gender to be visible within development policies that aim to increase women’s employment, as development is not a neutral process. This is observed by Ferguson (2011a) amongst women on the Copan Valley project in Honduras who received training that focused on masculine theorisations of entrepreneurial requirements such as accounting training rather than taking into account wider issues that were of concern to the women. Furthermore, invisibility of gender in development programs does not question gendered structures, limiting social change and thus leaving women who are ‘empowered’ by working to be ‘empowered’ only in that domain and not in a wider social context (Ferguson, 2011a).

Gender and development literature’s focus on the importance of human well-being rather than economic success leads to a conceptualisation of economic processes as all being part of the process of “social provisioning” (Power, 2004, p. 6). The concept of ‘social provisioning’ is useful in this study of entrepreneurship as it allows an understanding of motivations that do not draw on narrow notions of self-interest but rather is inclusive of less selfish motivations such as community benefit within the economic domain. Gender and development literature also draws attention to how having agency within the entrepreneurial process enhances well-being and how agency is achieved by increased visibility (Beneria, 2003). For example in the case of women who work in societies where cultural norms discourage women’s participation in the labour force, working increases their well-being by increasing their visibility as human-beings, as seen in Pakistani female entrepreneurs (Rehman and Roomi, 2012). This focus on the relationship between agency and visibility is instigated by female participant-entrepreneurs’ expressions of how they feel valorised through engaging in entrepreneurship, or as Dina from the women’s cooperative expresses this feeling “the other person sees you with a different eye if you work”. As for women, engaging in entrepreneurship is seen as something relatively novel versus the masculine norm of entrepreneurship (Waylen, 2000), female participant-entrepreneurs explain the benefits of their engagement in entrepreneurship as being related to their increased visibility within society. Although gender roles are fluid, it is interesting to note at this point the departure from the concept of visibility by male entrepreneurs none of whom mentioned the importance of being more visible as a gain from engaging in entrepreneurship which further illustrates the embedded masculine nature of economic engagement within society. In relation to the female entrepreneurs’ interpretations of entrepreneurship, their expressions show how agency is intimately connected with visibility as by working, they experience feelings of superiority illustrated by Anthoula who says about entrepreneurship: “I feel that I am doing something, that I am higher up...I feel more independent”.
Whilst Anthoula’s feeling of agency speaks to how entrepreneurship provides economic empowerment to its participants, it also illustrates how increased visibility gained by working also gives her social powers as she feels “higher up”. So this shows an instance of how visibility within an activity defined by masculine norms, provides the opportunity for women to be also more visible within society. This is a significant aspect of entrepreneurship for female entrepreneurs, as seen in Mannon’s (2006) study where Nicaraguan female workers stress the importance of the visibility given by working by expressing how they would “continue to work even if they no longer got paid for it” (p. 317). Similarly, Katerina states how engaging in entrepreneurship is “not only for the money”, highlighting how for her, entrepreneurship constitutes a social activity rather than just an income-generating activity as Tucker (2010) and Morrison (2006) also point out. The agency that women gain by engaging in entrepreneurship increases their visibility but differs depending on context. In the Greek context, women are free to move within public and private spheres, and hence entrepreneurship is a vehicle to get the agency to gain more social standing. However, in the case of Turkish female entrepreneurs whose movements between public and private spaces are restricted the issue of agency encouraged by women’s involvement in entrepreneurship is a more to do with visibility, as female entrepreneurs’ movement into the public sphere alone, constitutes an agentic action (Tucker and Boonabaana, 2011).

6.2.2 Leverage into entrepreneurship by utilising gendered ‘naturalness’

Looking more closely at the way female participants express their motivations for entering entrepreneurship, many justify their engagement by expressing how they are good at their craft. What is significant is that it is the female entrepreneurs who create items such as food and fabric items, draw on this justification the most, such as Anna from the handicraft school who entered entrepreneurship because according to her “weaving is easy to learn”. Similarly, the women at the cooperative also present their cooking skills to be their primary motivation and competitive advantage in engaging in this particular type of entrepreneurship, illustrated by how they have now adapted their own recipes rather than the ones suggested by training courses, to make their products. This is an example of how female entrepreneurs utilise gender roles that associate femininity to social reproduction in order to forge a place for themselves within entrepreneurship and thus use agency derived from feminine gender roles to enter the masculine domain of entrepreneurship. A similar type of boundary transgression is seen in the way foreign females in Göreme carve out their place in the tourism working environment by being considered ‘naturally’ better at dealing with tourists due to their role as tourists as well (Tucker, 2007). In the case of the handicraft entrepreneur participants, being ‘naturally’ better at feminine social reproductive tasks is also the reason why tourism development projects aim at incorporating women into the labour force
by encouraging them to engage in what they perceive as ‘naturally’ feminine tasks such as cooking and weaving that will not challenge their feminine roles even though it can be argued that this contributes to the feminisation of labour (Möller, 2011).

However, taking a different angle, gendered skills relating to social reproductive activities can provide women with the agency to engage in entrepreneurship as their conviction that they are better than men at these tasks is internally embedded not only in the women who make the handicrafts but also in their clients’ viewpoints. Another example of how female entrepreneurs interpret their gendered skills as motivation to engage in entrepreneurship is seen in how Ioanna says that she started her business because she can crochet and also because she knows how to care for the products, so she can be a more convincing sales-woman, as she says:

“It is easier to be able to sell them... when you know how they are made, you know what they are, if it is handmade or machine-made, I show the clients and then they trust me... I also tell them how to wash them which is important as well”.

This trust is a product of gendered structures operating to create the illusion of gender roles being connected to innately better skills in various activities. The relation of trust to gendered roles is also seen in the way grandmothers are often trusted with the care of grandchildren over the male partners as they are considered more specialised at this task (Brickell, 2011). So in terms of gaining a customer’s trust, engaging in entrepreneurship in a stereotypical gendered activity such as crocheting is advantageous to the entrepreneur, so acting to their best interest, entrepreneurs hold on to this gendered subjectivity at least in appearance.

MrsE, an elderly lady who makes and sells crocheted items says that her engagement with tourism handicraft entrepreneurship was not planned and came ‘naturally’ thus also drawing on gendered connections of woman’s ‘natural’ advantage at completing social reproductive tasks to justify her involvement in entrepreneurship. About this she says: “I didn’t take the decision to engage in entrepreneurship - it came by itself, just as though it was something natural”, hence superficially removing her agency in the creation of her business even though she is a dynamic woman with past dreams of creating a small factory making fabric items. MrsE also uses the tactic of projected adherence to feminine social reproductive roles to encourage customers to buy, as illustrated in an ethnographic moment when she very successfully sold two crocheted items by engaging in conversation with the male customer, stressing how, as she had made them and had years of experience in this craft, these were the best items the man could buy. As limited options exist to gain formal training within crafts that used to be social reproduction activities such as crocheting, women use the stereotypical connection of femininity to social reproduction in order to
maximise their utility (England and Folbre, 2003) in the entrepreneurial process. However, female entrepreneurs such as Hara, who is a silversmith, stress the importance of the formal training they have received in allowing them access to entrepreneurship. This highlights the connection between formal training and masculinity which relates to the value bestowed on the products made by people with training (Vaughn, 2010). So, in relation to female handicraft entrepreneurs, training is needed to enter either craft, however the appearance of adherence to feminine subjectivities is more important for women who engage in feminised crafts such as crocheting as this strengthens the appearance that the training they have received, although not formal, is of high value.

It is interesting to look at the politico-economic conditions that contribute to the absence of formal training in fabric crafts, such as crocheting, in Greece in order to conceptualise how gender operates within politico-economic structures. One of the reasons why crocheting and weaving became so popular as a way for women such as Flora, a home-based entrepreneur participant, to enter the labour market, was the combination of a need for items to make up a daughter’s dowry and the mass entrance of women into the public service as this was considered a suitably stable job for women but subtracted from the time needed to make their own dowry (Leontidou, 1994). This combination of competing time-pressures created a need not only for dowry items but also for other home items and coincided with the industrialisation plateau which Greece experienced in the 1960s, when factories making fabric items emerged, thus moving what was a home-based feminised craft into the public and masculine domain (Louri and Pepelasis Minoglou, 2002). At the same time, fabric handicraft-making skills were being taught at school (MrsE was a teacher of these crafts at a local school), but they stopped teaching them around 1980, as narrated by MrsE. This change in schools’ curriculum preceded the abolition of dowry by law in 1983 which was an attempt by the Equality Secretariat to promote greater gender equality (Vaiou, 2008). This sequence of events shows how motivations for engaging in entrepreneurship that are connected to gender roles are very fluid, transforming as policies and economic conditions mould them, at times encouraging the engagement with a certain type of entrepreneurship and at times discouraging it.

6.2.3 Beyond an individualist conceptualisation of entrepreneurship

The perception of women engaging in something that comes ‘naturally’ to them (Hewitson, 2003), in order to justify their involvement in entrepreneurship, permeates female tourism handicraft entrepreneurs’ interpretations of entrepreneurship in more ways than just the type of craft they engage in. Adhering to feminine subjectivities connected to caring, many female entrepreneur participants express how entrepreneurship is important to them as they can help both their family and others, an activity closely related to their embedded perceptions of caring as being
an intrinsic characteristic of the feminine role. The embeddedness of this concept within entrepreneurship is illustrated in studies that show how women see entrepreneurship as a way of supplementing the family income rather than being motivated by selfish motives as Anthopoulou (2010) concludes in her study on female rural Greek entrepreneurs. However the concept of helping others comes into opposition with the masculinist, separative-self image of entrepreneurship which does not allow for a sense of social solidarity (Waylen, 2000). Subsequently, entrepreneurs who deviate from individualist ideals are often penalised by economic structures that reward individuals more generously when they are pursuing individualist goals rather than community goals (Folbre, 2003).

Envisioning the duality between the market which is where rational individuals operate and the social where altruistic carers operate is useful in explaining how social acts such as helping the community or the family via entrepreneurship are considered feminised activities. Whilst seldom studied, the community aspect of entrepreneurship is very much part of the entrepreneurial experience (Fine and Milonakis, 2009) as also illustrated by female entrepreneurs in this study. For example Dina, a female entrepreneur from the women’s cooperative, interprets entrepreneurship in terms of economic independence so, as Dina says you “don’t have to ask all the time (from your husband)”, but also in terms of using her money to help other people, as Dina says: “If you have your own money you can help more, you can get something that you wouldn’t get if you were not working. You will help someone.” Here we see how embedded feminine roles of altruistic caring have penetrated Dina’s interpretation of entrepreneurship not being just for her selfish individual gain, but for her community’s gain as well. The social feature of female interpretations of entrepreneurship, is perceived here as entrepreneurs’ likeliness to perceive their work’s value in terms of the impact their work has on other people such as their family and the community rather than solely in terms of profit. This is highlighted by how the international female entrepreneurs Hanson (2009) studied are more likely both to utilise their social circle like friends and kin to enter entrepreneurship and to help them throughout entrepreneurship, and subsequently value their work in terms of its impact on their kin. The community is of significance particularly to female entrepreneurs within tourism as women working within tourism are disproportionately concerned about the effects of tourism on their community as seen for example in a study of rural tourism entrepreneurship in Intermountain Western United States(Petrzelka et al., 2005). This observation leads me to question the connection between femininity and community concern through altruism., The assumption that femininity and caring, often altruistically, for the community are inextricable linked is utilised by many tourism development programs that target women to be the recipients of community-targeted funding, as women are considered more likely to disperse the money within the community rather than spend it on themselves (Brickell and Chant, 2010).
So, by expressing entrepreneurship in terms of it enabling them to help others, female participants show that there is indeed space to conceptualise entrepreneurship alternatively. Visualising entrepreneurship as being an economic structure that incorporates elements of altruistic caring speaks to Gibson-Graham’s (2008) description of diverse economies that include non-traditional economic structures such as voluntary community groups and cooperatives. This is perhaps indication that female entrepreneurs, by refusing to conform to neoclassic interpretations of economies consisting only of market activities, are creating hybrid versions of entrepreneurship that are less guided by selfish individual choice, but rather include an element of altruism by being less individualist. The social factors that affect entrepreneurship are recognised as key to analysing female entrepreneurship, however they are often overlooked, for example by World Bank policies where social concerns are only superficially included, thus making only the women’s short-term contribution to the economy visible rather than supporting women’s community efforts which are longer lasting (Griffin, 2010). An example illustrating how, for female entrepreneurs, a more socially-oriented experience is important to them and their community is seen in how Lena, a felt-maker in Zagori expresses her joy in teaching (free of charge) young children how to knit and make felt as being central to her entrepreneurial experience as she says “the pleasure I get from a little girl learning how to knit from me...can’t be measured!”. Lena’s activity in this instance is both an indication of how entrepreneurship involvement is embedded in social structures but also how it can contribute to diverse economies as Lena teaches in exchange for the students gathering wool into balls rather than for money. This is significant as it means that women’s businesses often provide services to meet community needs that would not be met if their business was not present, which is an example of the role entrepreneurs can play in creating social change (Martin et al., 2007).

The extent to which entrepreneurial interpretations are linked to social goals such as helping the community, rather than just individual economic goals is connected to gendered roles as illustrated by women’s preference to strive for higher relational capital24. In a recent study on negotiation techniques used by entrepreneurs, women are seen to be far more prone to strive for higher relational capital than economic efficiency, a dynamic the authors refer to as a “relational accommodation”25 dynamic (Curhan et al., 2008, p. 192). Similarly, many female participants refer to the importance they place on social relationships over economic profits. For example Katerina, a female potter in Margarites village stresses the importance of being able to help her community as being an integral part of her entrepreneurial experience by saying: “you feel like you can do something more. I can do something for my village, my school...“. In addition, Katerina shows how

---

24 Relational capital refers to the value of personal relationships (Curhan, 2008)

25 In relational accommodation, “one forgoes one’s best economic interests in favour of relationship-oriented interests” (Livingston, 2011, p. 5).
she values relationships over personal profit by saying how she would rather have good relationships with the other potters than be in competition with them: “I help other potters as I want to keep good relationships with everyone. I don’t like competition.” Katerina’s aversion to competition shows how her interpretation of entrepreneurship deviates from neoclassical economic theorising of entrepreneurship that assumes that all economically successful entrepreneurs must be competitive (Barker, 2005). However despite not being ‘competitive’ as Katerina says, she is successful, which is indicated by her ability to make up for her husband’s financial shortcomings by paying part of the loan he took out for his carpentry business (which under the current economic climate is not doing too well).

Apart from the importance of the community in female entrepreneurs’ interpretation of entrepreneurship, another gendered structure that acts to mould entrepreneurial experience is the concept of ‘freedom from control’ from gendered expectations of female responsibility for social reproduction activities (Federici, 2012) as shall be discussed next.

6.2.4 “At work, no one checks on me”: Entrepreneurship and freedom from control

Another way in which female participant entrepreneurs express themselves as entrepreneurs is via vocalising how entrepreneurship gives them a feeling of freedom. When talking about ‘freedom’, much entrepreneurship literature talks about the significance of economic freedom in entrepreneurship (Gohmann et al., 2013) that is the governmental structures that allow for easier integration into the market, however another type of freedom is focused on here, that of ‘freedom from control’. Delving into the meaning of ‘freedom from control’ exposes how social gendered structures are at work to internalise the connection between femininity and the domestic sphere. This connection is seen more vividly and obviously in societies with strict gender role regulations concerning the space which women are allowed to move in, such as the Turkish female entrepreneurs in Tucker’s (2007) study who are largely expected to maintain their position within the domestic or private sphere. Whilst in Greece, women are allowed to freely move between public and private sphere, the association of femininity and domesticity still survives as illustrated in the concept of “mistress of the house” (Lazaridis, 2009, p. 57) still being an ideal characteristic for women to have, within Greek society, and also relates to a woman’s primary economic role being to regulate the household’s finances (Du Boulay, 1986).

Many female entrepreneur participants have internalised versions of femininity that are connected to their roles as ‘mistresses of the house’, indicated by how they express that occupying space outside the house by engaging in entrepreneurship is important to them. For example, Anthoula from the Rizarios Handicraft School expresses this feeling of freedom by saying how it is not
possible to be at home all day as she says: “and in the house all day, it is not possible”. Dina also stresses the social benefits of entrepreneurship as she explains how entrepreneurship has given her freedom to exit the domestic sphere but has also allowed her to be in contact with more people by saying: “In all areas I am better – only the fact that you leave home and come into contact with people is enough”. Whilst Anthoula and Dina appreciate how entrepreneurship allows them to be outside the house, Hara vocalises how gender operates within entrepreneurship more succinctly by elaborating on the value which she puts on economic gain versus ‘freedom from control’ by explaining how she values ‘freedom from control’ more than economic gain. She says:

“I am more free like this, I feel better. Not because I make money, freedom because no one controls me here, I can do what I want. No one at home controls me either but if I was at home I would be forced to do more housework”.

Here, Hara exposes how she feels the invisible neighbour’s ‘gaze’ forcing her to do housework when at home as she feels that is her gendered responsibility, whereas at work which is a masculinised space, the ‘gaze’ is less prominent.

So, it is increasingly evident that for these women, engaging in entrepreneurship creates a ‘gender-free’ space within which they can feel free from domestic responsibilities, even though the feeling of responsibility for social reproduction does not disappear, but rather dissipates at least momentarily indicating how entrepreneurship is providing the impetus to shape gender roles and relations. However, the perception that women’s feelings of freedom are limited to the market is raised by authors critical of tourism development programs that focus solely on women’s access to material resources. Indeed, Ferguson (2011a) stresses that empowerment through the market remains empowerment in the market with little other social change occurring. In the current study, gender acts to control behaviours indicated by how female entrepreneurs use entrepreneurship as a vehicle to escape the pressure for conformity to gender roles, a pressure which can be compared to Foucault’s (Foucault, 1972) panopticon surveillance techniques, by taking refuge in their entrepreneurial space. Indications of this feeling of escape from gendered pressures is found in how Katerina refers to her shop as being her shelter by saying: “I have found my shelter here, it’s like I have left everyone and everything, I have made my own world and I feel very good about it”.

In all these ethnographic examples, the importance of entrepreneurship’s social side rather than its economic side is emphasised by female participants which shows how lived realities can illustrate the ways in which gender permeates entrepreneurship, as also observed by Ahl (Ahl and

---

26 Please refer to the footnote in Section 5.5 for an explanation of this idea.
Marlow, 2012) who criticises current entrepreneurial discourse for positioning women as “lacking or incomplete men” (p. 543), rather than questioning the ways on which gender roles mould women’s entrepreneurial positions. Hence, taking the significance female entrepreneurs attach to entrepreneurship providing them with a ‘shelter’ from social stereotypes, is an example of how gendered value systems operate within entrepreneurship. Whilst for the male participants in this study, a shelter from social stereotypes was omitted from their accounts of how they experience entrepreneurship, for many of the female entrepreneurs, this social aspect was mentioned often and hence of significance to them. Including such measures of success within entrepreneurial discourses could facilitate a more gender equal representation of entrepreneurship theory and discourse.

In the masculine space of entrepreneurship, women are momentarily liberated from gendered expectations, however for male participants this is generally not a common feeling as illustrated by the absence of expressions of entrepreneurship in terms of feeling free from control.

The ways in which ‘freedom from control’ operates according to gender codes to transform women’s experience of entrepreneurship are a product of social constructs that lay down the operating manual for society. When adhered to, these social codes provide people with a sense of ‘fitting-in’ to society, however feelings of guilt emerge when entrepreneurs choose to depart from these societal norms as will be described next, focusing on the relationship of this guilt to entrepreneurial interpretations.

6.2.5 Gender, guilt and limiting business size

As feminine subjectivities continue to be connected to caring, many female entrepreneurs feel ‘guilty’ about spending time being an entrepreneur rather than caring for their children and partners. Children’s age plays a role in how economic relations in the productive sphere are gendered and the younger the children, the more responsibility inferred on women to spend time with them (Kunz, 2010). Accordingly, many female entrepreneur participants adhere to this role by stating how they delay engaging in entrepreneurship until their children are older. For example Katerina, a female potter in Margarites, delays entering tourism entrepreneurship until her children are 10 years old whereas Dina joins the women’s cooperative only after her children grow up as she says: “When the children were small, I wasn’t looking for a job. Then the children grew up and I looked – I had to do something”.

For entrepreneurs who do not conform to gendered ideals regarding prioritising their children over their business, social penalties in the form of guilt are imposed. For example, Frosso who did not stop working throughout her children’s childhood and even worked on the day her son was
actually due, regrets sending the children to the day-care “even when they were sick sometimes”. Flora, who had a tourist shop in Rethymno before she became a home-based entrepreneur, on the other hand, is disappointed that she was unable to keep her children out of trouble during puberty which she takes the blame for and attributes to her engagement in entrepreneurship distracting her from mothering. She says: “I won a lot but lost in that my children where in puberty then and I was detached from them. They made bad friends and I struggled to rectify things...If I was close to them...” with a tinge of sadness to her voice. Both of these examples illustrate how entrepreneurs that depart from social norms are penalised, as female entrepreneurs internalise full responsibility for their children rather than visualising the broader social structures that may have contributed to their perceived shortcomings as mothers, such as limited support from partners and kin.

These guilty feelings transform the ways in which female entrepreneurs conceptualise and perform entrepreneurship as they limit the size of their business in response to their gendered roles. For example, Frosso purposefully keeps her shop “off the main street” and does not sell wholesale, in order to be able to also take care of her family. This shows how gender permeates performances of the economic as guilt operates to keep her business small because feeling responsible for childcare acts as a barrier to entrepreneurship and thus is an indication of how adhering to traditional narratives of femininity can affect entrepreneurship involvement. These permeations of gender into entrepreneurship speak to what Marlow and McAdam (2013) call the “underperformance myth” (p. 155) whereby even though women-owned firms are positioned as ‘under-performing’ they seem to reflect the norm when taking into consideration gender roles that assign domestic tasks to women. The authors indicate that the ‘under-performance myth’ has a lot to do with gender, giving as an example how the value attached to part-time work is much lower than masculinised norms of full-time work. However as women who operate part-time do not do so by ‘rational choice’ but in response to socially ascribed roles, the question arises of how their performance can be measured based on ‘rational’ choice.

Some of the ways in which guilt is applied to women engaging in entrepreneurship is through intergenerational acculturation, an example of which is seen in the way Kostis, a middle-aged potter in Margarites village, expresses his opinion regarding working mothers. Acculturation is a concept used to describe the ways in which norms such as gender norms are instilled and perpetuated by society which is well researched in the field of immigrant children striving to adapt to new environments (Güngör and Bornstein, 2013). Intergenerational acculturation as the term suggests is used in this study to describe the ways in which older people reinforce stereotypical gender norms. Kostis believes that many of the psychological problems that children have, stem from their mothers spending too much time working rather than “being close to their children”. By putting all the blame
on women for the children’s outcome, Kostis enforces gendered norms that dictate women’s responsibility for childcare. By saying that “it is women’s fault for not having any spare time as they want to both have families and work”, Kostis asserts women’s full responsibility for childcare and blames women for ‘selling their soul’ to capitalism at their children’s disadvantage. This insinuation contributes to perpetuating gender norms that suggest women’s prime responsibility should be their engagement with social reproductive economic activities. Another example of how intergenerational acculturation acts to make women feel guilty about their engagement in entrepreneurship is seen in the words of MrsE, an elderly female entrepreneur who says how a woman engages in the productive economy at “the detriment of the family”.

However, having children can also be seen as a facilitator to remain within entrepreneurship as apart from the obvious financial gain, it is seen as an opportunity to educate children, which is often a gendered role undertaken by women. This may partly be the result of female entrepreneurs’ gendered responsibility to educate their children. As part of women’s social reproductive activities is to educate their children, by teaching their children how to engage in the productive economy, female entrepreneurs fulfil their gendered role of educator. However, this phenomenon of children working from an early age within a family business in tourism may also be an indication of tourism “sucking” (p. 11) people into labour for capitalism in order to make the family economic output more efficient and results in remoulding society, as children once active only in the reproductive economy are called upon to become economically productive citizens at a younger age as shall be discussed next (Harman, 2010’).

6.3 Tourism entrepreneurship creating a new role for children

Within the regime of neoliberal individualism, each individual is considered a rational actor with the ability to care for themselves, with the exception of children and the severely disabled who are considered as blameless for their poverty and free of working obligations (LeBaron, 2010). Child-labour is illegal in Greece, as it is in most countries, however the phenomenon of children ‘helping out’ in the family business by engaging in the productive economy within tourism is just as common as it is for children to engage in the reproductive economy, that is to complete domestic work within the home. The involvement of children in entrepreneurship via family businesses can be seen as a family strategy to avoid poverty, whereby children gain the skills to run their parent’s business even though this does not necessarily mean that they will decide to continue working within the family business as seen in literature talking to career choices of students with a background in family business (Zellweger et al., 2011). Sykes (2003) argues that the entry of children into the productive
economy is a product of capitalism’s pressure for accumulation which blurs the boundaries between the public and the private economic spheres. Within tourism, this ‘blurring’ occurs more rapidly because time pressures on family businesses are more acute, as seen in how children are encouraged to help during especially busy periods. For example, within Vietnamese souvenir-producer families (Thirumaran et al., 2013), children are even called upon after leaving the house, indicating how important kinship relations are to the survival of family businesses. However there seems to be little literature written on the gendered structures that encourage children to transcend into the productive economy via participation in family businesses within tourism, a lack which could be attributed to the invisibility of this phenomenon perhaps because of the ethical connotations of researching this version of child labour (Wyness, 2012).

Within this study, capitalism’s push to accumulate seems to have an effect on the economic relations between tourism entrepreneurs and their children, resulting in an early entry into entrepreneurship for many children in tourism, which is seen as a solution by parents to simultaneously care for their children whilst working. From an economics angle this action can be seen as a way in which especially female entrepreneurs, who are primary held responsible for childcare, maximise their comparative advantage by maximising usage of their time thus effectively instilling more value to their labour hours (Hewitson, 2003). An example of how children are encouraged to participate within entrepreneurship is seen in how Frosso prefers to get her children to help (for free) rather than employ someone, as this would reduce her profits. As Frosso says: “...we work 9-9 and all the family helps...my children stay here at the shop sometimes and although I could get someone to help me in the shop, my share of the profits would be much less”. By encouraging her children to become economically active not just in the household which they do already, but also in the productive economy, Frosso strives to ensure that her business is as economically viable as possible by encouraging her daughter to input labour hours by helping with the family business, thus also socialising her daughter into being an entrepreneur within the family business. In this way, Frosso embeds her daughter within a type of entrepreneurship that is guided by kinship relations, thus showing how kinship can be a match for rational decision-making forces of the market as observed by Stewart (2003). By relying on her daughter to maintain her entrepreneurial venture’s profitability, Frosso utilises her family resources, which is socially legitimate in gender terms as in her capacity as mother this is viewed as a way to educate her children and thus lives up to ‘intensive’ motherhood ideals that connect femininity to being fully responsible for children’s education (Fox, 2006). However, at the same time, Frosso’s daughters’ contribution to the family business highlights the often overlooked importance of children as actors who actively shape the gendered entrepreneurial landscape by choosing to help within the family business or not, which is lightly touched upon by Bartos (2012) who focuses on children’s political
agency of caring. The importance of children’s lack of participation in entrepreneurship can be seen in how Ioanna’s daughter, who is reluctant to manage the shop at midday, effectively pushes Ioanna to reconsider the viability of having two shops open, especially in the absence of the option to hire help in the light of the economic crisis, as she says “we’ll see about next year, I am getting too tired to be working so much and I can’t leave my daughter in the shop, she is too vulnerable”.

Ioanna’s explanation of how her daughter is “too vulnerable” to be left alone in the shop speaks to the “rescaling of childhood” that Katz (2001, p. 716) observes, whereby parents overcompensate for the state’s lack of structures to protect their children. However, whilst Ioanna is hesitant to encourage her daughter to engage in entrepreneurship (perhaps because as an immigrant Ioanna does not feel so safe in her non-local environment), other entrepreneurs use their business as a way in which to keep their children engaged in what they perceive as a safe activity, thus enacting their roles as carers in the absence of caring state structures. This highlights how children’s engagement in entrepreneurship is a way of preventing children from roaming the streets. However, the female workers in Ferguson’s (2010b) study who do not engage their children in entrepreneurship, are blamed for letting their children ‘roam the streets’. Indeed, female entrepreneurs who do not encourage their children to help them in their business are often penalised by societal blame manifested in feelings of guilt. An example of this social penalty is seen in the example of Flora who blames herself for her children “getting into bad company” as she says this was because she was not “close to them when they were growing up”, as she did not encourage them to take an assistant entrepreneurial role as other entrepreneurs did.

Katerina is a female potter in Margarites village who, like Frosso, would rather get the children to help than hire someone else which may also indicate a lack of trust of outsiders which is common in Greece especially in rural communities (Karametou and Apostolopoulos, 2010). However, viewing the family as an economic unit (Humphries, 2000) whereby all members contribute labour power to the family and all expect to have a share of the winnings, may explain children’s entry into the productive economy, especially in rural locations where children are expected to help with agricultural activities. The concept of children working in a family business in Greece is socially acceptable but is in opposition to going to work outside the family business, because when a child does, this is viewed as an indication that the family cannot sustain itself and thus constitutes a shameful activity (Aggelopoulos et al., 2008).

Katerina is keen that her daughters help her with the shop as she views this as an opportunity to teach them and often leaves one of them in charge during the midday when visitation is low. To this extent, she says about her daughters’ contribution to entrepreneurship: “in the summer I want
them to come to the shop and help with the clients and learn how to pot as they may need the skill in the future”. Katerina precedes talking about leaving her daughters in charge of the shop at midday by lamenting that because of her low education level, she feels “guilty that I cannot help them” referring to helping her children with school work which is considered a woman’s job (Reay, 2000). So, by educating them in a subject she is confident in, pottery entrepreneurship, Katerina adheres to gendered subjectivities that connect femininity to caring which corresponds to how literature on family businesses presents the family as a repository of resources such as educative resources (Nordqvist and Melin, 2010).

6.4 Chapter summary

This chapter’s aim was to describe how participants conceptualise their engagement with entrepreneurship from a feminist economics angle by highlighting how participants’ interpretations depart from or converge with classic economic theorising that is based on the centrality of ‘rational man’ theorising. Focusing on how gender permeates performances of the economic within these entrepreneurial interpretations, there is evidence that the type of tourism development plays a role in how economic practices are inherently gendered and how entrepreneurs create new spaces for themselves by challenging these stereotypical gendered roles via their involvement in tourism development. Separating the participant entrepreneurs in this study into collective entrepreneurs, who include entrepreneurs at a handicraft school and at a women’s cooperative and individual entrepreneurs who are ‘owner-producers’, subtle variations in the expression of entrepreneurship are evident. It is observed that these two groups vary mainly in terms of time-flexibility which has the effect of minimally agitating gender roles as entrepreneurs within cooperative structures can re-delegate work amongst themselves in order to continue performing household tasks whereas ‘owner-producers’ cannot. However at the same time, it is argued that tourism seasonality challenges the idea of collective structures’ time-flexibility, as during this season the women have to work very long hours, thus seeming to prioritise their work over caring and thus adhering more to masculinity than femininity. This notion is however justified by drawing on caring subjectivities connected to femininity as for example DarkK says “the tourists need to eat”. Another difference between the two groups is that within collective entrepreneurship, as women’s groups are inherently feminised, women are constituted as helpers in opposition to owner-producers who are more central to the entrepreneurial process, despite often even the ‘owner-producers’ conceptualising their entrepreneurial involvement as being for family or communal benefit.
Looking at four different ‘types’ of ‘owner-producer’ entrepreneurs, the non-local, the migrant, the male and the couple, the intricate interplay of society and gender within economic expressions are seen as the ‘owner-producers’ interpretations are moulded by this interplay. For the non-local entrepreneur, the importance of social networks within female entrepreneurship is highlighted with reference to how her husband makes up for this lack, but simultaneously perpetuates gendered notions of public activities being masculinised by dealing with bureaucratic procedures, which is however economically advantageous within the Greek political clientalism regime (Michas, 2011). Ioanna, the migrant entrepreneur, transcends gendered boundaries by taking risks and opening a second shop, creating innovative products and recruiting her husband into entrepreneurship. She is able to act in this ways because as an ‘outsider’ she does not fully conform to local social constraints, and rejects classic interpretations of economic theorising related to entrepreneurship (Godwyn and Stoddard, 2011). For male entrepreneurs, interpretations of entrepreneurship are more along the lines of classic economic theorising that emphasises the importance of being independent. Male entrepreneurs describe themselves in terms of being respected members of the community and being recognised for their craftsmanship which they achieve through networking with other potters, making their own tools and using skills gained through institutional studies to innovate. Looking at the entrepreneurial couple in this study, insight into how gender operates within family businesses is gained, where women’s role is often seen as part of the familial strategy to increase family income. Whilst for the male partner in the entrepreneurial couple, his wife’s role within entrepreneurship is described as that of an assistant, his wife takes a more agentic stance thus challenging this assumption as she engages in detailed conversation about tourism policies thus “metaphorically stepping outside” (Tucker, 2007, p. 100) her role as mere helper.

This agentic stance speaks to how tourism development programs promoting entrepreneurship should strive for women’s visibility in order to allow women to depart from the invisible masculine norm of entrepreneurship. One of the ways women carve out their own space within the entrepreneurial discourse is by drawing on gendered perceptions of how it is ‘natural’ for women to be good at tasks that were once social reproductive activities such as weaving. By doing this, female entrepreneurs bypass the need for institutional training and their time gains value in terms of ‘opportunity cost’. Another way in which female entrepreneurs challenge masculine norms of entrepreneurship is by conceptualising their engagement in entrepreneurship as being related to altruistic motives to improve their community’s well-being, by for example providing free knitting and weaving lessons as Lena does. When viewing this entrepreneurial act towards the community as an economic transaction, female entrepreneurs’ contribution is significant as it speaks to the
conceptualisation of diverse economies where non-traditional economic structures are possible (Gibson-Graham, 2008).

Apart from the departure from purely profit-driven individualistic gain, prominent features of the female participants’ entrepreneurial experience include expressions of ‘freedom from control’ which relate to internalised perceptions of femininity being connected to a domestic role. Engagement with entrepreneurship provides a “shelter” (Katerina, interview) from the social norm-enforcing ‘gaze’, in that women feel free from the imposition of gendered responsibilities as they find themselves within the commonly conceived masculine domain of entrepreneurship where participants are characterised by the masculinist conception of separative self (Waylen, 2000). Despite the protective feeling from the ‘gaze’ that entrepreneurial engagement provides, female entrepreneurs with children experience feelings of guilt if they do not prioritise childcare. This leads female entrepreneurs to keep their businesses small, by for example locating their stores “away from the main street” as Frosso does. This indicates how gender permeates performances of the economic as perceptions of ‘underperforming’ female entrepreneurs (Marlow and McAdam, 2013) are dispelled when interpreting entrepreneurship in terms not only of profit, but of social factors that contribute to female entrepreneurs’ perceived shortcomings.

Children are not only significant in moulding their parents’ entrepreneurial experiences through their need to be cared for, they are also actors within the entrepreneurial process, as within tourism, especially seasonal summer tourism when few state or private alternatives exist, children also become involved in entrepreneurship as they are encouraged to help out by their parents. This encouragement can be viewed as a manifestation of a mother’s gendered responsibility to educate her children and also acts as a safe place to keep children off the streets, thus maintaining the image of good working mother who combines entrepreneurship and good mothering efficiently. This differs to the female workers in Ferguson’s (2010b) study, whose roaming children gave rise to social criticism of female tourism entrepreneurship engagement. Children are often heavily depended upon for their help as they provide much needed relief from their owner-producer parents’ long work days and their agency in transforming gendered entrepreneurial interpretations warrants further investigation.

As illustrated, childcare is a significant factor when analysing entrepreneurship and the next chapter talks more about how gendered perceptions relating to social reproductive activities act upon entrepreneurs’ experiences. By looking in detail at how femininity is connected to caring and masculinity is connected to separate-self, I explore how gender acts within politico-economic structures to support or weaken entrepreneurs’ affinity for social reproduction responsibilisation.
Chapter Seven

Gendered economic relations within the social reproduction economy

“Ah...the secret economy! How most people do it is to have a woman who does it all” (Daniel, male potter in Margarites village, Rethymno)

What Daniel refers to as the ‘secret’ economy is this chapter’s focus, as I proceed to describe an aspect of the economy which has been shrouded by veils of invisibility in most tourism development literature. This aspect of the economy is social reproduction, which can be simply defined as all the activities needed to reproduce life on a daily basis and intergenerationally (Bakker and Silvey, 2008a). Social reproduction’s impact on the economy is something that various academics (Ferguson, 2010a, Bakker and Silvey, 2008b) in the field of international political economy are calling to be exposed in order to provide a better picture of economic reality, especially women’s economic reality, since it is women who seem to be ‘naturally’ held responsible for completing social reproductive activities (Steans and Tepe, 2010).

Whilst government policies shape many aspects of political economy, the gender dimensions of political economy are predominantly shaped by more private dynamics such as the dynamics within households. These private dynamics, that is household social reproduction dynamics, the implications of which have been largely ignored by neoliberal policies, promote market efficiency without taking into account the costs embedded in ‘market’ activities such as this non-capitalist, unpaid work (Bezanson and Luxton, 2006a). As discussed in Chapter Two, ignoring social reproduction dynamics is far from coincidental as government policies tend to shift responsibility for the labour force’s social reproduction onto the individual, individualising social problems and their costs, rather than conceptualising social reproduction as being a state responsibility (Ferguson, 2010b). An example of policies based on such thinking are the policies promoting requests of funding for families instead of requests for increased state responsibility for care (Luxton, 2006a). The fluid nature of economic relations produced from the shift in responsibility to the individual as a result of neoliberal policies, in addition to the shift of responsibility amongst individuals as a result of

27 The Greek word for woman, “gineka” has the double meaning of woman or wife in Greek
capitalism’s push for accumulation, shows how gendered economic relations in the social reproductive economy can be ‘kinetic’.

In order to analyse the current situation of social reproduction within Greece, an evaluation of how social reproduction is defined by, and distributed amongst, this study’s participants is crucial. Initially I shall describe how social reproduction activities are defined by participants (a task in itself as the concept of ‘social reproduction’ is not readily recognisable by persons outside the field) which will provide insight into how social reproduction tasks are gendered ‘by definition’. Accordingly, there is relative consensus amongst participants regarding what are perceived as social reproduction tasks, with a tendency for cooking, cleaning and childcare to be a woman’s responsibility and ‘exoterikes doulies’ (‘outside jobs’ which include paying bills, going to the bank, buying items to repair the house) being mostly perceived as family unit’s male member’s responsibility. The definition of social reproductive activities seems to differ amongst generations, with older women perceiving handicrafts and more specifically those related to making clothes, as part of feminine social reproductive activities. Similarly, younger male participants define social reproductive activities differently to older males, giving a less gendered account of social reproduction. For example Manolis, a young potter in Margarites, describes all aspects of taking care of his twin girls as both his and his wife’s responsibility.

Another significant point which many participants made when defining social reproductive activities was the importance of emotional support in reproducing familial life. Hence I briefly focus on the roles social reproductive activities such as psychological support, confidence-building as well as showing compassion and understanding, play in the maintenance of life on a daily basis. Whilst difficult to analyse since these activities are non-quantifiable and intangible, their importance in daily survival is unquestionable as any person who has experienced the therapeutic properties of familial support can testify.

After describing how the participants define social reproductive activities and the related gendered perceptions regarding whose responsibility it is to complete them, I progress to discuss how these activities are distributed amongst participants, the state and the market. Since the most frequently mentioned concepts of social reproduction comprise caring activities, I focus on these by

---

28 In Physics, ‘kinetic’ study is the study of motion and its effects whereas etymologically the word is derived from the Greek word for movement or to move, ‘kinesis’.
29 ‘Exoterikes doulies’, is Greek for ‘outside jobs’ which are a generally considered a male occupation in Greece. The masculine identity of this type of labour is indicated by men being primary candidates for this type of paid employment, whereas for example secretaries are commonly a feminine occupation within a company.
30 It is important to note here that when referring to ‘families’, I am referring to various structures consisting of people who support an individual (e.g. friends/relatives) and not solely the nuclear family structure (two heterosexual parents and children).

looking at how cooking, elderly care and childcare are distributed. As this distribution is gendered, it is evaluated in terms of how religion, state policies and intergenerational acculturation interact to maintain this gendering. Next, the market’s role in transforming social reproduction distribution is analysed with special focus on children’s private after-school tuition, which is a prominent feature of many Greek children’s social reproduction. The complexities in the relationship between the market and cultural familial ideals are especially interesting as the market and the ideals seem to contradict each other in the Greek context.

Finally, the chapter will focus on men’s role within social reproduction and how children also contribute to the family’s well-being. As most social reproduction literature talks to women’s role in contributing to a family’s well-being, including men’s and children’s roles within social reproduction adds nuance to the chapter. More specifically I provide an account of how men negotiate and justify distributions of social reproduction by analysing how their masculinities are expressed in relation to ‘feminised’ social reproductive tasks to explain men’s attitudes towards gendered social reproductive activities. Although the ‘breadwinner’ concept (Warren, 2007) is used widely in literature to explain men’s gendered roles in work and social reproduction, by investigating how political economic and cultural factors interact to create gendered expectations I hope to account for men’s attitudes in a more inclusive manner.

With regards to children’s contribution to social reproduction within their families this is significant as it presents an opportunity to focus on how cultural practices encourage certain types of social reproductive distribution. Whilst the participants’ children’s roles as carers exhibit a certain amount of seasonality, with children’s contributions to the family’s social reproduction being more intense in periods when their parents have increased workloads because of their involvement in tourism entrepreneurship (on a seasonal basis), it is interesting to see how cultural and politico-economic conditions contribute to the gendering of their workloads.

7.1 Social reproduction task definition

Overall, a clear difference between female participants’ and male participants’ definitions of social reproduction is observed amongst participants. Women provide an extensive and detailed list of duties that they consider part of the activities needed to maintain familial life on a daily basis and intergenerationally. Men on the other hand provide a much shorter list of tasks that they define as social reproductive tasks and are reluctant to talk about this subject to any great length, preferring to talk about their paid work. Whilst no male participants directly said to me that they perceive
household work to be insignificant (maybe because that would insult me as a woman?), their face expressions and deft avoidance of the topic gave me this impression. Another explanation could be that their avoidance of the topic simply reflects their lack of engagement and hence a feeling of guilt, indicating how gendered feelings of responsibility for social reproduction are becoming associated with masculinity at least internally, even though it may be shameful to show this externally.

Social reproduction activities mentioned by female participants include cooking, cleaning, mopping the floor, cleaning the dishes, making coffee, educating children (often referred to in Greek as ‘ta diavazo’ - ‘I study them’), making preserved sweets, looking after sick relatives, taking care of the garden, ironing, making a shopping list, shopping, paying bills, taking care of household accounting, childcare, keeping the fridge full, lighting the fire and telephoning children to make sure they are okay. These are the tasks which the female entrepreneurs felt they are responsible for, despite sometimes delegating the tasks to other family members. In addition, the female entrepreneurs at the women’s agrotourism cooperative, who have a connection to farming, look after sheep as part of their social reproductive tasks. As can be observed in Table 7.1, men have relatively fewer social reproduction responsibilities, which in the majority relate to tasks completed outside the house.
Table 7.1: Social reproduction duties separated into ‘women’s’ and ‘men’s’ duties (as narrated by this study’s male and female participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Women’s’ social reproduction tasks</th>
<th>‘Men’s’ social reproduction tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raising/educating children</td>
<td>Going to the banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving at the table</td>
<td>Dealing with public services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>Making household items out of wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing plates</td>
<td>Renovating shop/home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Going to the sea with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing clothes for husband to wear</td>
<td>Taking children to the kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making beds</td>
<td>Taking children to the doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making preserved sweets</td>
<td>Shopping at supermarket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging out clothes to dry</td>
<td>Paying bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing family income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making handicrafts/ Dress-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tending to garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting the fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after sheep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoning children to make sure they are okay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above table (Table 7.1), the social reproduction duties narrated by the participants have been put into columns to represent what the participants classified as a ‘woman’s’ or a feminine task and what as a ‘man’s’ or masculine task. In reality however, there is a lot of cross-over in terms of who does what, with ‘men’s tasks’ often being taken over by women, especially in the cases of participants in cooperative structures who have greater time flexibility. The participants seldom mention a cross-over in the other direction occurring, i.e. men doing ‘women’s’ social reproduction duties, except in the cases where men live on their own. Even in the cases where men live as singles, such as Daniel and Kostis (two male potters who participated in the study), help with social reproduction is often offered to the men in varying degrees from neighbours or nearby relatives. For example, Daniel often gets given fresh vegetables and fruits as well as cooked food from his neighbours, thus reducing his social reproductive need of cooking. Kostis enjoys a similar arrangement regarding cooking as his sister and mother live in very close proximity and cover this social reproductive need for him, albeit on a seasonal basis.

Looking at the table, it is interesting how taking the children to the sea and to kindergarten are counted as men’s social reproduction duties which resembles Hewitson’s (2003) findings that men’s
contribution to childcare revolves around playing with children or engaging in outdoor activities with them, rather than cooking or cleaning for them. This behaviour is explained by Miller (2011) in her research on men’s roles in infant care as being the consequence of masculine discourses that delegate primary childcare to the mothers. This notion of primary childcare responsibilities being a feminine attribute is reinforced by the state which accepts employers’ policies which typically do not accommodate family demands for men, as for example illustrated in the limited provision of parental leave for new fathers throughout Europe (European Commission, 2012).

I observe however, that some men are moving away from the discourse surrounding men’s secondary role in childcare, illustrated by some men’s definitions of social reproduction as including a wider range of childcare activities. For example Manolis, a young male potter in Margarites includes changing his baby daughters’ nappies as a social reproductive duty. However, George, another young male potter in Margarites who was very much involved in caring for his first daughter including bathing and feeding her. He abandoned this task on the arrival of his second daughter, which coincided with an increase in workload in the pottery shop and so does not now include these specific activities in his definition of social reproduction. These two examples indicate how tourism entrepreneurship may assist men to navigate their way through the fluid interpretations of masculinity that modernity brings, by being self-employed and thus not having to adhere to an employer’s policies regarding accommodating familial demands. However George’s example specifically shows the complexity of gender role negotiations and how these fluctuate over time as well as how gender roles are influenced by increasing workloads.

There is also a generational variation regarding what participants consider as social reproduction duties, with older generation female entrepreneurs including handicraft-making such as crocheting and weaving as part of social reproduction duties. As Anetta says about her childhood in the 1970s:

“It was a necessity for young girls to learn and it was a grandmother’s obligation to teach skills to her granddaughters. She taught us first how to be housewives and then all the other things that a girl would need when she grew up – cooking, crocheting, weaving....we spent eight to ten hours weaving and then we had to crochet our dowry...in order to rest from weaving, we crocheted!”

This is in antithesis to the younger generation female entrepreneurs who do not mention making handicrafts as part of their social reproduction activities. This also indicates how industrialisation has modified people’s social reproductive needs, by making items such as clothes and linen readily available for purchase and simultaneously diminishing the economic advantage of
producing hand-made items for home-use. Indeed, the production of handicrafts for home-use in Greece has severely diminished and is indicated by the very few looms in operation; handicraft schools closing down one after the other; and by that fact that the traditional methods of embroidery, crocheting and weaving are dying out as observed during fieldwork and also by Lazaridis (2009) in her study of silk cocoon-embroiderers in Crete.

Generational differences in social reproduction definitions are also observed with younger generation female entrepreneurs including paying bills as part of their social reproduction activities, which most of the older female entrepreneurs classify as a masculine responsibility. This suggests that some social reproductive tasks are losing their gendered character which LeBaron (2010) explains as being because there is a greater amount of capitalist control on daily life and thus human activity is channelled into forms compatible with accumulation. For example, younger women that perceive social reproduction tasks such as paying bills as not being gendered are empowered by being allowed to participate in this activity, but also risk being burdened with more tasks. At the same time it has become more acceptable for men to define activities located on the fading boundaries between what is perceived as feminine and masculine social reproduction tasks, such as childrearing, but risk being ridiculed if they step outside these fluid boundaries as illustrated by the example of Katerina laughing at the idea of seeing her husband hanging up washed clothes.

Mariniki, a female potter from Margarites village explains this generational re-defining of social reproduction to be a result of men finally realising that “whatever I do at work, my wife does as well”. Whilst modernity also promotes more gender-free discourses concerning the definition of people’s social reproduction activities, Mariniki’s words make a succinct point about the role, women’s engagement in the productive economy, has in transforming gender roles related to social reproduction. She believes that it is this realisation that has reduced the gendering of social reproduction activities and hopes that her children’s generation will share social reproduction tasks equally among genders and have less gendered perceptions of what social reproduction activities constitute ‘feminine’ or masculine’ activities. As she says: “now we are the second generation. I do most household work but in necessity my husband will help. In my children I see a 50%-50% (women-men) separation of household tasks”.

In this discussion about participants’ definitions of social reproduction, it is important to pay attention to the fact that social reproduction is not only comprised of the actual physical tasks required for social provisioning such as cooking or cleaning, but also to think of the “fleshy, messy and indeterminate stuff of everyday life” that Katz (2001, p. 711) talks about such as cultural reproduction via the assimilation of shared knowledge and values. Such ‘indeterminate’ social
reproductive practices include emotive, non-commodifiable activities such as providing re-assurance to a worried partner, building a child’s self-confidence or letting people in the family know they are loved. Social reproduction includes “...the vast terrain or love, friendship, sleep and dreams, sickness and death as well as much religious, scientific and artistic activity...” as Caffentzis (2002, p. 8) points out. Whilst essential for society, these social reproduction activities are ignored by most economic analyses mainly because they cannot either be measured or reproduced in a form that can be marketed (England and Folbre, 2003). In fact the majority of this study’s participants did not mention these emotive activities when defining social reproduction, but a few participants did focus on how the feeling of responsibility for keeping the house in order and the children happy, was a significant aspect when defining social reproduction. Consequently, many of the participants felt that it was not only the exertion created by performing the plenitude of social reproduction activities that concerned them, but also the constant need to be thinking about the activities by being held responsible for them. As DarkK from the women’s cooperative stresses about the household tasks in her family, “The children do some of them, but most of the jobs and the responsibility for the jobs, is mine”, indicating how she expends energy and time ensuring the smooth running of the household. Frosso, a female potter in Rethymno similarly stresses how she has “the responsibility for the house – cooking, cleaning – it is all my responsibility”. As gender roles and relations are heavily influenced by societal norms that are reproduced within the family, often via emotional pressure, accounting for the role of emotive social reproduction activities in the gendering of social reproduction is important.

Another example of where the emotive side of social reproduction is referred to by participants is Katerina’s expression that she feels guilty that she is not there to serve her family at the table, a social reproduction task she believes to be her responsibility and she laments that “you can’t be completely correct...you can’t be perfect at home and perfect at work”. This lament shows how whilst Katerina works full-time like her husband, gendered expectations persist that she continues to be a good housewife by serving her family food. Even though she prepares food for the family by getting up very early, before she opens her shop, Katerina still feels the responsibility for providing her family with the care that goes with serving her family at the table. Social reproduction’s intangible elements such as the emotional and intellectual exchange that takes place at the dinner table, allows family members to re-group and recount their daily activities, thus facilitating greater familial cohesion. Despite working, Katerina still tries to be home to serve her husband a midday meal as she says: “...even now I steal some time to go and see if he wants me to serve him his food, to see if he wants anything else. I am not completely irresponsible because I am at work”. Katerina feels that her contribution to her family’s social reproduction should go further than simply providing the basics to survive (e.g. ready-cooked food), as she feels what is ‘correct’ is to show her family she cares by serving them. But engagement in tourism entrepreneurship which is characterised by
altered working patterns and intensified work hours often acts upon social relations altering social reproductive activities (such as serving meals to the family) so that they are left lacking in the intangible, non-market constituents of care (i.e. emotional care).

An in-depth analysis of how the social reproduction duties are actually distributed next, provides a better understanding of how social reproduction functions and is influenced by cultural and politico-economic conditions.

### 7.2 Social reproduction distribution and caring

Within the political economy literature, social reproduction is seen to occur in three spheres: the state e.g. state kindergarten; markets e.g. a nanny; and the household e.g. childcare undertaken by a mother (Bezanson and Luxton, 2006b). Social reproduction’s distribution is not however equally divided amongst these three spheres and the weighting of this division depends on the particular society’s cultural and politico-economic conditions. For example, in countries such as Greece where the welfare state provides limited resources to families in terms of caring for the very young (less than ten percent of children under three years old can access public day care in Greece), these social reproductive tasks are absorbed by familial structures such as grandparents (European Commission, 2012). The market also plays a significant role in the distribution of social reproduction by providing families who lack time but have money, with an alternative. In Greece, some forms of social reproduction are highly marketised among families in which both parents work. For example marketised house-cleaning is very popular in Greece and is a phenomenon which was instigated in the 1990s by the influx of cheap labour in the form of migrants from East Europe and was fuelled by Greek citizens’ increasing financial well-being (Lyberaki, 2011).

As discussed in detail in Chapter Two, policies, market conditions and societal norms interact to gender social reproduction and its distribution, so by discussing how social reproduction is distributed both within families and also amongst families, the state and the market, this section evaluates how these structures both transform and are transformed by gender roles and relations. The most commonly cited definitions of social reproduction given by participants revolved around caring such as cooking, cleaning and caring for children/elders. Hence I analyse how these particular tasks are distributed with special reference to why men’s contribution to these tasks is limited and how tourism entrepreneurs’ children seem to experience responsibilisation for social reproduction at a young age.
However, first I focus on the role caring activities play within the gendered landscape of social reproduction. Caring or care work, is referred to by feminist literature as comprising the altruistic actions of an individual to provide for another individual’s well-being, often on a long-term basis with an emotional connection between care-giver and receiver (England and Folbre, 2003). Some authors make distinctions between caring for and caring about someone with caring for someone translating into providing services for someone who cannot do it themselves like children and the elderly and caring about someone being an expression of loving concern (Hobson et al., 2002). Caring for someone who is very dependent is the type of caring that warrants policy intervention and raises issues of renegotiation of boundaries amongst families, the state and the markets and it is this ‘type’ of caring that most participants cited as being a social reproductive duty.

As will be detailed in the following sections on how the participants distribute caring responsibilities, caring is primarily a feminised task. This can be explained because the motives to provide care for dependants are influenced by gendered social norms that link femininity to motherhood ideals (Folbre, 2003). Furthermore, these gendered social norms are influenced by government policies that often act to re-enforce entrenched notions of gender roles and relations. The first example of caring activities that participants identified as an intrinsic part of their social reproductive activities, is cooking for their family on a daily basis, which especially in Greece is an important part of a woman’s responsibility towards her family.

7.2.1 Cook, chef or kitchen assistant? The gendered nature of cooking for the family

The historical link between food and femininity serves to reproduce gendered assumptions regarding women’s role in cooking for the family and has been interrogated by various feminist projects which suggest that despite changing discourses regarding gender equality, women continue to do the majority of cooking (Hook, 2010, Aarseth and Olsen, 2008). Men’s relationship to cooking is more as a means of helping out at special occasions or doing it as a profession (chef) whereas many men focus on meat dishes, highlighting the link between masculinity and meat (Neuhaus, 2003). This connection of masculinity to meat is also observed in this study’s participants, as the majority describe men’s role in cooking as barbequing meat. Hara refers to this division of cooking duties by saying: “Oh, men do the difficult things like barbequing and we do the chips, salad, etc.”. Men’s association with meat is documented by various authors, for example Fenstermaker & West (2013) who elaborate on the relation of gender to “feeding the family” (p. 49) and how men’s role is related to going to the butcher and taking on a helping role to providing the family’s cooked meals. Many participants who refer to men’s role in cooking highlight how men do this on an occasional basis (and
do not clear up their mess afterwards!), when for example they have friends for dinner, as Katerina says about her husband “He cooks when he has company...but to wash the plates, no way.”

In this study, societal perceptions limiting men’s involvement in cooking on an everyday basis are also seen in how single men are often catered for by female relatives or friends in terms of food. For example Daniel, a single male in Margarites village, often mentions being brought food by the neighbours as illustrated when he was searching for something to offer me and he said “My neighbours often bring me produce from their gardens. Yesterday they brought me tomatoes, aubergines, greens and plums, but I ate the plums, sorry.” Kostis, who is also a single male in Margarites village, despite striving to be perceived as independent and self-sufficient in terms of cooking for himself and thus challenging cooking-related masculinities, admits that during the summer his elderly mother cooks for him and his visiting daughter. As Kostis says about this seasonal social reproductive assistance: “I cook and clean for myself, and only when my daughter visits do I let grandma cook for us to eat all together, so that grandma can spend some time with her granddaughter and show her, her love...”. However he explains this as an exception to the rule, thus questioning prevailing gender norms surrounding men cooking on a daily basis.

Moving on to the participants in partnerships, the majority of them see cooking as a female occupation with few women expecting their husbands or other male relatives to cook, either for themselves or the rest of the family. As Anthoula from the handicraft school says: “my brother doesn’t do anything – e, with two women in the house it is not right. What should I do, make him sweep the floor or cook? No..”. The idea of women being primary cooks in the family is also seen in Tucker and Boonabaana’s (2011) research, where one man in the Mukono parish wonders “would she (his wife) really want me to cook?” (p. 11), indicating how men may feel uncomfortable in the role as the family’s primary cook. The ways Anthoula mentions “with two women in the house” suggests a similar social pressure related to what other people will say, if they find out that her brother cooks “with two women at home”. This indicates how the ‘honour and shame’ principle, which is a form of social pressure in the form of gossip, operates. The ways in which gossip can ‘police’ people into acting in certain ways, such as making women’s work within hotels (‘pansiyons’) invisible and perpetuating social norms that confine women to the private sphere in order to protect their honour, as seen in Tucker’s (2003, 2007) work on female entrepreneurs in Goreme. Similarly, in Anthoula’s case, the fear of gossip perpetuates gendered economic relations within the social reproductive economy as even if her brother wanted to cook, it would be deemed ‘a shame’ for him to cook, whilst having his mother and sister living with him. At the same time it would be ‘shameful’ for Anthoula and her mother not to cook for the brother as this would be perceived as them not adhering to feminine subjectivities of caring within which cooking falls.
Some women display a type of pride in not encouraging or even allowing their male family members to cook and thus ‘spoil’ them into expecting food to be always ready for them. As DarkK says “No one else makes food. They don’t even cut salad. I have them very spoilt”. Whilst DarkK admits that her husband and two sons are ‘spoilt’, which she is to blame for as she does everything for them, at the same time she gives the impression that perhaps she would prefer that they were not so ‘spoilt’. However, by ‘spoiling’ her male family members by constantly cooking for them she adheres to feminine subjectivities dictating it is a woman’s responsibility to cook for the family. This indicates the complex and contradictory factors at play within DarkK who both feels responsible for cooking but also realises that she could potentially let go of this subjectivity and that the time pressures from working could make this altered gender role more acceptable both to her family and her community.

Tucker and Boonabaana’s (2011) female entrepreneurs re-iterate how women are held responsible for cooking by linking ideals of a good wife to cooking skills by saying: “_if you don’t do that (cook for him, serve him), you are actually not like a wife” (p. 13). Women’s roles as primary cooks are also indicated by the fact that many women work as cooks within tourism as they are considered to have training in this art because of their gendered upbringing. This has also been observed elsewhere, for example in a rural tourist destination in China (Ling et al., 2013). Sometimes female entrepreneurs can find innovative solutions to avoid disruption of their role as primary cook in the family. For example Frosso prepares the next day’s food in instalments – one part at night after the shop closes and then the other part in the morning before opening her shop. As she says about making ‘moussakas’, a traditional Greek oven dish which requires an increased level of labour “I fry all the aubergines and the potatoes the night before and also make the mince filling and put it in the fridge. Then the next day I assemble them and only need to make the béchamel”. Katerina has another way of managing cooking duties which is by waking up extremely early and preparing the food so that her family “always has ready food”, which is similar to what older female entrepreneurs in Goreme, Turkey also do according to Tucker (2007).

For Frosso, who says that her husband “doesn’t want anything to do with cooking now”, using innovative solutions to continue providing cooked food herself is a way of maintaining her family’s well-being and sustain their ability to be economically active, whilst at the same time avoiding arguments with her husband who wants to adhere to what he considers a masculine stance to cooking. Frosso’s husband’s approach to familial cooking services being a woman’s domain is indicated not only by his lack of participation in cooking for his family, but also by him being almost nostalgic about the times when his father would “simply tap the empty water glass with his fork and my [Frosso’s husband’s] mother would rush to fill it”. Mannon’s (2006) participant Cecilia, who is a
female tourism entrepreneur in Costa Rica with an unemployed husband, also puts up with gendered expectations regarding cooking being her responsibility, when for example, she quietly accepts being brought back home from her friend’s house by her drunk husband just in order to cook for him, indicating how the connections between cooking and femininity is embedded in women’s ideals.

Other female entrepreneurs re-distribute the social reproduction activity of cooking to family members, but still feel it their responsibility to complete this task. For example, Liana’s mother-in-law provides them all with a daily meal during the summer, which Liana feels is a big support, but Liana still feels responsible for cooking for her family, as she says: “the largest part of help is from Giannis’ mum who has food ready – she makes food for 20 people and whoever wants goes and eats. I can’t cook in the summer, I don’t have enough time!”. This re-allocation of social reproduction is beneficial to Liana as she is relieved of this duty, but it is also of significance to her mother-in-law who by providing sustenance for her son’s family is helping them survive and simultaneously fulfilling personal objectives of adherence to gendered norms surrounding cooking. Tucker (2007) also found that older women in Goreme had particularly increased social reproductive workloads because they continued to complete “food production duties” (p. 101) even though they themselves took up tourist-work. This highlights how older women are more bound by traditional narratives of femininity that require them to be the family’s cooked food provider and thus are relied upon by younger generations for cooking.

The generational gap between perceptions of gendered responsibility for cooking also talk to the changes in the definition of ‘consumption’ that Ferguson (2011b) observes to be occurring in Central America, where she looks at female tourism workers. As women become producers and have little time left to cook for the family, consumption ceases to be a luxury occupation and transforms into a necessity with mothers often using the solution of the easily available ready-meals to feed their family. Whilst women gain increased control over the household budget, capitalist influences that place primary importance on women’s ability to provide financially for their children, mean that women are still left with the responsibility of feeding the family, albeit in a slightly different way, as instead of expending unpaid labour on preparing the family meal, now they work for money and spend the money they earn on buying meals for the family. But as it is still their responsibility, the extent to which gender roles are changing is debatable. Even though relations of production and consumption are altering through women’s work in tourism, complexity arises regarding the connection of gender roles to cooking.

The boundaries between gender and culture are blurred as it is very common practice for Greek parents to continue providing for their children even after their children have families and it is
not uncommon for the parents who live nearby to provide food on a regular basis even to married couples (personal observation). As in the past, newly married women would cook not only for their family, but also for their husband’s family with whom they often lived (Anetta, interview), this is an indication of how social reproduction is restructured over time.

The state’s role in the social reproductive activity of cooking is minimal in Rethymno, but in Zagori where there are higher levels of poverty, some of the participants spoke about getting handouts in essential goods such as rice and flour from the government (interviews with Anna and Anthoula). This type of state help is a recent development, rendered essential because of raising poverty levels in Zagori which are due to the Greek macroeconomic crisis, however there was no mention of cooked food being provided for the female entrepreneurs by the state in the case study areas as participants were employed and hence not eligible for state ‘soup-kitchen’ food. In Athens however various ‘soup kitchens’ exist, that feed up to 8000 very poor people a day according to 2012 figures, many of them run by Church organisations and more recently, since the onset of the economic crisis, by newly-formed solidarity networks but also by the neonazi party “Golden Dawn” (Henley, 2012).

A few of the tourism entrepreneurs who participate in this study opt for marketised solutions regarding cooking, such as ordering meals from nearby restaurants for their midday meal. This is particularly prominent in cases of male entrepreneurs whose female partners are also in full-time employment. For example, Manolis, a potter in Margarites village ordered meals from nearby restaurants for his midday meal on a few occasions, including one time when I was also invited to partake in this meal. By relying on the market to provide this social reproductive need, Manolis is able to continue being economically active without disrupting gender norms dictating whose responsibility it is to provide for the social reproductive need of cooking, especially since his house is not in close proximity to his work-place and his wife does not engage in tourism handicraft entrepreneurship or live close-by.

Having discussed various aspects of cooking by looking at the role gender plays in how families distribute this activity amongst themselves and the market/state, I proceed to analyse other aspects of social reproduction - the ones associated with caring for elders and caring for children. According to neoliberal political thought, the very young and the very old are the only ones ‘eligible’ for state social reproductive care, as they are assumed to be unable to contribute to the productive economy (Jochimsen, 2003). Indeed, these caring activities are still largely gendered with women performing the majority of these activities, as seen in a recent report by the EU Commission into the role of men in gender equity (European Commission, 2012). Greece in particular, shows a higher percentage of
gender inequity than other European countries (European Commission, 2012). Initially, I focus on how participants distribute caring for elders within their families and amongst families, the state and the market and how this distribution transforms gender roles and relations.

7.2.2 How having a daughter can be beneficial in old age

Many female entrepreneur-participants describe caring for their elderly relatives as a social reproduction activity, however no male participants included this activity in their definition of social reproduction, indicating how caring for the elderly is gendered. Greece has one of the lowest institutional provisions for eldercare in Europe and whilst a number of private care homes exist, it is often frowned upon if the family cannot take care of its family members (Kenna, 2011). This idea is mirrored in Lazaridis’ (2009) study of Cretan handicraft entrepreneurs where one elderly participant comments on being looked after by a female relative “… some, in the cities, put their relatives in geriatric institutions and leave them to rot. But this is unacceptable, it is cruel and ‘shameful’. Only heartless women do this.” (p. 162). This illustrates both the gendered nature of elderly care and the perception that this should not be delegated outside the family. Similarly, in the current study, with minimal support from the state and increasingly low pensions (Lyberaki, 2011), participants’ elderly relatives mainly rely on the support of female family members to get help with social reproductive activities. These activities include buying the elderly people’s medication, taking them to the doctor, helping with their shopping, taking care of their garden and transacting with public services and banks.

For many of the female participants, taking on responsibility for social reproduction tasks such as caring for the elderly within the family is not only desired, it is expected. Accordingly, daughters are trained to take care of the family’s ‘feminine’ social reproduction duties such as cleaning and caring so that they can eventually do this instead of their mother. As Katerina says “every year it is better as my daughters are growing up and they see what the house needs”. Dina from the women’s cooperative is proud that she has trained her daughter well in completing social reproductive tasks as she says “I have a daughter, so I find everything ready (at home)”. Achieving her mother’s respect is a desirable act and so Dina’s daughter strives to complete social reproduction tasks in order to gain her mother’s respect. Doing this, Dina’s daughter also becomes trained in this type of labour which can potentially make her into an economically viable and desirable addition as a wife into a family based on the male breadwinner model31. Despite the breadwinner model of family being on the decline because both male and female adult members of the family are required to work in the

31 The male breadwinner model, although discriminatory, has the positive aspect of making caring and its costs visible within the family (Nairn, Higgins & Sligo, 2012)
current capitalist reality, in the absence of any other alternative model, social reproduction activities conveniently remain feminine in nature.

Furthermore by expressing the feeling of pride, Dina is in fact encouraging this type of training to occur and subsequently acting to perpetuate the gendered nature of economic roles within the social reproduction economy, an act which can be conceptualised as a form of intergenerational acculturation of gender roles. DarkK also notes how daughters are expected to help their mother with social reproduction duties when she mentions how her mother-in-law had “…four daughters and everything got done at home. First thing in the morning she would shout to them to make her coffee”. This is the same woman who scolds DarkK about getting her son to wash the dishes, indicating how elders act to maintain gendered economic relations within social reproduction. One of the girls from the handicraft school, Anna, also mentions this display of respect to elders via doing social reproduction tasks, as she says that when she and her sister visited their mother in the village, “our mother does nothing, we do everything. You know, us young women do things more carefully”. By saying that they do not allow their mother to do any domestic tasks whilst they are there, Anna is indicating her pride in undertaking this type of social reproduction, thus validating her activities as ‘what a woman does’ by being happy to undertake this gendered role of caring.

Anna and her sister provide social reproduction help to their elderly mother which is not provided by the state. On a weekly basis they travel to the nearby village where their mother lives and look after her garden, do washing and ironing, clean the house and help her deal with the public service and bank. In the absence of state support, Southern European countries such as Greece have long relied on strong family bonds to ensure completion of caring for the elderly (Glaser et al., 2004). However, this reliance on strong family bonds in what is known in Greece as a ‘familistic’ (Papadopoulos and Roumpakis, 2009) or a ‘collectivist’ culture, which is also common in countries such as Morocco, Turkey and the South Pacific Islands (Saffu, 2003, Essers and Benschop, 2007), in fact acts to perpetuate the gendered nature of caring for the elderly, as women were, and continue to be considered primary care-givers in the absence of state support for the elderly. Similarly, in Anna’s case, alternatives in re-distributing elderly care responsibilities are limited because market alternatives are not economically feasible for her, so she and her sister must shoulder this task. This lack of alternatives may be an indication of how class is related to the transformations of the gendered social reproduction terrain. Since all tourism handicraft entrepreneurs are considered to be the same class, issues of how class and social reproduction gender roles interact shall not be the focus of this study.
Caring for the elderly who are unwell is also a feminised task. Maria, one of the female participants at the Folk Art Centre in Rethymno, is especially aware of this expectation to care for her elderly and sick parents which she expresses in how her desire to “make a new start” is blocked by the expectation to look after her ailing parents. As Maria says: “I feel trapped. I can’t just leave my parents.” Lazaridis (2009) focuses on this expectation of women to take care of unwell elderly pointing out that if a woman does not fulfil this expectation she will be criticised as being ungrateful towards her parents which would be shameful for her.

On the subject of how social reproduction for the elderly and unwell is distributed, the social reproduction duty of caring for bedridden patients in particular, is something that is often purposefully ignored by states as it is very costly in economic terms. Anthoula mentions how she and her mother care for her sick father who is bedridden and has only limited financial help from the state, by taking him to the doctors, cooking and cleaning, buying his medicine, checking his oxygen machine and providing emotional support. As Anthoula says: “I feel trapped. I can’t just leave my parents.” Lazaridis (2009) focuses on this expectation of women to take care of unwell elderly pointing out that if a woman does not fulfil this expectation she will be criticised as being ungrateful towards her parents which would be shameful for her.

On the subject of how social reproduction for the elderly and unwell is distributed, the social reproduction duty of caring for bedridden patients in particular, is something that is often purposefully ignored by states as it is very costly in economic terms. Anthoula mentions how she and her mother care for her sick father who is bedridden and has only limited financial help from the state, by taking him to the doctors, cooking and cleaning, buying his medicine, checking his oxygen machine and providing emotional support. As Anthoula says: “I feel trapped. I can’t just leave my parents.” Lazaridis (2009) focuses on this expectation of women to take care of unwell elderly pointing out that if a woman does not fulfil this expectation she will be criticised as being ungrateful towards her parents which would be shameful for her.

Indeed, women are expected to complete caring tasks altruistically and the altruism women are expected to display regarding caring for the elderly is very closely linked to their roles as carers of children which shall be elaborated on in the next section.

7.2.3 Childcare distribution: the role of religion, culture and gender

When children are added to the familial equation, women’s unpaid labour within the household increases dramatically in comparison to men’s unpaid labour, indicating how women are primarily held responsible for most activities related to childcare (Hewitson, 2003). Interestingly,
men’s labour within the family actually decreases when children are added to the family in comparison to when they were a childless couple, as shown in research by Astone et.al. (2010). Similarly, for many of the tourism entrepreneurs in this study, childcare is a social reproductive activity considered mainly a feminine responsibility. The reasons why childcare is considered a gendered social reproductive act are complex with religion, culture and politico-economic factors all playing a role and shall be explored by examining how childcare is distributed amongst participants.

7.2.3.1 **God’s word as ‘house law’**

As discussed in Chapter Five, the influence of religion is strongly embedded in Greek culture, creating an inextricable link between gendered values, behaviours and Greek Orthodox teachings. A good example of how powerful the Church is in reproducing social rules is illustrated in Anetta’s (a female weaver from Epirus) words about how it used to be when she was young, in the 1970s:

> It was very obligatory what the Church taught you, more obligatory than you can imagine. Nothing to do with now. Since God’s word said so, you were obliged to do it. Most people did not dare to react as they perceived it as a ‘house law’, similar to what you know as a ‘state law’

Whilst the Greek Orthodox Church exerts far less moral pressure than the Roman Catholic Church in terms of divorce and abortion for example, the Orthodox’s Church’s presence is tangible throughout life in Greece with Church christenings and burials being compulsory (Papadopoulos, 1998). Consequently, the more religious participants believe it is only ‘natural’ for a woman to care for children, a fact some attribute to divine intervention. For example DarkK justifies her role as primary carer for her children by saying, “God, I believe, had the wisdom to choose the woman to have children...because we can stand much more than a man”. By referring to it being God’s will that she takes full responsibility for the children, DarkK is explaining why her role is gendered by drawing on her religious adherences. According to research confirming religious institutions’ impact on gender roles, such as Norris & Inglehart’s (2003) research on religiosity’s relationship to gender equality around the world, religious institutions often can act to reinforce patriarchal and economical values which emphasise women’s primary role as care-giver. Similarly, DarkK’s words illustrate how religion influences perceptions of gendered social reproduction roles by creating the impression that women are physically and mentally more suitable for a childcare role.

Men are simultaneously absolved from this gendered role because religious teachings stressing women’s primary concern to be the family, thus embeds men’s inability to care for children in social perceptions childcare, which is explained by some participants, for example Katerina, as being
because men “don’t have patience” to raise a child. Linking religious beliefs to gendering of social reproduction is vocalised in these instances by two participants for whom religion plays a significant role in their life, indicated by them being regular church-goers and frequently mentioning religion and its influence on their everyday life during our interactions. This connection between levels of religiosity and gender norms is echoed in Seguino’s (2011) study which does, however, stress that labour-market participation and existence of public welfare structures act to ameliorate religion’s influence on gender norms. Whilst the above observations highlight how the social roles that people take regarding childcare are influenced by religious gendering processes these are inextricably linked to how culture affects gender roles surrounding childcare. Like in Greece, Japanese societies stress the centrality of women’s gender identity as “dutiful wife and nurturing mother” (Leung, 2011, p. 255). Consequently, there are a variety of socio-cultural factors affecting the distribution of social reproduction, such as the embedded social structures that support the allocation of childcare to grandparents as shall be discussed next.

7.2.3.2 ‘Grandma power’– a childcare solution

For the majority of participants who have children, taking on full responsibility for childcare is a feminised activity, which is carried out by the mothers with the grandmothers’ help. Participants feel that distributing childcare to grandparents is a convenient, affordable, safe and emotionally fulfilling solution for both parents and grandparents as discussed in Section 2.2.2.5. Indeed, having a grandmother’s help is a given for most women whose mothers do not work, as highlighted by Katerina who wonders what “a woman who doesn’t have grandmothers around” would do regarding childcare help. Anna from the handicraft school also confirms this expectation as when asked how she would cope with childcare responsibilities if she were to have a child, she answers “well, how do all women do it? Their mother keeps it at the beginning and then they send it to a kindergarten...”. Anna’s answer also points to a gap in the provision of social reproduction in the form of childcare for babies by the state whereby few public childcare facilities exist for this type of childcare (i.e. before kindergarten age). This corresponds with EU policies stating that “member states should provide childcare for 90% of children between three years old and mandatory school age” (Stratigaki, 2004, p. 49). However, in Europe, on average, states provide childcare in public or publicly subsidized facilities for less than 10% of children under three years old (Jappens and Van Bavel, 2012). The relationship between low availability of such childcare in Greece and increased grandparental responsibility for childcare is confirmed in studies that link the lack of childcare facilities and grandparental childcare in a European context (Jappens and Van Bavel, 2012).

For participants, help from grandmothers in childcare includes cooking; looking after young children when the mother is at work; taking babies on walks; taking children to and from school and
various after-school activities; and providing emotional support. Activities such as cleaning the house, taking the kids to the doctor, going to the supermarket and dealing with public services and banks are rarely cited as social reproductive activities that are outsourced to grandmothers. So it is only certain aspects of childcare that are outsourced to grandmothers in this study.

Family bonds tend to be strong in Greek families and it is commonly perceived that the grandmother is ‘twice the mother to the child’. Indeed many of the participants prefer to rely on grandparents for childcare because they consider them as more trustworthy and more able to provide a safe and nurturing environment for their child than market solutions would. This was also found to be the case in a cross-country study where grandparents in traditional families were “more positively inclined to help out in childcare duties” because parents were less inclined to using public day-care (Aassve et al., 2012, p. 56). Other research however points to how grandparents who look after children are influenced by childcare policies favouring mothers’ employment and in Northern European countries this accounts for a higher probability that grandparents will help with childcare (Hank and Buber, 2009). This same research shows that Mediterranean grandparents who do choose to help with childcare do so on a more regular and intensive basis which suggests that in familistic welfare systems such as the Greek system, grandparents act as a more permanent solution for childcare rather than as temporary solution as it is in Northern European countries.

Whilst increasing numbers of women are joining the workforce and state policies have raised female pension ages from 55 to 67, thus limiting resources in terms of unpaid help from grandmothers, many families in Greece still heavily rely on ‘grandma power’, especially in more rural locations where the extended family lives in close geographical proximity (Lyberaki, 2011). For many tourism entrepreneurs who live far from their hometowns, this type of outsourcing is undertaken on a seasonal basis when their parents or in-laws visit, as is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8.5.

Despite grandparental childcare being considered the norm, it is interesting to observe that outsourcing childcare produces feelings of guilt in some of the participants. Battling internally, women feel guilty for not adhering to ideals of good mothering by choosing to spend their time working in order to provide economically for their children. At the same time however, societal norms that dictate mothers to be prime care-givers, come into conflict with the motherhood ideals of providing economically for their children. Hence, female participants feel they are blamed for any problems their children may encounter, such as Flora who says her children made “bad friends” because she was working instead of being at home looking after them. This guilty feeling speaks to how women are blamed for letting their children run loose whilst working in tourism, and thus are blamed for creating a general feeling of decline in family values because of their involvement in
tourism work (Ferguson, 2010b). Cupples (2005) also speaks about the guilt female entrepreneurs feel, but in the context of post-revolutionary Nicaragua this guilt is primarily felt by women who are unable to provide economically for their children, rather than by women who spend time away from the children. Hence, Cupples' (2005) study indicates how the context within which female entrepreneurs are situated plays a significant role when considering how childcare is distributed. So even though grandparental childcare is generally accepted as a good solution, a complex situation arises where by female participants who have internalised gendered responsibilities for childcare also simultaneously try to adhere to neoliberal ideals of providing economically for their children which produces two conflicting images of how an ‘ideal mother’ should behave.

7.2.3.3 Motherhood ideals and childcare

Ideals surrounding motherhood are strongly related to childcare practices and are maintained by various forms of societal pressures and market forces. This is illustrated by the emergence of ‘transnational motherhoods’ whereby female migrants perform childcare for other people’s families but simultaneously have intense feelings of guilt for leaving their own children back in their home country to be cared for by others (Arat-Koc, 2006, p. 78). Women, such as the female tourism workers in Ferguson’s (2010b) study, are encouraged to enter the labour market by various tourism development programs, but are also expected to continue to adhere to ‘good mothering’ practices by taking full responsibility for childcare and are then blamed for “disintegration of the family” (p. 875) when familial structures change. The perceptions concerning what a ‘good’ mother should do are seen in Kostis’ words who blames the mothers for “working too hard and not having time to talk to their daughters and guide them – but only cook and make money and think that is enough!”.

Kostis’ words illustrate in a nutshell the antithesis between capitalist ideals of social provision and cultural ideals of women’s contribution to social provisioning and how women are found at the nexus of these contradicting forces. Ferguson (2010b) also finds that male participants in her study think children have “lots of possessions but no family atmosphere” (p. 874) which she attributes to gendered mothering roles. The contradicting forces created from engaging in entrepreneurship and adhering to mothering ideals can act as transforming agents which promote negotiations of masculinities and femininities as Cupples (2005) finds in her study in Nicaragua where women negotiate gender roles by being “simultaneously complicit and resistant to neoliberalism” (p. 320).

According to Kostis, women are failing to complete their gendered social reproductive role because they have ignored the intangible aspects of social reproduction, such as guidance services. These intangible aspects of social reproduction form the fabric of relations between parent and child and when women do not provide them to their children, Kostis assumes them to be inadequate mothers. Viewing mothering requirements historically, in the last decade women are expected to
adhere to ideals of what Fox (2006) calls “intensive mothering” (p. 237) which involve high expenditures of physical, emotional and economic resources on children. According to Fox (2006), this rise in expectations of modern mothers is significant in the reproduction of gendered practices, as it sustains embedded perceptions regarding women prioritising childcare which involves increased amounts of time being devoted to childcare rather than for example personal time or working. From a feminist perspective, this intensification of mothering keeps women in the home and out of the labour market. Similarly, in Greece, motherhood is governed by patterns of ‘intensive mothering’ which I witnessed in many of the participants’ households and creates inflated expectations regarding childcare both in material terms but also in terms of intangible social reproductive elements, such as the ones mentioned by Kostis. Whilst intangible elements of social reproduction are mentioned by various authors (Bakker and Silvey, 2008a, Bezanson and Luxton, 2006b) as being essential parts of social reproductive activities, few studies have addressed these elements specifically. However the lack of intangible elements such as love, guidance, empathy and building one’s self-confidence, becomes evident when looking at how social reproduction is marketised which is characterised by an absence of social reproduction’s intangible elements.

7.3 Social reproduction ‘for sale’

A small proportion of participants choose marketised solutions for the distribution of social reproduction activities. These participants employ people to perform various household activities such as cleaning their house and ironing. Since the 1990s, the social reproduction activities of cleaning and ironing have become highly marketised in Greece, fuelled by state policies encouraging women to enter the labour market and a high influx of migrants initially from the Philippines and then from Albania, Romania, Bulgaria and other East European countries (Vaiou, 2006). In fact employing immigrant labour to help with domestic chores constituted a status symbol for many Greek families and this showing-off has only now subsided as a result of the economic crisis (Lazaridis, 2003). Whilst the introduction of marketised care work undertaken by immigrants offered women the opportunity to engage in paid work outside the house, as Lyberaki (2011) stresses, this did not result in greater gender equality as the social reproductive activities of caring remain feminised. Furthermore, although the actual transfer of care services to the market puts a price on these activities, thus making caring visible in terms of economic value, care services continue to be performed by female domestic helpers and the responsibility for dealing with domestic help arrangements is a woman’s (Kilkey and Perrons, 2010). A similar pattern is observed amongst this

---

32 There was a 50% increase in female labour participation in the period 1980 – 2008 (Lyberaki, 2011)
33 In the 1990s the influx of migrants to Greece was estimated to be around one million (Lazaridis, 2003)
study’s participants with the women organising the times and days that the domestic helper comes, arranging payment and deciding on whether they should continue employing the same person or not. As Frosso says about the lady she hires to clean the rooms that she rents out “I will tell the girl who cleans when to come, I arrange her payment...”.

Where this study’s participants differed from what Lyberaki (2011) calls the ‘typical’ employer of migrant domestic help is that participants only delegate household tasks (mainly cleaning) and not childcare or eldercare to migrants. For example George and Marinki, used to hire a person to clean their house and shop every couple of weeks, but delegated childcare to their parents. Liana who has a young baby ‘brings a girl every 15th of the month’ to clean the house but relies on her parents for childcare. This perception of external, marketised help in childcare not being preferable, relates to my previous focus on why there is a high incidence of grandparental childcare in Greece. The cultural element present in this decision not to outsource childcare is illustrated in other research such as that by Tucker and Boonabaana (2011) where female entrepreneurs in Mukono parish have no qualms about “hiring a maid” (p.12) to take care of their children.

Whilst the concept of having ‘a girl’ to help out with cleaning activities is very much accepted by some participants, Ioanna is very much against getting any sort of domestic help saying ‘Never, never would I get a girl for the house. No, no. I don’t like it, I want to do everything myself. I don’t like putting a foreign person into my house’. Ioanna, a migrant herself from Albania, shows a resistance to the marketization of social reproduction, despite often lamenting during our interactions how she only has Sunday evening to do household jobs and she ‘cannot do anything else about it. UNFORTUNATELY’. In Ioanna’s case, although she recognises that she has limited time and there are opportunities to outsource household tasks, she is against looking towards the market for a solution. She explains this refusal to employ paid help as being because she does not trust a person to come into the private space of her home explaining that a friend of hers who employs domestic help, often finds that household items have gone missing. As Ioanna is one of the few participants who says that household tasks within her family are distributed without much gendering, which she attributes to the fact that both her and her husband work in tourism, this distrust in marketised solutions may indicate that she has internalised concepts of outsiders ‘polluting’ the family environment which is a concept Dubisch (1993) uses in her analysis of Greek women.

---

34 By saying we get ‘a girl’ to clean the house, this does not mean the paid help is young in age, it is just a way of naming domestic help, which is perhaps slightly demeaning.
Similarly, Frosso’s husband also resists having domestic help within their house as he ‘
doesn’t like an outsider (‘xenos’35)’ coming into their house, which Frosso attributes to him being ‘a bit conservative in this respect’. Kostis also refers to the concept of ‘outsiders’’ inability to care for children, saying that “lots of psychological problems for kids growing up will occur when they are left with outsiders”. Marketization of social reproduction is made possible only by a change in social perceptions regarding allowing outsiders into one’s house to take over what is perceived as a feminine task. The participants who reject a market solution for social reproductive activities may have internalised gendered perceptions of caring and in particular cleaning and childcare being a female family member’s job and are thus considered as more ‘conservative’ in their ideas. However elements such as availability of suitable external, paid childcare help in rural areas should also be taken into consideration when conceptualising how gender infiltrates working women’s decisions of ‘to hire or not to hire?’ help with childcare.

The idea of women allowing ‘polluting’ elements into their house is closely related to concepts of shame and honour covered by various authors (Tucker, 2007, Dubisch, 1993), according to which, women should be confined to the house and not allow things into the street, such as gossip for example. By letting someone come into one’s house, the likelihood for gossip to exist increases since the outsider can see all of one’s most private spaces. This may be the reason why the more ‘conservative’ participants are adverse to turn to the market to cover their need for social reproductive activities. Gossip, according to Pietila (2007), is a way of establishing and negotiating what constitutes moral behaviour. Furthermore by people “both fearing and perpetuating gossip” (p. 14) gender relations can be negotiated or confirmed (Tucker and Boonabaana, 2011). Many Greek women, especially in urban centres such as Athens, have become quite accustomed to hiring help with cleaning activities where social pressures to adhere to traditional narratives of femininity are diminished because they do not fear being gossiped about or as Maria says, one is “away from the pressure of ‘what the community thinks of you’”. This difference between urban and rural attitudes presents an example of how patterns of social reproduction are shaped by and also shape social structures as also discussed by Bakker and Silvey (2008b).

7.3.1 Children’s marketised education

On the subject of marketization of social reproductive activities, I now focus on children’s education. In education, as in many social reproductive activities, gender plays a key role, with the responsibility for children’s education being allocated mainly to women. This allocation originates in

35 ‘xenos’ or ‘ksenos’ in Greek signifies the foreigner, stranger, non-villager, non-relative, an outsider. Dubisch (1993) expands on this notion in detail in her work on Tinos island where she talks about how women maintain household boundaries based on this concept.
the industrialisation era when women took on increasing responsibility for educating and training children but the allocation is also affected by socio-cultural factors (LeBaron, 2010).

Although education up to and including university level is provided for free by Greek state schools and universities, there is a certain amount of gendering in this social reproductive task, with women often taking responsibility for their children’s academic success (Antonopoulou et al., 2010). In Greece, it is very common for the mother to ‘diavazi’ (‘study’ in Greek) the children, which translates into the mother sitting with her children monitoring them studying and often encouraging memorisation of their work or actively marking work they have completed. Evidence of this is found in how DarkK mentions how much she has learnt about Greek history because of sitting with her son to help him study. Frosso also mentions how she is responsible for her children’s education by saying that ‘until 10th grade I ‘studied’ the children’. Frosso indicates how this is a gendered activity by saying “he (her husband) was not involved at all [in ‘studying’ the children]”.

Stemming from a lack of publicly available after-school help e.g. with homework, Greek mothers have stepped in to fill the gap in state-provided educational social reproduction. When mothers cannot help due to an inadequate level of education or lack of time, there is a market solution in the form of a booming private education industry in Greece. Multitudes of ‘frondistiria’ (a Greek term which literally translates into ‘care-houses’) offer a privatised solution to this educational social reproduction need. Referred to globally as the ‘shadow education’, various forms of private after-school tutoring exist throughout the world and are described in Bray’s (2010) article. These marketised forms of education include private tutoring on a one-to-one basis which is also very popular in Greece, indicating how social reproduction privatisation takes many forms depending on the cultural and economic context. In fact, for some mothers in Greece spending vast amounts of money on private lessons became something of a prestige thing, as Giota notes that “mothers bragged about how much they paid on “idietera” (private one-to-one tutoring) before the economic crisis”. This excessive behaviour may be linked to what Davies (2004) calls “intensive education” (p. 238) whereby parents put a premium value on their children’s education. Intensification of parenting demands regarding children's education maybe linked to the “intensive mothering” (Fox, 2006, p. 237) regimes that mothers are now expected to adhere to whereby the child is almost ‘over-cared’ for.

DarkK who ‘didn’t manage too well with studying’ also resorts to this type of privatised social reproduction as she hires a person to help her elder son with his homework. She says this with a

36 Indicative of the high number of ‘frondistiria’ is the exceptionally high number of university graduates who are employed there – 30% of all graduates, according to a 2012 study (Vagionis, 2012)
certain amount of regret, as though she would have liked to be educated in order to be able to carry out the task of ‘studying’ her children without having to hire someone, thus showing that she is a good housewife who is independent and has everything under control. Greek women derive a sense of pride from being able to adhere to feminine roles of homemakers by being in control within the house, whereas inability to do so is considered a woman’s shortcoming (Kyriazis, 1998, Dimen, 1983).

That DarkK feels guilty of not being able to provide this service to her children is related to the adherence to ideals of motherhood which are very much culturally constructed. Ideals of motherhood surrounding providing support with children’s education are nurtured by policies aimed at creating a work-family balance, as discussed by Budig, Misra and Boeckmann (2012) who posit that culture and policies work together to reinforce or weaken gendered norms regarding how women distribute their time between work and social reproductive tasks.

Ioanna expresses her involvement in her son’s education by relaying to me her great disappointment that her son did not achieve the grades he needed to qualify for medical school in Greece by saying “we will not take the Panellinies again”. Putting herself in the exam seat by implying that they initially took the exams as a unit “we” (her and her son), Ioanna indicates her deep involvement in her son’s education. In subsequent conversations she expresses her guilt at not doing enough to help him find a university which she blames on the lack of time because of her involvement in tourism entrepreneurship. Frosso, whose daughter is to sit exams next year, also mentions how she will strive to stay at home more during the winter when the shop is closed, in order to ‘help’ her daughter study, despite this limiting her pursuit of activities such as foreign language study and jewellery-making courses that she had engaged in during previous years.

The idea that monitoring a child’s education is a feminine task is also echoed in Katerina’s sentiments as she also feels guilty about not being able to ‘study’ her daughters as she left school at twelve years old and hence her education level is low. In an attempt to make up for her perceived ‘short-coming’ Katerina points out that she educates her daughters by training them in household tasks, pottery-making and in learning how the shop runs. As she says:

I encourage my daughters to stay in school. I feel guilty that I cannot help them. But in the summer I want them to come to the shop and help with clients, learn how to pot as they may need the skill in the future.

Ioanna expresses her involvement in her son’s education by relaying to me her great disappointment that her son did not achieve the grades he needed to qualify for medical school in Greece by saying “we will not take the Panellinies again”. Putting herself in the exam seat by implying that they initially took the exams as a unit “we” (her and her son), Ioanna indicates her deep involvement in her son’s education. In subsequent conversations she expresses her guilt at not doing enough to help him find a university which she blames on the lack of time because of her involvement in tourism entrepreneurship. Frosso, whose daughter is to sit exams next year, also mentions how she will strive to stay at home more during the winter when the shop is closed, in order to ‘help’ her daughter study, despite this limiting her pursuit of activities such as foreign language study and jewellery-making courses that she had engaged in during previous years.

The idea that monitoring a child’s education is a feminine task is also echoed in Katerina’s sentiments as she also feels guilty about not being able to ‘study’ her daughters as she left school at twelve years old and hence her education level is low. In an attempt to make up for her perceived ‘short-coming’ Katerina points out that she educates her daughters by training them in household tasks, pottery-making and in learning how the shop runs. As she says:

I encourage my daughters to stay in school. I feel guilty that I cannot help them. But in the summer I want them to come to the shop and help with clients, learn how to pot as they may need the skill in the future.

---
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Whilst Katerina’s lack of formal education may create a certain feeling of inadequacy regarding her adherence to neoliberal ideals of standardised education, she provides her daughters with training both in feminine social reproductive activities and in a way to make their living.

No male participants mention feelings of guilt because they cannot ‘study’ their children. In fact they do not mention participating in the activity of ‘studying’ their children at all, indicating a gendering of this childcare responsibility. As shall be discussed in the next subsection, male participation in the completion of social reproduction tasks is limited to what are considered ‘manly’ tasks such as paying bills, repairing things and going to the bank with few exceptions. It is however through these exceptions that a notion can be gained of how the gendered landscape of social reproduction is altering.

7.4 Men’s role in the distribution of social reproduction

Continuing to analyse the distribution of social reproduction, I now turn to the role men play in this distribution. The relationship of masculinity to men’s participation in household work has been referred to within much gender and development work. For example Kabeer’s (2007) work that focuses on the relationship of class to men taking on more social reproduction tasks, suggests that men of a lower economic standing participate more in household tasks, as for example a Cambodian male participant says he helps in the household to maintain his title of ‘head of the household’. However, this is perhaps an exception to the rule as seen in literature such as Adams and Coltrane’s (2005) work that observes how men justify their lack of involvement in social reproductive activities as being because they feel they must primarily adhere to breadwinner roles. Studies, such as Mannon’s (2006) work, explain the reasons for unemployed men’s non-participation in household work as being because men want to adhere to a breadwinner-related version of masculinity. Other literature focuses on investigating how men’s masculinities are played out in relation to the ‘breadwinner’ construct referred to in much feminist literature which bases a man’s worth on his ability to provide financially for his family. An example is Hoang and Yeoh’s (2011) focus on how Vietnamese men whose wives have emigrated, negotiate their ‘breadwinner’ image with their new role as primary care-giver. Men in Hoang and Yeoh’s study have mixed responses, some increasing the hours worked and others decreasing their work hours in order to spend more time with their children, indicating the complexity of lived gender relations. However, there are limited studies focusing on how masculinities are expressed in relation to participation in social reproduction activities that are considered as feminised ‘household tasks’, such as cooking, cleaning and childcare.
(rather than in relation to their ‘breadwinner image’) and how this is related to what Federici (2012) terms the “reorganisation of social reproduction” (p. 46) which I address next.

For the majority of male participants or male partners of female participants, social reproductive tasks are related to jobs outside the house, for example paying bills, going to the supermarket or taking the children to the doctor. Whilst single men like Daniel and Kostis undertake a larger variety of social reproductive activities, the majority of men in this study who are in partnerships with women adhere to gendered assumptions regarding what tasks they undertake. Kostis who is single, cooks and cleans for himself on a daily basis and says this attitude was present even when he was married as he would help his wife (who worked as a judge), to iron the clothes, wash-up and cook. He explains his approach to participating in household tasks as being because he felt sorry for his mother who “used to get tired and complain about her back hurting” as his mother used to do all the cooking, cleaning, looking after the kids and making their clothes, in addition to working in the fields. Single men’s difference in mentality regarding the gendering of household tasks stems from the need to change their perceptions in order to survive and the subsequent realisation of the value and time the tasks take, as also found in studies on single men who are left to ‘mother’ their children (Risman, 1986).

Single male participants in this study also depend on external help for the completion of social reproductive tasks. For example, Daniel cleans his house, washes his clothes by hand and usually cooks but he rarely goes shopping relying on neighbours to bring him vegetables and fruit from their gardens and even occasionally bring plates of cooked food. Kostis similarly often gets help from his sister and grandmother with ‘feminised’ tasks such as washing-up and cooking. On an occasion when a group of us ate together at his house and I offered to wash the plates, he said “don’t worry, my sister or my mother will do them”, which indicates how kin helps a single man with social reproductive tasks (Papataxiarhis and Loizos, 1992). Similarly, in Lazaridis’ (2009) study, single men with elderly parents are not expected to care for them and it is “permissible” (p. 166) for the men to pay for care, an act for which women would be despised for doing. Although there is limited literature on how single men deal with social reproductive tasks and how their attitudes regarding gendered social reproductive tasks may be different from married men’s attitudes, there is an indication that gendered assumptions persist even for single men. This is hinted at in a study measuring expenditures in terms of time allocated to domestic tasks, which were found to be higher for single women than for single men, indicating that domestic work is gendered even amongst single people (de Ruijter et al., 2005).
Returning to the men who are in partnerships with women, only a few of them undertook daily cooking and cleaning activities. Anetta who lives in an isolated village in Northern Greece where more stereotyped ideas regarding gendered social reproduction activities exist, mentions how it would actually be an insult for a man to be caught performing what are considered as feminine social reproductive tasks in her community. She says:

\[\text{It was strictly forbidden for men to push a pram or contribute to womanly tasks, they had it as an insult. If someone washed a carpet, he did it in secret. Some men did it because they respected the woman’s tiredness, but at night so that no neighbour realised that he was doing this job.}\\
\]

Whilst Anetta says that this is how things used to be in the 1970s when she was young, traces of this attitude persist. Indeed my asking if men undertook tasks such as cleaning caused an amount of amusement in some participants, as Katerina says giggling: “The father of my daughters is not the guy who would hang out clothes...hahahah...I am laughing because I can’t imagine him hanging up clothes!”. This nervous giggling points to an internalised perception that hanging out clothes is not a masculine activity, which is held by couples adhering to more stereotyped narratives of femininity/masculinity such as Katerina and her husband.

For less ‘traditional’ couples, such as Giorgos and Mariniki, male involvement in feminised social reproductive tasks is on a helping basis. As Marinki says “in times of pressure, he (George) will put the washing machine on, hang out clothes, when in need. He isn’t traditional.” Ioanna’s husband also helps her with what she conceives as feminine social reproductive duties when there is no alternative, indicated in her saying: “a lot of times I’ll tell my husband to hang out the clothes when we get back at night. What can I do?” . This shows that although it is becoming more socially acceptable for men to do these feminised jobs, indicated by the fact that the women have no qualms about telling me about their husbands’ involvement in them, it is still only acceptable for men to take a ‘helping role’ rather than a primary care-giver role. With regards to other social reproductive tasks, both George and Ioanna’s husband take responsibility for social reproductive activities such as paying bills, going to the supermarket and taking the children to the doctor. However, it is interesting that their wives also perceive these activities as “a great help” (Ioanna), indicating that perceptions regarding women’s responsibility for the family’s social reproduction persist. This is illustrated nicely in Katerina’s words: “I made the family, I have to be responsible for the whole thing”. Ferguson (2010b) also refers to the assistant role that men have with household duties saying that whilst female tourism workers’ husbands in her study help their wives, they are not involved in housework “in any substantive manner” (p. 881). However when comparing the attitudes of the ‘helping
husbands’ to those that do not help at all, like for example DarkK’s husband who “does nothing, I do everything”, (DarkK, interview) a slight change in gender roles seems to be occurring.

When talking to female participants about their male partners’ involvement in social reproductive activities, many women perceive men as being incapable of performing social reproduction tasks within the household. Lazaridis (2009) also found this to be the case in her study of Cretan female handicraft entrepreneurs, explaining this perception of men being “unwilling or unable to perform domestic tasks” (p. 56) as being because they would be ridiculed by their peers. The ways in which participants express their perceptions of men’s incapability to be involved in household tasks are manifested in various ways. DarkK for example, believes that men lack the organisational skills required to complete the myriad of social reproduction tasks which women complete on a daily basis, indicated by her saying: “a man does not have such organisation (in order to be able to combine work and household responsibilities)”. Anthoula also believes that men are mildly incapable of performing social reproduction duties by saying “Women know what to buy, what to cook, what do men know?”. Anna also thinks that men are incapable of taking on social reproduction activities, saying “men just can’t manage (to do household tasks) – they can only work and don’t do anything else”. By expressing the idea that men are unable to complete social reproduction tasks, female participants reinforce stereotypes absolving masculine responsibility for social reproduction as well as simultaneously excluding the men from what the women consider their domain of responsibility (Salamone and Stanton, 1986). Daniel’s comment on how women exclude men from the household and claim ownership of the household, is relevant and entertaining: “They kick-out their husbands for external jobs. And when the stud comes back into HIS house, he isn’t a stud anymore, his wife is in charge”.

Female participants’ active disempowerment of men in the household arena may be related to the consequent empowerment women feel from being in control of the family’s wellbeing in a ‘familistic’ (Pinto and Coltrane, 2013, p. 43) culture which prioritises the advancement of the family rather than self, common in both Greek and Latino cultures (Papadopoulos and Roumpakis, 2009, Pinto and Coltrane, 2013). However, attitudes regarding the idea that women are empowered by being in charge of the house seem to be changing. It is still considered important for a woman to be a good housewife, as indicated by participants’ references to how engaging in household duties is the ‘correct’ way of being. Katerina for example, mentions how she tries to be “correct in the house” by keeping the house clean, having food ready for her husband, washing and ironing clothes, etc., however, other female participants view housework more as a burden. Many of the female participants talk openly about how they get tired from doing housework, for example Mariniki who says “If you mean do I get exhausted from the household tasks, yes I do” and this admission itself is
indication of the increased visibility that household tasks are gaining, because since a woman is getting tired it means that she is working. This is in opposition to previous generations when as Anetta says women “were heroes – they did everything and couldn’t complain”. Similarly, now women are challenging the concept of men not being able to do housework, by saying that they believe men have been socially conditioned to “find things ready” as Dina says. By making their work visible both via vocalising the effort it takes to complete household tasks and by attacking the perception that men are unable to do housework, female participants question the notion that social reproduction tasks are gendered. The change in gendered roles is gradual, as these negotiations cause tension which can be seen in various studies on female entrepreneurs (Ferguson, 2010b, Pinto and Coltrane, 2013), but the fact that women are speaking out about their partners’ lack of involvement in household work, e.g. DarkK saying that her husband “lies on his back, doing nothing, like Ali Pasas” when asked about who does the household tasks in her house, is a step towards negotiating gendered social reproduction norms indirectly, without creating tension within the family.

Whilst most participants attribute this gendered distribution of social reproductive activities as being something of the past with many participants noting that in previous generations things were much more gendered and now “things have improved a bit” (Mariniki, interview), some participants feel this gendering is unique to their community. Hara takes the reproduction of gendered attitudes to a national level, presenting the reason that women in other countries adhere less to gendered responsibilities for household tasks than Greek women is because they do less housework, saying

I believe that in other countries household jobs are just not being completed – Greek women are much better housekeepers than every other nationality. I have lived with foreign girls and they don’t understand cleanliness like we do.

Whilst this represents a certain amount of nationalistic pride in Greek women being the best housewives, at the same time it indicates how important it is for Hara to be considered proficient in household tasks which is manifested in an obsession with cleanliness, which Stamiris (1986) refers to as being part of a “domestication fetish” (p. 3) among Greek women.

For some participants this gendering of social reproduction is perceived as a local attribute, as Dina from the cooperative ladies in Northern Greece says “here in Epirus the man is a Pasas, he would always wait for the woman to bring water to the table”. However, participants in Crete also

38 Ali Pasas was the Ottoman ruler of Ioannina during Greece’s occupation by the Ottoman empire. Comparing someone to Ali Pasas in modern Greek has come to mean someone who has everything done for them and sits around a lot doing nothing.
39 Pasas again refers to Ali Pasas.
point out that this is the case in Crete, like Mariniki who says that her father “would not drink if you did not serve him water. It was a terrible situation. If my mother was away at work I would have to wake up early to make his coffee”, but things are different within her own family. Frosso’s husband also mentions how his Cretan father expected absolute servility from his wife, but as Frosso’s husbands adds, with a note of melancholy, “things are not like that anymore”. So maybe the gradual changes in gendered constructions of social reproduction activities are more dependent on generational changes rather than the regional differences addressed in this study. As Daniel says about his mother and household tasks “that was another generation – that was her job and she didn’t want to share it with anyone!”, indicating how his mother took full responsibility for all household tasks, an attitude that few female participants have. It is important to reiterate here, that as discussed in Chapter 5, literature on the current state of gender roles related to social reproduction in Greece is missing and hence it is difficult to present other literature here relating to current gender roles in rural Greece (Herzfeld, 1991b, Dubisch, 1986a, Dubisch, 1993, Loizos, 1991).

Building on the theme that the gendering of social reproductive activities is changing from generation to generation, some of the younger male participants hint that a more equal distribution of household tasks is becoming acceptable. For example, Manolis says that he and his wife do “everything together – the clothes-washing, the dish-washing, hanging out clothes, putting the babies to sleep, changing the babies, everything”. He refers to the idea that social reproduction tasks are gendered as being “another era – now these things [the distinction between what a man does and what a woman does within the home] have been surpassed”. However, some female participants have a different perception of the change in distribution of social reproductive activities, such as Hara, a young female silversmith-maker in Rethymno who is ambivalent regarding the extent to which things have changed. Whilst she recognises that she can ask much more from her partner in terms of doing household tasks than her mother did, she still believes that the majority of social reproduction tasks are a woman’s responsibility, as she says to me: “you know, every woman knows that she has these things (household tasks) to do”. Assumptions regarding how gender roles related to social reproduction are changing from generation to generation and are themselves gendered, with men perceiving a greater change occurring than women do. This may be linked to men’s realisation of how much work is actually involved in women’s invisible roles as housekeepers.

Generational changes also extend to children’s roles in social reproduction, which is especially significant to discuss in the context of tourism entrepreneurship which places pressure on children to take up the domestic slack that is left by their absent parents. Whilst female children have historically been involved in social reproductive tasks within Greek families, this study’s participants
indicate that a gradual change in the gendering of these activities is occurring with boys as well as girls being expected to participate in household tasks.

7.5 Children’s role in social reproduction distribution

Including children within political analyses, such as the current one, has been largely absent from political economy literature, for the reasons discussed in Section 2.2.5. What the current analysis hence attempts to do is to represent the ways in which children operate as socio-economic actors within tourism handicraft entrepreneurship. More specifically and in keeping with this study’s research question of ‘what is the relationship between gender roles and handicraft tourism entrepreneurship?’ I explore how participants’ children’s gender roles alter by their participation in productive and social reproductive activities.

Much research on children’s caring roles has focused largely on cases where the child is left in charge of household activities because of a family tragedy, for example Evans’ (2010) review of children’s involvement in family care work in families affected by chronic illness and disabilities in Sub-Saharan Africa. However, less has been written on children’s roles where children are required to input into the family’s social reproduction because of their parents’ involvement in tourism. More specifically, I focus on how gender roles are constituted and transformed via children’s involvement in social reproduction by initially considering their involvement in social reproduction.

The tourism handicraft entrepreneurs’ children are very important for the completion of social reproduction tasks within the family. Whilst when they are very young, they themselves constitute a major social reproduction task, via their need to be cared for, when they get to an age (e.g. twelve years old) when they can help with social reproduction tasks, they become vital to the family’s survival. Although there is recognition of children’s role in the productive economy from various studies within social science and geography literature that focus on ‘working children’ such as Robson’s (2004) analysis of the gendered negotiations taking place in Nigeria among children who work assisting women communicate with the outside world in a highly segregated community, there has been considerably less attention to them as actors within the social reproductive sphere. Consequently, although children have been marginalised in much political economy literature, by being conceptualised as being the victims of whatever the system throws at them, Kunz (2010) finds that they are increasingly contributing to the restructuring of social reproduction by becoming “nannies, workers, protectors and much more” (p. 928). Within the context of children that migrant parents have left behind in Mexico, the children in Kunz’s study take on social reproductive roles in
the presence of neoliberal state programs that aim at responsibilisation of citizens for social reproduction. Similarly, in the context of tourism, participants’ children take on an increased burden of social reproductive work as their parents are away from the house for very long hours.

Whilst the concept of children as carers comes into opposition with commonly accepted models of childhood (United Nations Human Rights, 1989) as a care-free time when children are cared for by their parents, spending most their time in pursuit of education and recreation (Ansell, 2005, Katz, 2004), in the current study, tourism acts as a transformatory agent regarding children’s roles in social reproduction distribution. In reference to this, many of the tourism entrepreneur-participants in the current study note that their children are involved in the re-distribution of social reproductive tasks during the touristic period. As Ioanna notes, now that her children are older, they take on social reproduction duties such as cleaning and cooking, as both her and her husband work all day managing their two handicraft shops and as she says her “children try to fill in this gap”. Her children, an 18-year old boy and a 13 year old girl share tasks such as dusting, putting ironed clothes away, cleaning the floor and cooking “simple things, you know, like pizza, that’s what they like!”.

Just like Ioanna who makes no distinction between which of her children does which social reproductive task, Frosso also says how both her children (male and female) help with household tasks, as she refers to their role in helping collectively saying “now the children help”.

Looking at other participants however, a difference is observed in conceptualisations of what social reproductive tasks are ‘suitable’ for boys and what for girls. Whilst Ioanna and Frosso perceive no difference between male and female children when allocating social reproductive tasks, for other female entrepreneurs, such as Katerina and DarkK, who adhere to more stereotypical narratives of femininity, social reproductive tasks that children are encouraged to complete are far more gendered. Katerina who has two teenage daughters says she has trained them “in cleanliness – now when they see something untidy they think ‘a, that has to be fixed’” and they help her complete household tasks which she is unable to do because she is working, such as cooking, cleaning, washing plates, mopping the floor and washing clothes. For Katerina, the notion that boys should also be helping with the same type of social reproductive tasks is an unfamiliar concept, as she says:

*There are boys that do (household) jobs... they exist...I don’t know if I had boys if I would have taught them to do (household) jobs...here in the village it isn’t the same as the cities, they have the mentality that girls do the (household) jobs and the boys do the outside jobs more.*

Similarly, DarkK says that her husband and sons are not involved in household work at all and more specifically regarding cooking she says: “no one else cooks – they don’t even cut salad”.
However the sadness in her expression of this indicates that she would like this gendered mentality
to change. Similarly, Katerina after saying that she is not sure if boys should do household tasks,
seems to have a change of mind saying “if I had boys, I would have taught them to do household
jobs”, indicating the complexity of internal negotiations surrounding gender roles that occur in the
female entrepreneurs’ minds, with the alteration in perception occurring within minutes (i.e. in the
same conversation).

One of the ways in which children’s social reproduction gender roles are formed is by
intergenerational acculturation. Although DarkK attempts to get her sons to help with the daily
household tasks such as washing up plates, she is prevented from doing so by her mother-in-law. One instance of this occurring is when DarkK’s mother-in-law is shocked at DarkK encouraging her
sons to participate in domestic tasks and calls her up in the middle of a busy work day to threaten
her saying: “I’ll break everything you have! Imagine putting the child [the son] to wash the plates!”
This indicates that whilst there are attempts to alter gendered attitudes towards household tasks
from the younger generation, it is the older generation that acts to enforce what they perceive to be
the ‘normal’ way of acting. Kostis also talks to this exclusion of boys from helping within the domestic
sphere by stressing how although he wanted to help his mother when he was young, he “was
forbidden to do so”. These instances exemplify how gendered arrangements within social
reproduction are maintained via children’s socialisation. As children are the vessels via which gender
is ultimately reproduced, a grandmother’s intervention such as the one described above influences
the way in which children then reproduce notions of gendered relations within social reproduction.

Whilst children’s roles as socio-economic actors were not initially the focus of this study,
children’s contributions both on a productive level (e.g. taking care of shop at midday when Frosso
rests) and on a social reproductive level (e.g. Katerina’s daughters completing all the domestic work
whilst their mother worked) was found to be instrumental to the smooth running of most tourism
handicraft entrepreneurs’ households. This significant contribution in terms of labour, which is
largely missed out by political economic analysis of tourism, provides a fascinating avenue to further
investigate children’s role within tourism and thus create more inclusive accounts of tourism
economic relations. Indeed, building on the observations made in this section, policy
recommendations concerning children who operate within tourism are made in Chapter 9, that
promote the consideration of children’s opinions in tourism policies and increase the amount of
gender equity in children’s social reproductive roles as tourism actors.
7.6 Chapter summary

In this chapter, the distribution of social reproduction was analysed in terms of how gender roles and relations contribute to participants’ perceptions of the term and its distribution. Whilst social reproductive tasks such as cleaning, cooking and caring are defined as feminine in nature, it is observed that some masculine tasks such as, for example, paying bills are no longer perceived as being exclusively male tasks. However little cross-over in the opposite direction occurs, except in the case of single males who tend to define social reproductive tasks as including cooking and cleaning. There is also a generational significance in the definition of social reproduction with older female participants including handicrafts in their definition of social reproduction activities, which younger female participants do not mention.

Regarding the distribution of social reproduction activities, most female participants focus on caring being one of their main social reproductive activities, which include childcare, elderly care, cooking and cleaning.Whilst male participants also engage in cooking, they mainly do this on an occasional basis, for example barbequing for their friends, or taking an assistant’s role, which is also reflected in work by Tucker and Boonabaana (2011). Single men often receive assistance in daily meal provision from kin or friends indicating how their local community perpetuates gendered perceptions dictating that cooking on an everyday basis is not a masculine act. Many female entrepreneurs find innovative methods of adhering to gender roles that connect femininity to cooking, by preparing cooked food in two instalments, getting their children to assist or relying on an older female relative to cook.

Some participants highlighted the importance of social reproduction’s emotional aspects such as psychological support, empathy and understanding play in the maintenance of life on a daily basis and intergenerationally. Literature on ‘emotive’ social reproduction is scarce and it is not included in economic analyses mainly because it is intangible and non-quantifiable. However, the significance of ‘emotive’ social reproduction for participants is gauged not only by the participants defining this as part of their daily duties but also by them ‘opting-out’ of marketised help with childcare and elderlycare which lacks these ‘emotive’ elements. In the absence of state alternatives for childcare and elderlycare, the low take-up rates of marketised social reproduction options is also linked to cultural reasons such as lack of trust of outsiders and adherence to gendered caring roles.

Caring for the elderly in Greece is a feminised task with women being looked down upon if they do not take care of elderly family members. In the lack of state provision for elderly-care and in the presence of cultural pressure, most female participants who look after elderly or sick parents do so both because there is no other alternative and also because in this way they feel they are fulfilling
their roles as ‘dutiful daughters’. As Anna, a ‘dutiful daughter’, says, “we don’t allow our mother to do anything at all”.

Children, like the elderly, are dependants that need to be cared for and this type of social reproduction is of prime importance in how participants distribute their time among social reproduction activities. The more religious participants perceive their central role in childcare as being because God chose them for this role as women are more suitable than men because women “can stand much more than a man” (DarkK, interview) which relates to literature on Orthodox religion supporting women’s primary concern to be her family (Du Boulay, 1986). However, state policies also play a role in gendered distributions of childcare indicated by the gap left in the provision of childcare for the very young (i.e. under three years old). In this study, the gap is filled by grandmothers who take care of the children on a daily basis, a solution that for the majority of participants is a given, both because of the lack of alternatives and also because of issues of trust of outsiders.

The subject of outsiders or ‘xenoi’ taking over social reproductive tasks is important in Greek communities as this challenges and inhibits marketization of social reproduction. Childcare and elderly care are rarely distributed outside the family both because participants do not trust outsiders and because of the potential gossip that women may be subjected to if they do not fulfil their feminine roles related to childcare and elderlycare. Some of the more conservative participants strongly oppose hiring help with cleaning even though they can afford it, as they perceive outsiders as ‘polluting’ the house by their presence, despite it being common practise to hire migrant cleaning help in urban centres such as Athens. The concept of hiring a private tutor for children’s social reproductive activity of education is much more accepted, especially when this social reproduction activity cannot be performed by either parent.

Men’s role in the distribution of social reproduction is analysed in terms of their participation in social reproduction activities, which represents a departure from much development literature that analyses gender roles in relation to men’s ‘breadwinner’ image. Taking this approach, men, especially are excluded from various social reproductive tasks such as hanging up clothes, by persisting attitudes concerning men’s unsuitability for this type of activity (Lazaridis, 2009). However, changes in this attitude are observed in younger participants who are more keen to divide tasks equally. In women’s vocalisation of how housework is a burden for them, we see women resisting ideals regarding woman’s primary role as housewife. It is interesting to note that the extent to which social reproduction gender roles are changing, are also gendered, with men perceiving a greater change to be occurring than women do.
Finally, touching on the subject of children’s role within social reproduction, participant’s children are involved in much social reproductive work, even though this contradicts commonly accepted (United Nations Human Rights, 1989) models of childhood as a care-free time when children are cared for by their parents.

Having analysed the various ways in which economic relations within social reproduction are gendered and how participant entrepreneurs express their conceptualisation of how these forces operate, investigation into the negotiations between productive and reproductive economic spheres shall be undertaken next. This shall be done by combining the knowledge produced in Chapter Six, where participant entrepreneurs conceptualise entrepreneurship and hence their positions within the productive economy, with the knowledge produced within this chapter that relates to how participant-entrepreneurs are situated within the social reproductive economy. Blending the two will give a picture of the tourism entrepreneurs’ economic reality by revealing the complexities of how gender operates within the economy.
Chapter Eight

8 Negotiating entrepreneurial and gendered subjectivities

Under the influence of neoliberal capitalism, more and more women are drawn into productive activities, creating tension between the competing time-demanding activities of social reproduction and economic production. As Kunz (2010) points out, as women’s time is not infinitely elastic, this tension leads to a transformation and potential depletion of social reproduction resources in the absence of state provision of social reproduction. This transformation of social reproduction also indicates a transformation in gender roles and relations as the household is a primary site for gender role negotiation (Fenstermaker and West, 2013). In previous chapters I created a picture of how productive and social reproductive elements contribute to what the economy looks and feels like in this study’s context. In the current chapter I consider how hegemonic gendered articulations surrounding work, femininity and masculinity are restructured because of involvement in tourism entrepreneurship.

Whilst social reproduction gender roles and relations are influenced by various factors such as religion, culture, the market and state policies, as discussed in Chapter Two and analysed in Chapter Seven, what I shall be focusing on in this chapter is the relationship between entrepreneurship involvement and social reproduction gender roles within the politico-economic and socio-cultural context of Greek tourism handicraft entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurship involvement represents what mainstream economists term as the ‘productive’ economy and social reproduction involvement represents the ‘reproductive’ economy. However, as Cameron and Gibson-Graham (2003) point out in their article on envisioning alternative economies, viewing these two entities as separate from each other serves to lock in the subordinate of market/masculine vs. household/feminised. Viewing the ‘productive’ and ‘reproductive’ economies as discursive constructs instead of distinct parts of the economy, I investigate how these constructs contribute to the transformation of social processes such as gender roles and relations on a more inclusive basis, acknowledging all “who produce, appropriate, distribute and consume in society” (Cameron and Gibson-Graham, 2003, p. 153). So, rather than looking at the effect of one ‘part’ of the economy or the other, I shall look at the relationship between these fluid constructs by analysing how participation in gendered discourses surrounding ‘tourism handicraft entrepreneurship’ and ‘social reproduction’ is related to gender roles and relations.
8.1 Gender role negotiations

Having introduced the feminist economic theory that guides the analysis in Chapter Two, I continue with a description of how gender is perceived and more specifically how gender negotiations are defined in this study. By delving into how participants attempt and/or succeed to disrupt social reproduction patterns and what role their involvement in entrepreneurship plays in these negotiations, my aim is to give a more complete picture of how gender roles and relations are played out in the context of this study. Hence by looking at how gender creates social order dynamics (rather than gender being a property people have), I analyse the “interactional scaffolding of social structures and the social processes that sustain it” (Fenstermaker and West, 2013, p. 23) by looking at how participants negotiate and recreate images of masculinity/femininity and conceptualisations of tourism entrepreneurship.

Negotiations of social reproduction activities (which include caring activities), are particularly significant in analyses of gender as the household is considered a prime site for the enactment and negotiations of gender (Forstner, 2012, Fenstermaker and West, 2013). However, because family members are restricted from bargaining too hard out of fear that they may harm the family unit, changes in gender roles are very gradual. Negotiations often need to be undertaken over generations in order to ultimately result in gender role metamorphoses (Legerski and Cornwall, 2010). Indeed, in this study, this is vocalised by participants who feel that a change in the distribution of social reproduction has occurred since their parents’ time. Whilst dialogues can also be thought of as a way of negotiating, negotiations of gender roles are mainly conceptualised as the ways in which participants express performances of gender roles, as internalised negotiations such as thoughts and wishes. These internalised negotiations are products of gendered familial interactions that have originated from dialogues with kin, neighbours, children and partners.

As intra-household negotiations are in a continuous process of renegotiation, very subtle changes occur over a long time period, making it difficult to readily identify the negotiations which lead to the new arrangements becoming the status quo. In order to identify these processes of negotiation and renegotiation I reveal the gendered actions used to sustain and erode conceptions of gendered social reproduction roles and use participants’ parents’ gender role perceptions to investigate how perceptions change over time. Indicatively, the fact that most female participants feel that they are ‘better off’ with regards to social reproduction pressures than their mothers were (and men feel ‘worse off’ than their fathers were!), is an indication that a certain degree of negotiation has occurred over generations, in the current study.
Hence, the first part of this chapter is dedicated to discussing the ways in which participants negotiate their roles as entrepreneurs and carers, mothers, fathers, husbands or wives. Whilst when looking for negotiations during my fieldwork I expected more vocal or ‘live’ negotiations to take place between family members, this was not the case. This was partly because I rarely met the husbands as they were also working and the children were often absent when the mother was there. On the few occasions that I did interview couples together, although there was some mild disagreement regarding the distribution of social reproduction, they did not display their full emotions to me, perhaps because I was a stranger and they didn’t want to air their ‘en oiko’ (Greek for ‘in house’) matters, in public. This idea of not allowing private matters outside the house where it can become transformed into something “dirty” (Dubisch, 1986a, p. 210) or polluted such as gossip, is a subject that various authors such as Dubisch (1986b) and Lazaridis (2009) also find to be present in Greek society.

In general, negotiations are produced from interactions with others, using various tactics or methods in order to avoid confrontation and simultaneously to achieve a situation that is acceptable for the individuals using these methods. For instance, Hochschild & Machung (1989) found that half of the women in their study used passive (e.g. pretending to be ill) or active (i.e. directly asking for help) negotiation tactics when actively trying to change the division of household labour within their homes. Bargaining over household duties has been the subject of much research using approaches such as ‘resource exchange’ theory to explain gendered division of labour within the family. This theory links labour to the relative resources in the relationship, but the way in which gender roles alter because of this bargaining has been covered to a lesser extent (Bittman et al., 2003).

The various methods used within families to ‘negotiate’ social reproductive activities are often highly gendered themselves, perpetuating adherence to gender roles and relations. This can be seen in a study of Chinese participants, where the male participants cite using ‘delaying tactics’ (p. 75) as being their main strategy in negotiating household tasks such as for example saying they will complete the task at a later date and then conveniently forgetting about it (Lui, 2013). In the same study, female participants negotiate household tasks by feigning helplessness or tiredness, by nagging and by using praise, all of which are highly gendered ways of achieving a respite from household tasks, as they draw on feminine qualities of weakness. Negotiating in this way, Lui’s participants adhere to ‘good wife’ gender roles and consequently the extent to which gender roles and relations are disrupted is debatable as the responsibility for social reproduction remains firmly in feminine hands with men maintaining their role as helpers, albeit with some delay.
In the current study, participants have various ways of negotiating social reproduction activities. One way participants actively negotiate social reproductive duties is by simply telling someone to do a task, for example when Ioanna tells her husband to hang out clothes some nights: “Lots of times, I tell Andreas to hang out the clothes when we come home at night”. This is an example of a division of labour that has already been negotiated, since Ioanna’s husband simply accepts this task as, and when, she needs him to. Regarding the methods used to negotiate, Giota from the felt shop in Zagori, says her and her flatmate use the technique of “reminding each other of jobs to be done, e.g. watering the flowers”. This represents a less gendered method of ensuring the distribution of household tasks as it indicates that the tasks to be done have already been agreed upon and reminding each other of the tasks serves to settle this negotiation. Rather than ‘nagging’, which implies an unequal division of power, reminding implies a more even distribution of power as both individuals have a sense of responsibility for the task at hand.

The way in which Ioanna’s husband and Giota’s flatmate react to being asked to complete a social reproductive task, differs inherently to how one of Brickell’s (2011) male Khmer participants views his wife’s requests for help with housework as ‘nagging’. By drawing on his positionality as the family’s breadwinner, Brickell’s participant refuses to do housework stating that it is not his job and draws on the derogative term of ‘nagging’ to assert his masculinity, thus attempting to keep gender roles constant. Nagging is an activity associated with feminine gender roles as women are not expected to openly press for their rights and indeed women who initiate negotiations and are assertive are often penalised for this by being viewed as less desirable as wives (Bowles et al., 2007).

Katerina also refers to ‘nagging’ as a way in which her mother negotiated a better distribution of household tasks, commenting how she has moved away from this tactic. Katerina delegates social reproductive tasks to her daughters “not by shouting, in a nice way in order to understand that when I cannot do the household jobs, they should know to do them instead”. This is an improvement, in her eyes, on the way her mother ‘nagged’ her to complete household tasks when she was young. As Katerina says “I like cleanliness… I like order in the house...Maybe because I didn’t want to hear shouting from my mum, that is why I would say to myself that I should do everything before she nags at me...”.

Older female participants in this study exhibit internalised negotiations of gender roles by raising the subject of gender role negotiation by telling a relevant story. For example MrsE, in order to raise the subject of how rigid gender roles used to be, in relation to men’s involvement in handicrafts told me this story:
There was a story in a nearby village about the doctor’s son who started weaving on the loom because he liked the ‘garifalaki’ [coronation flower] design. When his father came back from work and found him with the shuttle in his hand, he [the father] had a heart-attack and died. When he [the doctor’s son] grew up, no bride wanted him. Then he got a job in a bank on an island and there was a ‘lucky’ woman who took him...hahaha...but what bad did he do?

Whilst MrsE ironically refers to the ‘lucky’ woman who eventually married the man who loved weaving, indicating that she too thinks that men should not weave, she simultaneously opens her gendered opinion to scrutiny by asking “…but what bad did he do?”. This is an example of how telling a story can open the road to negotiation of gender roles. As seen in literature on the usefulness of narratives, stories can provide a vivid snapshot of gender roles existing at the time as well as the perceptions surrounding these gender roles (Maynes et al., 2012). Furthermore, whilst storytelling can be used as an agent to instigate change, it can also prevent change by reinforcing dominant roles, as Murgia and Poggio (2009) find in their analysis of how men’s stories fail to challenge masculine hegemonies in organisations.

Another instance of how social reproductive roles and entrepreneurial identities are negotiated is a conversation that leads to one of the parties feeling guilty about not adhering to a gendered role. An example of this happening is when Kostis, a single male potter from Margarites village has a confrontation with his daughter who is visiting him during the summer with the intention of combining a holiday with pottery production. In this incident, his daughter complains how much time she loses taking her grandmother shopping which she feels subtracts from the time she wants to spend producing pottery, retorting that her father should take the grandmother to town the next day to get her medication, instead of her driving the grandma to town again. Kostis reacts by asking his daughter if they should arrange a taxi to take the grandmother to town to which his daughter succumbs to say that she will take the grandmother if that is the only other alternative. This example reveals the complexity of gender role negotiations as two subjects are touched upon. First, Kostis’ daughter draws on her productive engagement in pottery in order to negotiate her role as ‘dutiful daughter’ by saying that she cannot take her grandmother around as this stops her from being productive. Then, Kostis plays upon the daughter’s adherence to ‘dutiful daughter’ subjectivities that dictate that in order for her to adhere to feminine narratives she should take care of her grandmother. Furthermore, it would be shameful to resort to a market solution for eldercare (i.e. getting a taxi), a concept also mentioned by Lazaridis (2009) in connection to women’s responsibility towards their elderly relatives. The result is that although the daughter agrees to partially adhere to the role of ‘dutiful daughter’, she has in fact taken a stance regarding her role in
production which sows the seed for future negotiations regarding how a ‘dutiful daughter’ should perform. Kostis’s daughter’s vocal resistance indicates how ‘hybrid’ identities are emerging, as illustrated by Tucker’s (2010) ‘peasant entrepreneurs’ who are caught between modernity and embedded morals governing women’s place/space in society. Whilst this may seem like a punitive change, it does give women greater negotiating power, as also observed by Gates (2002) who, in her study on Mexican women who negotiate their entrance into employment by offering to do more domestic work, concludes that this type of negotiation is a more effective method than using threats to withdraw services such as cooking. Furthermore, with regard to her entrepreneurial identity, Kostis’ daughter is enabled to participate in this discourse as her father encourages her to make and sell pottery. This is significant because often daughters are excluded from family businesses (Wang, 2010). However, Kostis encourages his daughter to participate in his business but on the condition that she still adheres to gender roles surrounding eldercare, illustrating Kostis’ agency in creating new conceptualisations of entrepreneurship.

As described above, there are various ways in which participants in this study actively negotiate gender roles related to social reproduction, however the majority of negotiations being displayed are internalised. These internalised negotiations are represented in conversations where participants vocalise how entrepreneurship involvement affects the distribution of social reproductive tasks, as shall be discussed next.

### 8.1.1 Internalised gender role negotiations

Internalised gender negotiations arise from peoples’ evaluation of everyday interactions and the possible consequence of that evaluation on subsequent interactions (Fenstermaker and West, 2013). These internalised gender negotiations are displayed either in the ways in which people react to certain situations e.g. ‘just doing housework as no one else will do it’, or can be shown in situations when the participant contradicts her/him-self, an indication that she/he is actively thinking about how things could be different during our conversation which represents an ‘in-becoming’ negotiation.

An ‘in-becoming’ internalised negotiation occurs when Katerina talks about how her involvement in entrepreneurship has affected how much time she spends caring for her husband and her house. Katerina simultaneously feels guilty about not providing her husband with as much care as she perceives he should have, as she says: “If I didn’t work, I would have him like a Pasha”\(^{40}\), and

\(^{40}\) ‘Pashas’ is a rank within the Turkish army equivalent to the British Lord. As Greece was under Ottoman rule for over 400 years, the work ‘Pashas’ in Greek came to be associated with a person who has everything and his every whim is granted.
also feels relieved of this duty because she is working at her pottery shop and has an excuse not to adhere to traditional narratives of femininity that dictate her primary role as care-giver by saying: “...I have the excuse that if I have work I won’t go back home [to serve her husband, do housework]”.

Then Katerina expresses the feeling that she actually feels better when she is at work as she is calmer, indicating that she is internally negotiating gender roles as she admits that her primary responsibility is not only towards her family, by saying that: “On the other hand, I am calmer because I leave the house...because being all the time in the house, is not good.”. This ambivalence indicates how Katerina negotiates and re-defines feminine subjectivities as a product of both caring and working capacities/responsibilities.

Whilst Katerina is still in the process of negotiating adherence to caring subjectivities over working, Hara seems to have already progressed to a closer adherence to masculine entrepreneurship ideals that an entrepreneur should prioritise work over the household, which is also illustrated in Marlow and McAdam’s (2013) work on the role gender plays in the perception of under-performing female entrepreneurs. Hara seems to adhere more closely to masculine interpretations of entrepreneurship, having decided that working is more important to her that taking primary responsibility for social reproduction. Consequently for Hara, despite her adherence to caring subjectivities, involvement in tourism entrepreneurship offers her freedom from adhering to these subjectivities which she expresses by saying:

I would rather not have so many household jobs and to have my work (silversmithing). I am more free in that way – I feel better. Not because I make money, freedom because no one checks on me here, I can do what I want.

Apart from an indication that Hara has internally negotiated definitions of feminine subjectivities as not being necessarily connected to concepts of primary carer, her statement regarding how she feels free, “not because of the money”, brings to the fore how entrepreneurship is more than just an economic phenomenon.

8.1.2 Entrepreneurship as more than just an economic phenomenon

Hara’s statement that it is not solely the financial gain from entrepreneurship that she values but also how she feels ‘free’, leads me to interrogate development literature that posits a link between economic empowerment and how women are in a better position to negotiate gender roles related to social reproduction. Microfinance initiatives for women’s development in Pakistan are linked to women’s greater negotiating power in how to spend money on social reproductive activities such as buying household items and investing in childcare (Mahmood, 2011). Similarly, EU
development programs are often aimed at creating more equal gender roles via women’s encouragement to start up entrepreneurship ventures, such as the Equal program initiative in Spain and Portugal (Pardo-del-Val and Ribeiro-Soriano, 2007). However, viewing entrepreneurship as a social process which challenges taken-for-granted boundaries, rather than simply as a method to gain more financial independence allows for a more in-depth enquiry into how Hara’s ability to negotiate gender roles has altered due to her involvement in entrepreneurship (Steyaert and Hjorth, 2006). Perceiving the economy as a cultural and social formation (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2003), rather than simply as a site of exchange of labour, an exploration of entrepreneurship’s interaction with social norms such as gender roles related to social reproduction is possible. Hara’s words that her internal negotiations are the product of “not because I make money, freedom because no one checks on me here”, encourage us to look beyond the economic and to focus on the “social milieu in which entrepreneurs are embedded” (Morrison and Skokic, 2012, p. 3) in order to evaluate how entrepreneurship interacts with social processes. Similarly, Tucker (2010) suggests a move away from Western ethnocentric descriptions of entrepreneurship, as an industrialised practice that subsumes local culture, to viewing entrepreneurship as a socio-cultural derived economic activity full of contradictory truths.

This also indicates how economic ‘empowerment’, whilst being hailed as a panacea for gender equality, is not always effective in reaching this goal if the cultural specificities of each context are not taken into account (Tucker and Boonabaana, 2011). On the notion of economic empowerment, Kabeer (2005) and Lingam (2008) comment on how although microcredit is seen by many financial institutions as being very helpful in empowering poor women both economically and with regards to domestic power relations, in reality, microcredit acts as an economic safety net and reinforces individual responsibility for social reproduction thus leaving gender roles unchanged and unquestioned. So, it is important to consider how gender roles operate within work-family interactions and how these are expressed within each culture as the ways in which notions of femininity and entrepreneurship interact vary depending on cultural factors, for example Turkish female entrepreneurs’ relationship to entrepreneurship is constricted by how honour and shame dictates restrictions to their movement between public and private space, as well as the expectation to adhere to housewife ideals (Tucker, 2007). Even within the same culture, there are specificities in the construction of feminine subjectivities. For example in Japan, if a woman happens to be the wife of an eldest son, she is expected to adhere to very strict gender rules concerning adherence to motherhood, which affect her involvement in entrepreneurship by limiting it, but this does not apply for other women who are married to younger sons (North, 2009). These are all indications of how gender roles and relations are embedded in economic interactions such as entrepreneurship and illustrate the role culture plays in the construction of entrepreneurship.
8.2 Transformations in conceptualisations of entrepreneurship

Much gender and development literature speaks to how women’s burden has increased because of their involvement in entrepreneurship, a change which is often instigated by development programs aimed at improving women’s well-being by tapping into women’s latent labour power (UNWTO, 2011). However, less literature is concerned with the gendered subjectivities that micro-entrepreneurs draw upon when negotiating their way through the ragged terrain at the nexus of entrepreneurship and social reproduction. In this section, I discuss how entrepreneurship affects concepts of social reproduction being a woman’s role and how entrepreneurs negotiate the related gender roles and relations, by focusing initially on how entrepreneurship acts to make social reproductive tasks gradually accepted as ‘work’ and how this ‘work’ is becoming less gendered in character. Then, I analyse how women are ‘excused’ from social reproduction duties because of their involvement in entrepreneurship and the complexities that are played out as women negotiate notions of femininity that require them to take a central role in social as well as economic provisioning.

8.2.1 Using altruism to define the value of social reproductive work

An initial examination of how social reproduction is defined and distributed within this study is provided in Chapter Seven, where the significance of gender roles and relations in establishing meanings and distributions of duties related to social reproduction is discussed, indicating how participants move between these concepts by adhering to gendered subjectivities such as the ones surrounding motherhood or breadwinning. The purpose of the present section is to draw upon participants’ positionality with regards to the gendered definition of social reproduction and interrogate how entrepreneurship acts to re-define social reproduction in order to further knowledge of current gender roles related to social reproduction within the context of Greek tourism handicraft entrepreneurs.

To begin this analysis I focus on how the value of work (either within or outside the home) relates to concepts of gendered subjectivities. Social reproduction is still largely invisible work, often taken for granted by society and devalued by the market (Kabeer, 2007), which is reiterated by DarkK who, when asked if she considers social reproduction to be ‘work’, says: “this is not work – they don’t see it as work”. Much feminist research supports the social perception of social reproductive activities being, what Federici calls “a labour of love” (2012, p. 16) which women do for free and get pleasure from doing. This perception influences the ability of working women to negotiate for a more equal distribution of social reproduction. It also brings to the fore how women within economics literature are portrayed simultaneously as altruistic care-givers and as
“autonomous, rational actors” who can bargain for reduced work at home (Bergeron, 2011, p. 156).

This produces contradictory images of femininity as female entrepreneurs feel unable to negotiate for a more equal division of social reproductive activities because of fear that doing so might hurt family members which results in what Legerski and Cornwall (2010) term, women being “held hostage” (p. 451) by care work, by being expected to both prioritise and perform caring on an altruistic basis. In fact, the association of altruism to femininity is embedded in female perceptions as also indicated by research showing girls’ preference for occupations with an element of altruism involved (Weisgram et al., 2010). The common description of women as altruistic care-givers in much gender and development discourse (Gates, 2002) urges a further exploration of the significance of altruism in how gender roles are negotiated, as the term presupposes both an element of free choice and that altruistic work is without market value when observing altruism from a rational economic viewpoint (Humphries, 2000).

The concept of altruism which is defined by Batson (2010) as “a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare” (p. 3), is utilised to illustrate how little social reproduction is valued as it is perceived as an act performed by women selflessly. This focus on altruism as being a component affecting the relationship between entrepreneurship and gender roles is explored in depth by Brickell and Chant (2010) who emphasise that altruism is inextricably connected to feminised social reproduction roles, which are taken for granted by development programs. An act of altruism, which is conceptualised as an act of a person sacrificing something for another person (e.g. time) with no expectation of direct benefits is slightly problematic in its use within economic theorising (Draguns, 2013). As an altruistic act is not a marketable commodity, it subsequently has no economic value. Women do receive social recognition as ‘good housewives’ or ‘good mothers’ but the activities which they perform in order to adhere to these roles are considered of little market value as they are performed altruistically rather than rationally. As currently it is the ‘market’ that determines how work is valued resulting in paid feminised occupations such as elder-care being undervalued, this consequently lowers the value of unpaid social reproductive work which women perform and vice versa (Folbre, 2003). To this extent it is pertinent to comment that the existence of ‘true’ altruism is debatable, as even giving alms to beggars, which is an oft cited example of altruism, does in fact provide the alm-giver with a sense of gratification through the feeling of ‘doing something good’ stimulated by socially conditioned feelings of empathy (De Waal, 2008). Examining the concept of ‘enlightened self-interest’ as a potentially better term to use in the analysis of how social reproduction’s value is altering, there are advantages, as ‘enlightened self-interest’ can explain human cooperation among kin. Within a business context, ‘enlightened self-interest’ is used to describe businesses that do things for their community, a corporate philanthropy strategy that is perceived by clients and their employees as favourable, as for example in the case of tourism SMEs
researched by Hallak, Brown and Lindsey (2012). However as the term ‘altruism’ is being used simply to highlight the perceived value-lesness of social reproduction, ‘altruism’ is more useful in this context because it does infer that the acts that mothers and wives around the world are expected to perform in order to adhere to feminine subjectivities, are selfless acts.

The gendered connection of altruism to social reproduction results in women around the world completing household labour for collective rather than individual gain. This collective focus is often taken advantage of by development programs that disperse financial aid to women, thus solidifying current altruistic caring gender roles rather than challenging them (Chant, 2008). Stereotyped gender norms connecting masculinity to self-interest rather than altruism are found in the way Anthoula talks about who takes care of the money in her community as she says: “in our community, women are in charge of money because men take the money and make it ‘na’ [disappear]! They spend it on tsipouro41, eating meat, good times…..”. A similar observation is made in Tucker and Boonabaana’s (2011) research which indicates that men’s lack of altruism results in an increasing number of men in Mukono becoming alcoholics because rather than spending the money they earn from tourism on their families, they spend it on themselves. Interestingly, women in Mukono are encouraged to enter tourism entrepreneurship because of their husbands’ lack of altruism, a move which creates a gradual change in gender roles surrounding female involvement in entrepreneurship, as previously, women were expected to primarily stay at home and take care of the family rather than work.

However, here, introduction of the concept of ‘complimentarity’ where is based on the idea that gender equity can be achieved by members of a heterosexual couple helping each other, which does however lead to poor men who do not help with household tasks becoming hyper-visible as irresponsible partners and being blamed for gender policies not delivering the expected results. For example, although there is no proven link between poor unemployed men and alcoholism, based on a study carried out in Ecuador by the World Bank, which is one of the largest funders of development world-wide, unemployed men’s drinking problems where over-represented and became central to the Bank’s gender policy texts (Correia, 2000). In effect, unemployed men were blamed for the gender problems as they were perceived to be drinking and thus having reduced caring capabilities. Whilst unemployed men have been blamed for violence and reduced caring capabilities because they are unable to fulfil breadwinner roles, there is no evidence to show that employed men are any different. Bedford (2007) criticises the idea of ‘complimentarity’ as being development trying to account for men’s time and ensuring that men’s time is spent productively (rather than spending

41 ‘Tsipouro’ is a strong, transparent alcoholic drink made by distilling grapes and is common in mainland Greece. In Crete a very similar drink is known as ‘raki’.
time drinking for example) by encouraging men to help within the family, instead of trying to achieve
gender equality. Hence, it is important to consider to what extent men are misrepresented by
development policies whose sole goal is to increase productivity, under the guise of increasing
gender equality. Indeed, the role of development actions (that encourage men to complete more
household tasks), in re-privatising caring and thus being complicit in the neoliberal retreat from social
provisioning, needs to be questioned by any feminist research, such as the current one. Whilst the
development programs to promote rural tourism in Greece do not refer to men’s caring
responsibilities, this serves as a note of caution to any future development policies. This is also
because imperative to include men in order to encourage complementary partnerships between
couples also hides the perceived need to keep men in families for gender equality to be achieved,
presenting marriage as the ultimate anti-poverty strategy and making women who need to leave
violent relationship, vulnerable. So, it is obvious that development programs can influence discourse
on men and women’s roles in achieving gender equality in complex, contradictory and often invisible
ways.

8.2.2 Entrepreneurship prompts alterations in ‘altruistic’ behaviour

Although altruistic performances are on the decline, partly due to global neoliberal ideals
preaching the significance of accumulation for personal gain (Harman, 2010), women are still keeping
the altruism ‘flame’ alive by avoiding negotiation of social reproductive work. An example of this type
of altruistic behaviour is evident in some of the participants who apart from considering
responsibility for social reproductive activities as their duty, also seem to have embedded the
altruistic nature of this duty as being an indication of being “correct” (Katerina, interview). For
example, Mariniki says she does not push her husband to do more housework when he is working
full-time because she is “not that kind of person”. Liana also has a similar logic and when asked if she
uses working as an excuse not to do housework, she answers: “There are women and women, I am
not one of them” emphasising how despite being very busy, she would not degrade herself by using
her paid occupation to leverage her household bargaining position. In these examples, both Liana
and Mariniki seem to be ‘held hostage’ by their adherence to ideals of femininity that contain a
degree of altruism, because despite their heavy workloads they want to be perceived as completing
social reproductive tasks because they are ‘that kind of person’. ‘That kind of person’ in the present
context is someone who despite all odds continues to preserve the ability to be primary carer
without the need to negotiate for a more equitable workload indicating the presence of altruism as
women are expected to sacrifice their personal time with no expectation of personal benefit. The
connection of femininity to an absence of selfish acts is illustrated well by Anetta who comments on
how women were not allowed to have individual goals in the 1960s: “personal ambitions? That did not exist for women!”.

An example in international literature of working women displaying altruistic tendencies by sacrificing personal time, are the female factory workers in Bangladesh who wake up at dawn to do housework in order to preserve their appearance as good housewives (Kabeer, 2007). Similarly, in Lazaridis’ (2009) study, Cretan women wake up very early to prepare the day’s meal before starting work on silk cocoon fabrics. Both of these examples indicate how women are expected to sacrifice their personal time. Similarly, in the present study, many participants also sacrifice their personal time in order to continue adhering to notions of femininity connected with caring. Katerina wakes up very early to cook and clean the house in order to be “correct”; Frosso prepares food in instalments the night before and early in the morning the next day; and Ioanna uses her only non-work evening to do housework, rather than to rest.

However, despite indications that female participants find various ways to ‘yield’ (Kabeer, 2007, p. 18) to stereotyped gender roles which dictate an inextricable connection between femininity and performing social reproduction on an altruistic basis, a degree of resistance to the altruistic nature of these gender roles is emerging. Evidence of the ‘revolution’ against what can be perceived as ‘enforced’ altruism is seen in women’s cries for help with social reproductive duties. By simultaneously challenging the supposedly altruistic nature of women’s household work, the concept that women have a “comparative advantage” (Pujol, 2003, p. 29) in nurturing are also challenged. As altruistic displays rely on the perception that women are only doing what is in their nature to do, by asking if altruism is in fact ‘enforced’, the concept of women’s ‘natural’ predisposition to social reproduction is also questioned. By asking for help with social reproductive duties from male partners and not just relying on the usual helpers i.e. grandmothers, women are raising their voices to make social reproductive work more visible. They highlight how their time is valuable and thus challenge notions that they complete social reproduction on an altruistic basis by wanting recognition for the time spent on social reproduction.

8.2.3 Asking for help: Temporality, entrepreneurship and gender role negotiation

The act of making social reproduction work visible by rejecting the perception of altruistic behaviour being a feminine trait also highlights the significance attached to valuing time spent completing an activity. My focus on the importance of valuing work based on the time spent
completing a task was inspired by a talk from Margaret Wilson42 (2013), who on the occasion of the celebration of 120 years of the NZ suffrage movement, argued that valuing household work in terms of time spent on it is an important move towards gaining more gender equality. Measuring unpaid, feminised domestic work in terms of time has been the subject of much feminist work in the 1970s/80s with a focus on this aspect of work dying out during the last 20 years. However, feminist writer Adkins’ (2009) call for a revival of domestic work’s temporality aspect resonates particularly well with the current study, as Adkins highlights the dynamism of time. Perceiving the value of capitalist activities as the activity’s performativity in terms of time (Butler, 1993), is also useful in conceptualising how social reproductive activities are negotiated by re-distribution.

Mariniki refers to the concept of social reproduction having a value in terms of temporality by getting her husband to help with household tasks when she feels overwhelmed in her attempt to combine productive and reproductive responsibilities. She says how “in need, Giorgos [Mariniki’s husband] will help serve dinner. In need, he will put on the washing machine, hang out the clothes...”. So essentially, by presenting the need as driven by time-pressures, Mariniki negotiates for a more equal distribution of household tasks by demanding recognition from her male partner that her time is not “infinitely elastic” (Young, 2003, p. 113) and simultaneously challenges notions of femininity being bound to gendered prioritisation of social reproduction. Focusing on the significance of time in negotiating social reproductive gender roles, literature presenting the concept of ‘time poverty’, which is defined as the lack of time to rest after working, is useful as it highlights how women are more likely to suffer from this problem because of their gendered social reproductive responsibilities (Bardasi and Wodon, 2010). Furthermore, time-use studies that are used to measure the time spent doing household tasks, indicate both the need for a value to be put on this time and how time-use is gendered as women complete the largest share of household tasks, as for example Guatemalan women do in Gammages’ (2010) study.

Economic theorising using the ‘utility approach’ attempts to explain this gendered inequality in time use by positing that a household will allocate the time of its members between household work and labour in order to maximise its utility in terms of commodity consumption. However, this theory has been criticised as lacking the insight that household dynamics are shaped by gender roles (Hodgson, 2012). Despite this criticism, a growing body of literature utilises concepts of time spent working in order to evaluate people’s well-being, establishing a connection between a balance in time spent working and free time as being essential to one’s well-being (Goodin et al., 2008). As most

---

42 Margaret Wilson is a prominent New Zealand politician who acted within the parliament as the first female “Speaker of House” during 2004-2008, is a trade unionist, and currently is an academic at Waikato University dealing with issues of law, feminism and multiculturalism.
people strive to achieve the maximum amount of well-being at least for themselves, it is logical that they will strive to avoid ‘time poverty’ and applying this logic to our study we can theorise that entrepreneurs will strive to bargain for the most profitable time division. So, when Mariniki asks for her husband’s help with social reproductive duties, what she is doing is negotiating for recognition of the time performativity she puts in by admitting that she cannot cope with the combination of caring and working demands which also results in the household work becoming more ‘valued’ in terms of time as she is making this time visible (at least to her husband) by getting her husband to participate in the execution of the duties. This can be construed as an example of how time can be conceptualised as a negotiating tool for more gender equality by adding value to social reproductive tasks. Ferguson (2010b) also briefly reports (but does not focus upon) on the increasing significance of time pressures to her female participants, who ask for help from “their male partners, children and other family members in order to keep the household running” (p. 871) as their time is limited since becoming involved in tourism work.

Many of the female entrepreneurs in the study, apart from negotiating gender roles by making social reproductive tasks visible by not completing them, outsource social reproduction tasks to their children. This indicates that although completing both paid work and domestic work contributes to the creation of a crisis in social reproduction, rather than social reproduction being depleted because women’s elastic time is at snapping point which is a possibility discussed by Rai, Hoskyns and Thomas (2011), social reproduction is creating new social forms. Although not all women in the current study ask for help from their family, partners or kin, a large majority admit ‘neglecting the house’ during intensely productive periods because of the lack of time to do everything ‘correctly’.

8.2.4 Neglecting the house: Inaction transformed into action

Although some female entrepreneurs do not ask their male partners for help, their involvement in the time-consuming activity of entrepreneurship, allows them to ‘neglect’ as they say, household duties illustrating the presence of budding gender role negotiations. Whilst this may seem like a slightly contradictory way of making a statement, by taking as an example how, dirt by starting to accumulate on the windowsill because of neglected cleaning makes cleaning activities visible, this statement allows for a parallel to be drawn between neglecting social reproductive tasks and increasing the visibility and value of social reproductive tasks. Thus, I discuss the ways in which inaction can be transformed into action and the ways in which gender roles may mitigate this process.

Many of the female entrepreneur-participants say that their families are also acutely aware of the time pressures induced by engagement in tourism entrepreneurship which is why their families
exert less pressure on them to be ‘perfect’ housewives. For instance, Frosso narrates how her family is understanding if she ‘neglects’ housework, as she says: “It will be different if I say I am tired, I can’t complain, everyone understands. The demands on me are fewer – since I work so many hours, they turn a blind eye to whatever has to do with the house”. Whilst it is obvious that both Frosso and her family continue to perceive the responsibility for social reproduction to be gendered and lie primarily on her shoulders, her expression illustrates how entrepreneurship acts to gradually morph this perception. Whilst this change can be conceptualised as primarily being led by pressures that require family members’ labour power with an intensity like never before, as a family’s survival depends on at least a double income (Bakker and Silvey, 2008b), the consequence of Frosso’s involvement in entrepreneurship is a reduction in hours available to complete social reproductive tasks. Again here we see the significance of time in gender role negotiations. It is because of her reduced time availability to complete household tasks, that Frosso is able to negotiate gender roles connecting femininity to social reproduction shown by her admission that she neglects housework. This raises the question if Frosso’s inability to complete the housework, makes the housework more visible and hence puts a value on the housework. However, since Frosso’s daughter has taken on some of the household tasks, it seems that the responsibility for social reproductive tasks has simply been re-allocated to another female family member. Indeed, since the children grew up and started helping her, Frosso notes how her husband completely withdrew from helping with household tasks, indicating how social reproductive gender roles remain fairly constant by being transferred to the younger generation. As Frosso says:

Previously, my husband helped a lot – he did all the ‘outside’ jobs, the shopping, he took the children to the kindergarten. He helped a lot. As soon as the children grew up he stopped doing all these jobs. He doesn’t want to have anything to do with cooking, where as when I met him he used to cook.

Katerina also refers to how entrepreneurship involvement allows her to ‘neglect’ social reproductive activities:

Now that I am at work, I have the excuse that if I am at work I can’t go home – you feel much more free from the household duties because you can say: ‘today I didn’t do any household jobs, but it is the shop’s fault.

Katerina, like Frosso, has re-allocated social reproductive tasks to her daughters, as she says: “Every year it is better, because they [Katerina’s daughters] are growing older and they see for themselves what needs to be done in the house without me telling them”. So whilst Katerina’s involvement in entrepreneurship means that she has less time to complete household tasks which could potentially
mean that the visibility and value of these tasks would increase through the house being messy, the
gendered responsibility is off-loaded onto her daughters instead. This means that Katerina’s husband
continues to have everything ready for him, and so he does not notice the value of the social
reproductive tasks as he is not pressured into completing them himself.

Similarly, on the subject of how being an entrepreneur can increase the visibility and value of
social reproductive tasks by the lack of time to complete them, Dina also notes how when she is
working, it is perfectly acceptable for her to say that she is “working, so the housework will have to
remain behind”. Whilst Dina says that no one complains at home when she does not complete the
household tasks because she is working, and that her family members “do the tasks themselves
sometimes”, which indicates that Dina may be achieving some visibility of the labour inputted into
completing household tasks as her male household members complete some household tasks in her
absence, complexity arises as Dina says that she also has a daughter whom she off-loads much of the
social reproductive tasks onto. She says: “I have a daughter and I find everything ready”. By saying
how she prioritises working over housework, Dina exhibits a change in attitude from previous
generations when women were not allowed to show signs of non-adherence to feminine ideals
surrounding prioritising housework, as Anetta says about a working woman’s life in the 1960s:

The working woman of the 60s did not have personal hours of her own – she
was like a robot. You had to have finished your cooking, cleaning, getting clothes
ready, bread, etc. by 11am, so you could sit at the loom and weave until it got
dark. After that apart from taking care of the children she would have to crochet
until 12 at night. Crocheting was considered leisure time – it was the easiest.

As Anetta stresses, by saying that women had ‘no personal hours’, she illustrates how the
value of women’s time was perceived to be minimal. An example of the perception that women were
not supposed to have ‘personal hours’ is referred to also by Herzfeld (1991a) who highlights how the
concept of ‘sitting’ idle, doing nothing, is related to power since this is a male prerogative. These
eamples show how women’s engagement in productive activities, reduce the time available to
engage in social reproductive activities and potentially make social reproductive tasks visible by
leaving them uncompleted. Further investigation into the effects of engagement in entrepreneurship
on the transformation of social reproduction into a set of productive activities through their
increased visibility as they are off-loaded onto other gendered subjects, could yield interesting
findings regarding how inaction can be transformed into action within the context of
productive/social reproductive economic activities. For example it would be interesting to investigate
how men react to the way in which female entrepreneurs neglect household tasks as they are too
busy to complete them. As social reproductive tasks, within the context of handicraft tourism entrepreneurs in this study, are often off-loaded onto children, it would also be interesting to ask male children how they perceive their new role in providing social reproduction to their family. This would illustrate how gender roles regarding social reproduction are changing for the new generation.

The conditions surrounding women’s involvement in tourism entrepreneurship also contribute to the way gender roles are negotiated, such as the conditions surrounding women’s motivations for engaging in entrepreneurship some of which are supported by development policies aimed at increasing female employment (ESPA, 2013). Anetta herself is one of the first few women of her generation to become involved in tourism handicraft entrepreneurship, an entry which she attributes to the fact that her family was already involved in tourism entrepreneurship and this instilled in her the conviction that she wanted to be financially independent from her husband as she says: “I worked before I got married, in my family’s business, and so I thought I had to get married and create myself. I didn’t want to get married for a man to ‘live me’”43. This is an empirical example of the role social consequences of the market economy play, such as altering conceptions of gender roles. As illustrated by Anetta, involvement in the market economy from a young age gives her the ability to negotiate prevailing gender roles dictating that a woman’s role is to care for the family and be economically provided for by her husband. The past expectation of women to be financially inactive is illustrated by the now-abolished (by law) pre-requisite of having a dowry in order for women to get married, which constituted their financial contribution to the partnership in terms of material goods and also formed a type of social protection according to Symeonidou (1996). Other state interventions apart from the law abolishing dowry have also played an instrumental role in the way entrepreneurship and social reproductive roles interact such as in development and welfare policies as is discussed next.

8.2.5 Welfare policies, entrepreneurship and gender roles

Policies that do not challenge stereotyped gender roles, such as EU policies focusing on increasing women’s capacity to work by introducing flexible working conditions rather than focusing on changing the division of domestic labour, have contributed to the way Greek women negotiate social reproduction and entrepreneurship (Stratigaki, 2004). Accordingly, EU policies have been criticized for not promoting gender equality as a social goal. As Karamessini and Rubery (2013) say, the EU is a “striking example of a U-turn” (p. 333) in promoting gender equality with the commitment to increase women’s entrance into employment being more for economic purposes rather than for

43 The phrase ‘to live me’ (‘na me zisi’) translates into someone paying for all living expenses and has a slightly derogatory connotation with subordination to the person paying the expenses being inherent. The negativity of this concept is gendered as it is considered worse for a man to be ‘lived’ by a woman than it is vice versa.
achieving greater equality. Whilst policies like the aforementioned EU policies (focusing on the ‘reconciliation of work and family’) encourage women to continue drawing on feminine subjectivities dictating their primary role as family carer, working women use their own techniques to negotiate these roles, by for example, delaying marriage and not having children until they are older. The average age of mothers at first birth has risen from 25 years old in 1970 to 28 years old in 2006, in Greece (Mathews and Hamilton, 2009). This delay in having children reflects global trends and indicates that a change in social reproductive gender roles is occurring as younger women no longer feel it fair to be like the ‘robots’ of Anetta’s generation who were the first generation to be voluntarily sucked into the capitalist vacuum, by turning the items made as part of their social reproductive activities into commodities by selling carpets and fabrics woven within the home as tourist handicrafts, and thus prioritising the accumulation of capital over producing simply to meet the household’s needs. Working women in other countries adopt different methods to negotiate a change in social reproduction roles, like for example, female entrepreneurs in Nicaragua who adopt single motherhood in defiance of gendered social reproductive roles that constitute them as primary carers even when their husbands are unemployed (Cuppes, 2005). In Greece however, the continuing prevalence of nuclear family ideals; the stigma attached to lone parenthood; and the low level of state support for single mothers mean that Greece have one of the lowest rates of children being born out of wedlock (Gavalas et al., 2013). These state welfare responses largely prevent the adoption of single motherhood as a response to negotiating social reproduction roles, indicating the role welfare policies play on gender roles. Instead, many women in Greece delay marriage and childbearing, thus negotiating social reproduction roles as also observed by Tanturri and Mencarini (2005) who highlight how the drop in fertility rates in Italy are attributed to persisting gender roles dictating women’s primary responsibility for social reproduction. Anthoula from the handicraft school reflects this trend in women delaying marriage and childbearing by narrating how faced with a boyfriend who had neither money nor any propensity to help out if they did decide to have a family, decided to leave him as she felt she was “better off” on her own. Although self-conscious of her age (30 years old), Anthoula debates the necessity of marrying since she has her own money now, which indicates how entrepreneurship acts as a vehicle to alter perceptions surrounding women’s dependence on a male breadwinner wage. At the same time, by expecting her future husband to have some kind of economic backing, she is still adhering to notions that men should be able to financially support their wives or at least support themselves. What has altered, is her requirement that her future partners contribute both financially to the family and in terms of social reproduction help as well as the perception of her role in the family as contributory breadwinner.
8.2.6 ‘Hyper-women’: Intensive caring and economic hyperactivity

Changes in the meaning of entrepreneurship are becoming more visible as notions of motherhood are increasingly connected to the ability of mothers to financially provide for their children as illustrated by Cupples (2005), who observes that neoliberal policies transform femininities through their connection to altered notions of what a ‘good mother’ is. The economic nature of current ‘motherhood’ ideals is also commented upon by McRobbie (2007), who suggests that capitalism is driven by the way in which women’s labour is re-distributed in order to focus on reaching a hyper-economic ideal of femininity, characterised by the movement of caring outside the house as social reproduction becomes increasingly commodified. However, simultaneously, concepts of motherhood are also changing to what Fox (2006) terms as “intensive mothering” (p. 237) where inflated expectations in terms of childcare are demanded of women. Hence, I discuss how intensity to adhere to caring subjectivities that women experience, transgresses the social reproductive boundaries into productive economic activities.

First, the focus shall be on how women negotiate concepts of entrepreneurship by challenging or reinforcing notions that altruistic behaviour is a desired feminine characteristic. The altruistic behaviour that is discussed next refers to the collective good that their engagement with entrepreneurship brings, which was a subject mentioned by many female entrepreneurs as being significant to them. Brickell and Chant (2010) discuss how instances of women exhibiting altruistic behaviour are reflected in a tendency for working women to fulfil collective rather than individual interests, such as investing in the family and helping relatives and neighbours as also observed in female basket-weavers in Mukono (Tucker and Boonabaana, 2011). Similarly, among participants in our study there is a tendency for female entrepreneurs to justify their engagement in entrepreneurship by referring to the benefits of entrepreneurship as being for the collective good. Thus women adhere to altruistic prototypes which are intricately connected with feminine gender roles. For instance Dina, from the women’s cooperative displays altruistic tendencies by emphasising how one of the significant advantages of working is that she can help her family and community with the money she earns, an act that gives her pleasure as she says:

If you have your own money, you can help more, you can get something that you wouldn’t get if you were not working, you can help someone. And for things that are missing in the house, you can also contribute, something that makes you happy.

This shows how Dina negotiates the masculine concept of entrepreneurship by drawing on feminine subjectivities surrounding ‘helping others’ which is intimately tied in with women’s role as
altruistic primary carers (Hewitson, 2003). Engaging in entrepreneurship in order to improve the family unit’s economic well-being is commonly stated by women as being their reason for engaging in such an activity, as for example the female tourism entrepreneur Koutsou et al (2009) studied who said that what counted for her most was that “her children won’t worry about finding a job...” (p. 204). The significance of working to contribute to the “family economic unit” (p. 117) is also highlighted by research done by Tsartas (2003) who stresses that women who benefit from tourism development in Greek insular and coastal areas spend most of their money on their families. Similarly, Cretan female entrepreneurs in Lazaridis’ (2009) study enhance the family budget with their earnings, whereas women who use profits for personal items such as clothes are criticised for being selfish. The majority of the older female participants stress how entrepreneurship involvement is important to them because they can help their family in various ways, like for example, paying for their children’s education as Anetta says: “because I worked, I wanted to be able to afford to pay for my children to study, give them an education”; supplementing the family income as Frosso mentions “I bring money to the family”; and “helping the child open a new home when it gets married” as BlondeK narrates. This attitude is similar to the attitudes of the Central American female tourism workers that Ferguson (2011b) interviewed, who despite gaining more control of the household’s finances by taking up a productive role, simultaneously found themselves under increased pressure to provide financially for their children. This deeper integration into circuits of global capitalism is manifested by the women in Ferguson’s study feeling the pressure to send their children to private schools, hence perpetuating the need for women to continue being productive. So whilst women working in tourism superficially have greater personal autonomy as they earn their ‘own’ money, the fact that they are expected to spend this money on their children, leads me to question the extent to which tourism development does in fact encourage more gender equality.

Katerina, also feels that engagement in entrepreneurship enables her to help her community as she says of her experience as an entrepreneur: “you feel that you can do something more. I can do something for the village, for the school...”. This attitude to entrepreneurship is different to masculine perceptions of entrepreneurship which value achievement, initiative and respect most, according to a recent cross-country study on entrepreneurs’ “work values” (Terrell and Troilo, 2010, p. 279) and also reflected in male participants’ focus on similar values during our interviews. Looking at female participants’ use of working for collective benefit to justify their involvement in entrepreneurship from an economics perspective, it is useful to move beyond the concept of household bargaining whereby individuals bargain for the most economically favourable outcome (Bittman et al., 2003) and to refer to the concept of “relational accommodation” (Livingston, 2011, p. 5) whereby individuals forgo their personal interests in favour of relationship-oriented interests.
Relational accommodation is a gendered process with more women preferring to pursue a collective interest instead of an optimal economic outcome as Gelfand et.al. (2006) point out.

However, looking at the younger generation of entrepreneurs, their justification for being involved in entrepreneurship is oriented towards personal rather than collective gain. This illustrates how the economic and the social are inextricably linked and how femininity ideals change over time and in turn affect conceptualisations of what entrepreneurship means for participants. For example, younger female entrepreneur participants such as Anna and Anthoula from the handicraft school, even though admitting that they spend most of their money within the family to pay bills, etc. because of limited financial resources, openly explain how one of the positive aspects of their involvement in entrepreneurship is their ability to purchase nice clothes and shoes and having a car and go for coffee or a drink when they want. This open admittance of working for individual gain represents a departure from gendered perceptions that femininity is associated with altruism and working for collective gain (Chant, 2006b) and also indicates how individualism is becoming more accepted for women as well. As working for individual gain is a quality associated more with portrayals of ‘rational’ men engaging in entrepreneurship, we see that younger female entrepreneurs are drawing on these masculine interpretations of entrepreneurship to describe their entrepreneurial roles (Bruni et al., 2005). Also, as there is a difference in expressions of entrepreneurship between generations, this indicates that gender roles dictating that women exhibit altruism within entrepreneurship are changing, thus also moulding both how entrepreneurship and social reproduction are conceptualised in gendered terms.

Looking at entrepreneurship as a socio-economic function is useful in analysing how Anna, a weaver at the Rizarios Handicraft School negotiates concepts of gendered social reproduction. Anna admittedly feels more independent, because her involvement in entrepreneurship gives her the financial freedom to move around as she pleases, illustrated by her saying: “It is very good that I am working, you have your car, you will go for an outing, you have your money, your insurance.”. Furthermore, her perception that “a woman should work and have a family, you can’t do it differently”, shows how entrepreneurship has become embedded in her life-view, indicating that she believes that the concept of ‘working mother’ is a socially acceptable form of femininity and thus that gender roles regarding women’s primary responsibility to the family are altering. Construction of alternative ideals of motherhood are also observed by Page (2013) who points out that in England, mothers can still adhere to ideals of motherhood whilst going to work full-time. The contradiction and complexity arises when, although Anna is aware of her economic advantage as an entrepreneur and is also favourable to the idea of combining work with having a family, on being asked if she would mind having a house-husband, she is shocked at the suggestion, saying: “a pa pa...oh, no, no...I
wouldn’t like that thing. It would be better if I stayed at home. For a man to take such a female role, no way! And anyway, which man would do it?”. This suggests that Anna is internally processing concepts of femininity as she not only rejects the idea of a man being the one primarily responsible for social reproductive duties because that would be a departure from her role as carer “it would be better if I stayed at home”, but she also questions the probability of a man departing from the ‘classic’ breadwinner role in order to be primary carer by saying “which man would do that?”. Whilst Anna is very doubtful as to whether any man would take up the feminised role of primary carer, her questioning does hide a sliver of hope that prompts a dialogue on how masculine subjectivities are altering.

These complexities urge us to look at how socio-culturally constructed notions of masculinity and femininity can potentially affect engagement in entrepreneurship, as highlighted by Anna’s dilemma between choosing her or her husband as being primary carer, which culminates in her choosing herself to be primary carer to the potential detriment of her involvement in entrepreneurship. As seen in literature on gender roles and relations in Greece, the centrality of women’s responsibility towards their families is reinforced both by religion, by women being considered as “the root of all evil” (Dubisch, 1986a, p. 23) outside their roles as wives and mothers, but also by socio-cultural norms that idealise women’s role as a “noikokyra” (Greek for ‘housewife’) from which they derive public prestige (Du Boulay, 1986). So for Anna, adherence to these ideals is important as signified in her persistence to adhere to culturally constructed gender roles, despite having economic independence. Furthermore, Anna’s case represents an example of how a feminised quality commonly associated with social reproduction, that is altruism’s tenet of operating for collective gain, has crossed-over to influence how women experience entrepreneurship and consequently how entrepreneurship is moulded by this gendered feminine attribute. This reasoning also speaks to the reconstitution of boundaries between personal and economic life as highlighted in Polanyi’s (1957) work on how labour is conceptualised not as a commodity but as part of human identity.

As discussed in this section, a negotiation of gender roles is indicated by this study’s female participants making a stand in order to make visible the value that the time spent doing social reproductive tasks has, which pre-supposes a diminishing adherence to the altruistic nature that social reproduction tasks appear to have embedded in them. In addition to this, men have a role in supporting negotiations of social reproduction gender roles by being involved in tourism entrepreneurship. In this study, men are becoming more aware that “whatever I [they] do, my [their] wife does” (Mariniki, interview), a realisation that gives men some agency to negotiate their own masculinities in relation to social reproduction roles. So, to follow will be a discussion of the
relationship between tourism handicraft entrepreneurship involvement and masculinities related to social reproduction roles and how they shape each other.

8.3 Metamorphosis of masculinities: “whatever I do, my wife does”

In this section, the focus is on the transformation of masculine gender roles as both men and women take on breadwinner roles through engagement with entrepreneurship, prompting a questioning of how breadwinner and caring roles are negotiated and re-adjusted so that both partners work. Whilst this adjustment to women’s increased capacity to earn is what Kabeer (2007) calls “painful” (p. 9), the male participants in this study as well as the male partners of female participants are bravely finding new ways to adjust to the world’s new reality.

Relating back to Section 8.2.3 where female entrepreneurs make the value of social reproductive activities visible by re-negotiating for a more equitable division of household tasks, this concept is also relevant here. Valuing social reproduction tasks in terms of time taken to complete them also leads to a re-negotiation of how housework is associated with feminine subjectivities by attributing opportunity cost to activities that were previously performed altruistically (by women). The concept of ‘opportunity cost’ is utilised by England (2010) to show how women often choose ‘masculine occupations’ such as blue collar jobs because it is more profitable to them, whereas men rarely get engaged in feminised occupations, such as caring, as they are devalued, thus giving men little incentive to move this way. Similarly, I apply the concept of ‘opportunity cost’ to social reproduction activities which are feminised, and hence devalued, conceptualising men’s refusal to take up these positions as being contrary to achieving maximum efficiency in terms of ‘opportunity costs’. This alteration in the perception of household tasks’ value being correlated to their gendered nature, is seen in how Manolis, a thirty-five year-old male potter in Crete justifies the equitable division of housework in his family as being because: “either if you pay someone or you do them yourself thus losing time from work, it is the same thing”. By saying this, Manolis draws on ‘rational man’ subjectivities concerning maximising his economic output by saying that if he did not do household tasks, he would be less economically efficient. By doing so, he simultaneously conceptualises domestic tasks to have a monetary value. So in effect, Manolis adheres to dominant neoclassical economic theorising that individuals rationally choose optimal market choices (Weber,
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44 Opportunity cost is used in micro-economic theory to describe any benefit that provides utility as the basic relationship between scarcity and choice. In the context of social reproduction, opportunity cost is the cost that domestic work would have if women did not perform it altruistically but for pay, which is related to the cost of the hours spent on social reproduction in relation to how much they would be worth if the women spent their time working for the market instead (England, 2010).
2009), as he initially insinuates that his motivation for taking on more caring responsibilities is purely economic. However, he later goes on to say that “when you have a family, there is no ‘I don’t do’”, indicating that he is not in fact a ‘social moron’ (Sen, 1982, p. 99) and is very much aware of his environment, making alterations in order to accommodate changes in his environment, in this instance, his household circumstances. This behaviour can be explained better by new home economics theory which posits that decisions are taken by an altruistic household head to maximise family welfare, rather than for individual benefit (Waylen, 2000).

Furthermore Manolis’ departure from social norms that dictate a reduced male involvement in household tasks is facilitated by using concepts of paid care-work costs to justify his adherence to a caring role. Using the concept of paid care-work is significant because the availability of paid-care work for working class families in Greece is a relatively new phenomenon (Lyberaki, 2011). Whilst the fact that the immigrants who provide the commodified care are low-paid reiterates how the commodification of care contributes to the gendered nature of social reproductive activities by being feminised (Pearson, 2000), it can also be argued that the rise of paid help in Greece has helped put a value on caring work. Since caring is ‘elevated’ to the status of a commodity, Manolis is able to adhere to stereotypical feminine concepts of caring by leaning on economic principles regarding maximising his family’s economic output. What helps him cross the boundary separating gendered social reproductive subjectivities also extends to the socio-cultural and politico-economic environment he is in. As discussed in Chapter Seven, Greek cultural norms that dissuade take-up of marketised childcare solutions, and welfare policies that provide limited state help for children under three years old (Manolis has twin baby daughters) allow Manolis’ contribution to caring to be viewed as a necessity rather than a preference.

However at the same time, Manolis’ perception of household work in ‘purely’ economic terms indicates how the household has become embedded in capitalist social relations which is achieved according to Le Baron (2010) by the household being pervaded by “logics of market dependency and commodification” (p. 907) because of neoliberal individualistic responsibilisation for social reproduction which consequently promotes the restructuring of social relations as these are being incorporated into the capitalist system of production. Manolis constitutes a ‘good capitalist’ as he performs his role as breadwinner convincingly and by using market efficiency logic to negotiate social reproduction gender roles he illustrates how capital increasingly pervades all aspects of life. As a ‘convincing’ breadwinner he may feel his masculinity more intact and so he can participate more in caring labour without compromising his masculinity or self-esteem, which is reflected in men adhering to primary breadwinner roles in studies undertaken by researchers examining the role gender plays in domestic labour distribution (Parreñas, 2005).
8.3.1 Women’s role in defining masculinities

Women’s role in moulding masculinities is also significant in the context of tourism entrepreneurs’ negotiations of social reproduction. One of the ways in which women in this study explain why social reproductive roles are gendered, is by drawing on feminine subjectivities of caring that make them feel as though they are better suited to these activities than men. For example, DarkK emphasises how social reproductive roles in her family lie heavily on her shoulders which she justifies as being because of men’s inability to organise such a complicated sequence of activities by saying: “Men don’t have such organisation. Even if they want to, they can’t”. The idea that men are unable to complete social reproductive activities to a satisfactory degree transcends into the productive sphere with tourism occupations which require nurturing abilities such as cooking or cleaning for hotel visitors being mainly completed by women as seen for example in Ateljevic and Doorne’s (2003) study of tourism entrepreneurs in Croatia.

However, whilst DarkK appears to make sense of the way in which social reproductive roles are divided, by accepting that a change in these roles occurring is close to impossible because of men’s perceived inability to complete social reproductive activities, her engagement with entrepreneurship does seem to be challenging her notion of these ‘fixed’ gender roles. The realisation that her engagement in entrepreneurship entails very similar tasks to those which her husband does in his paid employment is a revelation as she says:

*My husband comes back from lifting cement bags and says ‘I can’t do anything more, I’m tired’, and he lies down. But did anyone ask me what weights I carry? Here at the cooperative we often have to lift sacks of flour, crates of fruit...*

Although for DarkK the conversion of this realisation into a negotiation is still at an early stage, other female entrepreneurs such as Ioanna and Mariniki use the fact that they are doing exactly the same type of work as their husbands as leverage for a more equitable distribution of social reproduction. Whilst Ioanna and Mariniki, are both part of nuclear families, they too are aware of the leverage to negotiate social reproductive roles that is provided by their engagement in entrepreneurship. Ioanna for example says:

*Now he [her husband] has more understanding because he also works many hours and he understand that it is very difficult for one person to do everything...Now he understands more, that is why it is good for spouses to do the same [type of] job*
Mariniki has a similar mentality, explaining how her position differs from her mother’s in terms of how many social reproductive activities she is expected to complete by her husband, expressed by saying: “My mother was from the first generation of women to get out of the house to work, so men did not have time to realise that ‘whatever I do, my wife does as well’” (Mariniki, interview).

Ioanna’s and Mariniki’s statements indicate how the breadwinner role’s masculine character is waning, as the women claim their stake in this role by actively participating in the same kind of work their husbands do and so the women also become primary rather than secondary breadwinners. This gendered transformation of breadwinning is also seen within gender and development literature where, for example, Chant and Gutmann (2002) report that women’s participation in micro-credit schemes have challenged men’s breadwinner status with ramifications such as family violence and an increase in ill-health among men. These extreme ramifications were not observed in this study’s participants. However, an indication that men are confused about their roles within the family and about meanings of masculinity is indicated in a couple of instances. An example of this is when George expresses the difficulties he experiences in combining work and family time by saying: “It is very difficult when your house is also your shop. It is easy on one side but difficult to balance the time you give to your family and work – you are in the middle!”

Being ‘in the middle’ is a feeling experienced by many working mothers who feel the dual time pressures of housekeeping, childcare and work bearing down upon them, but it is a less common feeling for working men who are held responsible for fewer social reproduction tasks (Jacobs et al., 2009). As concepts of masculinity are linked to breadwinning rather than social reproduction, expressions of manhood (a term which Schrock and Schwalbe (2009) use to avoid attributing men’s behaviour to masculine acts and thus insinuating that men are devoid of agency), are attached to “ideal worker” (p. 6) characteristics which include avoiding household tasks in order to dedicate themselves to a work role (Livingston, 2011). Much entrepreneurship literature that stresses the link between entrepreneurship and masculinity thus creating a masculine norm to entrepreneurship, contributes to men feeling that as entrepreneurs they need to be self-sufficient, independent beings very much along the lines of the ‘rational man’ economic theory as critiqued by Ahl and Marlow (2012). So George’s feeling of being ‘in the middle’ indicates that he is negotiating a departure from ‘classic’ images of entrepreneurs by showing that his priorities are not purely to make enough money for his family but also to participate in social reproductive activities such as childcare. By making way for an alternative gender script, George’s ‘in the middle’ feeling also shows how conceptualisations of what constitutes entrepreneurship are changing. By not conforming to the ‘rational man’ theory and admitting that social reproduction is part of his priorities, George illustrates how a rejection of the idea that entrepreneurship is purely an economic activity leads to the
conceptualisation of entrepreneurship as a “social change activity with a variety of outcomes” (Calas et al., 2009, p. 553). Social change in this instance is the change in gender roles that occur from engagement in entrepreneurship. This gender role negotiation stems from a need to achieve a work-family balance, which is important in order to increase one’s well-being (Greenhaus and Allen, 2011).

However, what one perceives as a good work-family balance within entrepreneurship is gendered itself with women stressing the importance of having support from their family when performing as entrepreneur. Eddleston and Powell (2012) examine how entrepreneurship is nurtured by the family and find that male entrepreneurs perceive themselves as having a better work-life balance when they have more from family support at home, whereas female entrepreneurs perceived themselves as having a better work-life balance when they incorporate family support into their work (“family to business enrichment” (p. 531)). Finding a good work-family balance is something tourism entrepreneurs in particular have to deal with on a seasonal basis, as illustrated by this study’s participants whose intensive work patterns are limited to approximately half the year. Tourism’s seasonal nature hence creates seasonal gender role negotiations, as shall be discussed next.

8.4 Seasonal negotiations of gender roles and entrepreneurship

Seasonality is a global tourism phenomenon involving the visitation of tourists to tourism destinations on a seasonal basis and is often governed by climate, as is the case in many Mediterranean countries like Greece and Italy (Cuccia and Rizzo, 2011). In Crete in particular, seasonality as a phenomenon has been reviewed by various authors, however like many studies on the impacts of seasonality, the focus has been on the economic impacts of seasonality, ranging from issues associated with the large influx of tourists in a short time period such as environmental congestion, overuse of facilities and off-season unemployment (Andriotis, 2005). There has been less focus on the social impacts of seasonality, as noted by Deery, Jago and Fredline (2012), who collated studies addressing the social impacts of seasonality, highlighting how social exchange theory has been used to describe impacts on hosts without however explaining how these seasonal social impacts affect hosts. However, some literature on seasonality’s social effects looks at how seasonality affects hosts’ quality of life such as Tovar and Lockwood’s (2008) article which gives insight into the significance of communities in the perception of seasonal impacts on the quality of life. Despite there being associated literature such as that investigating the link between seasonality
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45 This theory infers that local residents evaluate tourism in terms of the costs and benefits they expect to occur in exchange for their involvement in it.
and quality of life, there is little literature specifically on the relationship of tourism seasonality to a specific social impact - the impact on social reproductive gender roles.

Whilst much literature on tourism seasonality has focused on the negative impacts of seasonality and offers suggestions for policies that combat seasonality (Higham and Hinch, 2002), many of the participants in this study actually welcomed the break offered by seasonality. Participants frequently confided in me how they were actually looking forward to the end of the tourist season, viewing the shoulder season as a period of re-generation, as Mariniki says: ‘I am happy for seasonality. We need to rest in the winter!’ The gruelling hours that tourism micro-entrepreneurs work during the tourist season was the most oft cited reason for wanting a break from working, with the majority of entrepreneurs not being overly worried about the lack of income during this period both because they used this time to produce items for sale during the tourist season and because they must make enough money to survive during the tourist period. Hence a preference for seasonality indicates how participants connect seasonality with quality of life. It is important to note here that the majority of participants who comment that seasonality is an important part of their life are the ones located in Rethymno, Crete which exhibits more severe seasonality than Zagori in Northern Greece, for a couple of reasons. Firstly, Crete is a summer destination with mainly international tourists who arrive on holidays promoted by tour operators who see Crete as a summer destination, and secondly, the intensity with which visitors arrive in Crete is immense, it being the most developed tourist destination in the Mediterranean with 2.8 million visitors annually (HNTO, 2008). Tourism handicap entrepreneurs in Crete also view the shoulder season as an opportunity to be involved with other activities which they cannot be involved with during the summer due to limited time availability. Some, like Frosso, take this opportunity to teach their craft at local art schools, learn a new language and produce more handicrafts in preparation for the summer. Others, especially the participants based in the rural location of Margarites village, like Mariniki and George, say they use the shoulder season “to tend to the olive trees and fields, rest and see friends”. In general, things in the winter are “different” (Katerina, interview). As well as a change in the productive activities that entrepreneurs engage in however, there is also a change in the negotiations of social reproduction activities as illustrated by Katerina:

*In the winter things are different regarding who does the household tasks and in the summer it is different. In the winter, the children are at school and so I am forced to do all the housework. Whatever hours are left in the winter, I work [making pottery items for the shop]. In the summer, I get up in the morning and do some household jobs, but if I don’t have enough time, my daughters are old...*
enough so they wash plates, mop the floor, put on the washing-machine, they come to the shop and sit during midday for me to go and rest a bit.

Here Katerina indicates how she relies upon her children for help with social reproduction activities during the summer, but during the winter it seems that this negotiation dissolves with her doing all the housework yet again. Two factors affect this negotiation, first that her daughters are at school for a large part of the day, and this is a familial priority because since the abolition of the dowry law, education is seen as a “quasi-dowry” (Leontidou, 1994, p. 84) for women, and second that because Katerina is not making any money from her work as the shop is closed during the winter, she does not have the ‘excuse’ of working to help negotiate the redistribution of social reproduction activities such as housework. This switch in roles from breadwinner to housewife and back again resembles the challenge that migration poses to families whose female primary carer migrates abroad for work in what is known as the “transnational motherhood” (Parreñas, 2013, p. 169) phenomenon. As female migrants who work abroad take on breadwinner roles, a redefinition of motherhood is prompted as social reproduction roles are challenged since the mother is no longer physically present to provide care for her children. Whilst this is not identical to the pressures female participants in this study face, the similarity lies in the intensity of work required from them during the tourist season that separates them, in terms of temporality rather than spatiality, from their children. The most significant similarity between migrant women and female tourism entrepreneurs is that they both negotiate social reproductive tasks for a certain time-period and then have to re-negotiate them again on the temporal or physical return to the family. The fluidity in gender roles between summer and winter for tourism entrepreneurs and home and abroad for female migrants is also manifested in how masculine social reproductive gender roles are affected. As illustrated in Hoang and Yeoh’s (2011) study on North Vietnamese women who migrated in search of work often leaving their husbands to care for the children, social reproductive gender roles are negotiated by this disruption in roles, with the men in this case taking on the role of secondary breadwinner and primary carer. Despite this change in responsibility, most men in Hoang and Yeoh’s (2011) study point out the significance of continuing to be involved in paid work for “the symbolic meanings” (p. 733) that it carries which they describe as warding off potential ridicule for their engagement in women’s work, showing how masculine subjectivities are being re-negotiated because of this arrangement.

Returning to the way in which social reproduction is redistributed during the busy tourist period, we see that Katerina is able to easily delegate household work to her daughters during the summer but not during the winter. Similarly, Ioanna also reports how “in the winter I do all the jobs [household work]” rather than getting her daughter, son and husband to help as she does during the summer. Manolis also says how, although in the summer he does not have time to cook for his family
which is a task his wife or her mother does, in the winter he cooks too. All these excerpts indicate the
difference in negotiation of social reproduction gender roles between tourist/non-tourist period and
raise the question of when these negotiations occur. The tourist shoulder period is associated with
the return to more stereotypic gender roles as host communities shrink to the small number of
residents that remain in the tourist destination. This is illustrated by Ateljevic and Doorne (2003), who
say that in winter “long-standing intergenerational social networks become the basis for the
articulation of personal and economic life” (p. 139).

This change in activity between seasons suggests that at the start and end of each tourist
period, there is a liminal period within which gender roles are temporarily dissolved thus creating
fluidity in the negotiation of social reproduction gender roles. And indeed, the majority of female
entrepreneurs report that during the winter they undertake a range of activities which include both
productive tasks such as Frosso producing more pottery for her shop and considering the potential of
selling them online whereas Ioanna crochets the trimmings for her exclusive lace curtains. Female
entrepreneurs also complete a range of social reproductive tasks that they feel they have abandoned
during the summer, such as Frosso “being closer” (Frosso, interview) to her daughter who is sitting
exams soon and Ioanna who expresses her pleasure in using her free time in winter to cook pies for
friends. This combination of aspirations for engagement with both productive and social reproductive
activities indicates how feminine subjectivities draw on a combination of both ‘breadwinner’ and
‘good housewife’ images even in the absence of the temporal pressures of working, and also points to
how social reproduction gender roles are negotiated in seasonal tourism destinations to form hybrid
gender roles.

Although albeit a ‘lighter’ version of the breadwinner-focused femininity that female
entrepreneurs assume during the summer, in the winter female entrepreneurs seem to keep some of
the gender role negotiations that occurred during the summer. When looking at international
literature, the way in which some migrant women try to overcompensate for their prolonged absence
is by doing all household tasks on their return to their family which points to a limited amount of
gender role negotiation, especially since their children take on many of the social reproductive tasks
in their absence rather than their husbands (Asis, 2006). However, when looking at the overall
picture, as for example the Vietnamese female migrants researched by Thao and Aggergard (2012),
women have increased power in decision making for large purchases since migrating, which highlights
how women draw on primary breadwinners’ subjectivities and caring roles, contradicting the notion
that gender roles are static.
This performance of gender across connected sites, with female tourism entrepreneurs enacting slightly differently gender roles at home, at work and during different seasons, highlights the complexity of gender role negotiations as gender is gradually constituted, dissolved and reconstituted again from these repetitive performances (Butler, 2004). Just as gender and gender roles are formed by interconnected processes of re-enactment, economic practices are also performative. For example, new forms of entrepreneurship are gradually becoming accepted as ‘normal’ after being subjected to gendered interrogations of political and cultural influences on economic gender role performances (Mitchell, 2005). Focusing on the significance of tourism seasonality in terms of economic and social reproduction restructuring, I explore how, in seasonal destinations, relocation of the site of production and consumption occurs through the seasonal movement of entrepreneurs’ parents to their children’s place of work, as the parents move there to help with their children’s social reproductive activities.

8.4.1 Seasonal relocation of social reproduction

An aspect of tourism seasonality that affects the distribution of social reproduction and hence the negotiation of related gender roles, is the dependence of participants not only on help from their immediate family members such as their partners or children, but also from their parents. As many of the participants’ parents often live in different cities to their children, a relocation of social reproduction is observed, with the parents coming to live with the entrepreneurs for three or four months during the summer in order to help their children with social reproduction. Although this phenomenon is especially marked for entrepreneurs that have very small children, it seems to continue to be a common trend with most entrepreneurs’ parents taking the opportunity to have a holiday themselves whilst helping their children out. The prolonged duration of these ‘working holidays’ prompts an interrogation of how relocating social reproduction operates to blur the boundaries between tourism and work and allows for parallels to be drawn between this phenomenon and migration, viewing seasonal relocation in terms of a ‘temporary migration’ as is explored in the context of this study’s participants.

An example of this ‘temporary migration’ and the consequent seasonal relocation of social reproduction is Liana’s situation. Liana is a wedding-favour maker in Rethymno’s Old Town whose parents (living permanently in Athens), relocate to Rethymno for the summer’s duration in order to
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46 I also observed this trend of parents relocating to help their children with social reproduction tasks in some of my friends’ families such as a friend whose husband worked as an on-call doctor for tourists and she as a pharmacy-owner whose parents came from Athens to Chania, Crete to live with them for the duration of the summer (4-5 months!). Whilst this caused serious space-sharing issues within their small house, my friend was obliged to have this arrangement in lack of other economically feasible and trust-worthy alternatives.
help their daughter with social reproductive activities such as childcare. Her parents have what Liana calls the responsibility of the “child parking”. In fact they do more than just ‘child parking’, they do various social reproductive activities such as caring for the young baby, taking the baby on walks, bringing the baby to the shop at feeding time, paying bills on Liana’s behalf, babysitting while Liana pursues her hobby of volley-ball training, and provide emotional support for their daughter in the busy and often stressful summer period. As analysed in Chapter Seven, especially Greek grandmothers, feel it their responsibility to look after their grandchildren. This responsibility is culturally enforced via the need to adhere to ‘good mother’ images as the grandchild is considered ‘twice your child’ (Lyberaki, 2011). Another reason that makes the grandparents’ relocation necessary, is that privatised help for young children and the elderly is stigmatised because of a lack of trust of outsiders (Dubisch, 1993). Adding to this, is the lack of state provision for childcare for children under three years old which makes grandparents’ help with childcare even more necessary (Jappens and Van Bavel, 2012).

A similar trend in parents relocating from their permanent residence to provide social reproductive assistance is observed in the Margarites pottery couple (George and Mariniki) when Mariniki’s mother comes to help out during the summer months, relocating from her home in another part of Crete. During the summer, as George says, social reproduction tasks such as “cleaning, the clothes, the food are all responsibilities of Mariniki and my mother-in-law, when she is here during the summer”. Ioanna, also recruits her parents’ help on a seasonal basis during the summer tourist period. During the summer months, her parents relocate for a few months from Albania to Crete in order to help with their daughter’s family’s social reproduction duties, as Ioanna says “my parents come and keep the children because here the hours are so many that you can’t even cook or do the household jobs, so you must have some people at home”.

As care is increasingly commodified and hence increasingly relocated outside the house, keeping social reproduction at the place of production is significant within modern day capitalism and this is often a subject of political action as observed by Sevenhuijsen (2003) who finds a connection between political action and the relocation of care in Holland. By being commodified, social reproduction becomes more important in economic terms as it is increasingly perceived in economic terms rather than just an unpaid, invisible, altruistic activity. Simultaneously, commodification of social reproduction often means that social reproduction is relocated geographically, which has serious repercussions for the economy as labour power is relocated. A striking example of where social reproduction is commodified and geographically relocated is when women migrate in order to provide domestic help to wealthy individuals. This represents a spatial transfer of wealth, as the
migrants move their own social reproduction labour power to another country which also leads to a restructuring of social reproduction (Katz, 2001).

Much like the migrant workers who relocate to provide privatised social reproduction by working as domestic help in countries other than their own (Arat-Koc, 2006), the seasonal relocation of participants’ parents results in the restructuring of social reproduction with uneven effects. For example in Liana’s case, whilst her parents help their daughter with social reproduction tasks on an unpaid basis (unlike the migrants who do so on a paid basis), the relocated parents rely on Liana’s mother-in-law’s social reproduction help in the form of cooking. This indicates an increase in the mother-in-law’s social reproduction duties at the site of tourism production, which is caused by Liana’s parents’ seasonal relocation. As well as the actual cooking, the mother-in-law also pays for the materials needed to cook, which represents a transfer of responsibility for cooking from Liana to her mother-in-law because of Liana’s involvement in tourism entrepreneurship. Liana’s parents also spend money at the site of production, as they are effectively on a type of holiday, and so go out for coffee, meals and swimming. The increased economic transactions are a result of social reproduction’s seasonal relocation are significant to tourism economic analysis as they create capital flows both through the labour power input by the relocated grandparents, the increased labour power input by the mother-in-law (at the place of consumption) and of course the material sustenance and expenditure of the relocated grandparents.

Additionally, the seasonal relocation of social reproduction indicates how capitalism acts as an “unsettled, dissolute, irresponsible stalker of the world” (Katz, 2001, p. 709) by effectively transferring the tourism entrepreneurs’ relocated parents’ wealth to the site of production, albeit on a seasonal basis, via their summer stay with their daughters. This represents a restructuring of social reproduction on a seasonal basis caused by tourism which has been missing from most tourism development literature. Whilst invisible, this tourism-induced relocation of social reproduction shows how tourism development encourages female entrepreneurs to negotiate gendered social reproduction roles by effectively off-loading these tasks onto relocated others (their parents).

Seasonality seems to promote mobility of social reproduction, which in turn has an economic dimension in terms of the relocated parents spending their money in the tourism production site rather than at home, as well as contributing to the social reproduction economy at the tourism production site. This is another way in which tourism promotes mobility, facilitated by the movement of employees who seasonally relocate to tourist sites in search of work, thus promoting increasingly mobile social relations (Duncan et al., 2013).
When analysing how the mobility of social reproduction affects social relations, a focus on the effect of this tourism-induced mobility on gender roles and relations is warranted. As the relocated parents are only seasonally available to take over social reproduction, they temporarily disrupt negotiations of social reproduction gender roles by undertaking their children’s social reproduction. Whilst this may reduce negotiations of social reproductive activity distribution within the family, on the parents’ departure, tourism entrepreneurs are left to re-negotiate these activities and the associated gender roles. This creates complexity in the way gender roles are transformed as on the one hand tourism entrepreneurs are able to take up productive roles more effectively as they delegate social reproduction activities to their parents. However, this merely stalls negotiations rather than permanently influencing them and often leaves entrepreneurs with guilty feelings as they try to adhere to ‘intensive mothering’ ideals. In contrast, during the tourism shoulder season, female participants are encouraged to adhere to these ideals by being primarily responsible for social reproduction activities without any help from parents, children or having the ‘excuse’ of working.

This seasonal relocation of social reproduction is also influenced by political factors such as those impacting on welfare. The state plays a key role in mediating the conflict between the need to accumulate and the need to maintain the labour force’s living standards, by taking care of people’s social reproductive needs whilst they work, for example by providing childcare facilities and schools (Luxton, 2006a). However for this study’s participants, childcare facilities such as kindergartens and educational facilities such as schools are not available during the summer, making the state’s contribution to social reproduction absent. For the female tourism entrepreneurs, this results in leaving gendered responsibilities, such as childcare and education on women’s shoulders who off-load them to their relocated parents. If there were provisions within tourism development programs for policies that included help with social reproduction duties for tourism entrepreneurs’ families within the summer period, the state could play a more active role in ensuring its labour force’s social reproduction and simultaneously help challenge gendered social reproduction roles. However neoliberal political beliefs that ‘fetishize’ (Arat-Koc, 2006, p. 92) qualities of independence and self-reliance as workers’ ideal qualities, are unlikely to produce state welfare responses to tourism’s seasonal effect on social reproduction and hence continue to both make invisible this work as well as acting to preserve its gendered nature.

As discussed, seasonality is a structural cause of disruption to economic processes, affecting the relationship of entrepreneurship to gender roles and relations in various ways. Another structure that acts upon this relationship is the economic crisis which has been affecting Greece since 2010 which has been transforming social structures and economic relations at both the productive and social reproductive levels, as shall be discussed next.
8.5 How the Greek economic crisis affects gender role negotiations

The importance of economic crises to tourism is significant because whilst austerity measures, rising levels of unemployment and salary-cuts have globalised impacts, tourism’s voluntary nature (Hall, 2010), makes the tourism industry especially sensitive to crises (Cohen, 2012). Hence, it is pertinent to focus on the social impacts of the Greek economic crises by describing how participants in this study perceive the effects of the economic crisis in terms of its effect on tourism entrepreneurship activities and social reproductive activities. To get an idea of the severity of the Greek economic crisis, it has resulted in the economy shrinking by 15% in the last 4 years and unemployment rising from 8.3% in 2008 to 22.6% in 2012, whereas labour costs have decreased by a massive 23% since 2008 (Galanos, 2013). Whilst various studies focus on the fiscal and capital impacts of the Greek economic crisis on tourism (Papatheodorou et al., 2010), fewer studies have focused on the crisis’ social impacts on tourism, such as the impacts on social reproduction (Young, 2003) and women (Karamessini and Rubery, 2013). The ways in which social reproduction is managed in times of economic crisis, is of vital importance as state expenditure for welfare is cut and the domestic sector is expected to absorb this shock, acting as a “safety net of last resort” (p. 67) as Elson (2012) aptly describes the family’s role in macroeconomic crises.

So, in this section I focus on how the crisis contributes to moulding gender roles and relations, by looking at how the uneasy combination of an alteration in the time spent completing productive activities and reduced ability to hire external help, impacts on social reproductive gender roles. An alteration in time spent on productive activities is a result of a decrease of ‘real wages’ (as taxation and bills increase) which consequently requires increased female participation in the work force with a historically unique intensity. The crisis affects the increased necessity of women to work productively and so justifies women’s absence from housework; thus the crisis can be seen to create space for negotiation of social reproductive gender roles and relations (Mannon, 2006). The intensity with which both partners’ wages are required is illustrated by Katerina who says with a hint of despair: “I don’t know how we would survive if I did not work as well as my husband!”.

For the majority of participants in Crete, which has high levels of international tourists, responses to the crisis relate to the increased amount of time spent making and selling handicrafts. This increase in productivity is not however driven by increased demand, as research shows that fewer and poorer tourists are visiting Greece now. Papatheodorou, Rosello and Xiao (2010) comment that there has been a downturn in international tourists because of the macroeconomic crisis and also that the type of tourists is changing, with less money being spent per tourist. When doing fieldwork in the summer of 2012, in Rethymno, Crete, whilst there was no obvious drop in the
numbers of tourist visiting, many participants did point out that the “quality of tourists has changed, the ones that come seem to be uninterested” (Mariniki, interview). Regarding the number of tourists coming to Crete however, Frosso says, even though she “hasn’t seen the crisis because I don’t work with Greek tourists”, she does admit to working more hours because of the crisis by saying: “I work a bit more with the crisis.” So there is an indication that the crisis has resulted in women increasing their productive work, which also happened in the Asian financial crisis, resulting in women working more hours as Young (2003) reports. On the subject of increasing the number of hours worked, Katerina also stresses how she now takes any commission that is going, for example making multiple identical pottery items as wedding or christening favours, whereas before the crisis she was more selective and worked more exclusively on producing items for her tourist shop, as she narrates: “whatever it is, christening or wedding, I’ll do it because that is where I will make money from, but before I didn’t do work for these commissions. Now I am squeezed for time.”

This reference to being “squeezed” for time brings to the fore how economic crises press women to work more, which is also seen in other financial crises (Utting et al., 2012). It is significant to mention here that Katerina’s increased engagement with pottery is not only a result of the financial pressures posed by increased taxation and decreased revenue, it is also because her husband has “made openings” by getting loans for his carpentry business. As construction of new homes in Greece has halted, indicated also by BlondeK who says that her husband who is a tile-layer is seriously underemployed, Katerina’s husband finds it hard to find enough work in order to pay off the loans he took out to buy equipment. Hence Katerina acts to “cushion” (Peterson, 2005, p. 514) the crisis’ impact on household income by extending her working hours, which does however act to obscure the gendered costs of the crisis as her responsibility for social reproduction activities does not diminish to a great extent.

In other countries, the gendered effects of the crisis are different to those in our case study. For example, in the Central American crisis women’s entry into the labour market was hindered because the reliance on women as primary carers (in the lack of state alternatives) contributed to a rise in female unemployment (Espino, 2013). This gendered reduction in employment is also observed by Elson (2010) who explains it as being because employers consider men having “more right” (p. 206) to keep their jobs as primary breadwinners. However, Espino (2013) notes that female entrepreneurs in particular are resilient to economic crises, as seen in Nicaragua and Costa Rica where despite the crises women still occupy a high percentage of the market. In Greece, the crisis
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47 On the subject of tax reforms during economics crises, Ortiz and Cummins (2013) point out how these can be a particular threat to women and children as crisis-led social sector spending allocations tend not to provide sufficient support to women and children.
affects both men and women in terms of unemployment because the labour market institutions no longer protect men as “primary earners” (p.409) as Matsaganis (2012) reports. At the same time, as unemployment rises, state support for social reproduction in Greece has been reduced due to crisis-driven welfare expenditure cuts and current political ideology that presumes families will step-in to fill this gap in social reproduction provision either by increased private spending, for example in the form of migrants (Maroukis, 2013), or by turning to neighbours, friends or their community (Matsaganis, 2011). In the face of a decrease in welfare provisions such as cuts in the ‘Home Help’ programs (recipients reduced by 30-40%) that provides help for the elderly in their homes and the unreliably ‘free’ healthcare system and childcare benefits being available only for people with three children or more (Matsaganis, 2012), there is an increased push to find alternative social reproduction arrangements.

Social protection, far from being an unaffordable ‘luxury’, is essential to peoples’ survival through the crisis (Utting et al., 2012). However introduction of temporary assistance measures for example “special support schemes” (Matsaganis, 2012, p. 414) in the form of a few hundred euros being paid in a lump sum, does little to ease people’s dire situation on a long-term basis and indicates the failure of the welfare state to protect its most vulnerable. It is interesting that in the absence of the welfare state, various voluntary community groups, ‘solidarity networks’ (Smith, 2009) have stepped in to create a sense of increased social cohesion in the form of offering help to low-income families by collecting and distributing food and medicine donations, as well as providing private lessons to children. Extreme cases of altruism are observed such as a man in Athens (calling himself ‘The Other Human’) who on a daily basis cooks for 3000 homeless people using his own and donated funds (Diniakos, 2013). These are all examples of where social reproduction tasks e.g. cooking and educating children are taken up by the state or voluntary citizen initiatives and whilst instigated by the crisis, are a product of many years of inconclusive state policies regarding providing citizens with social reproduction solutions. One temporary welfare response from the state is the means-tested shops (so called ‘social grocery stores’) that provide food and clothes and which are being formed by municipalities and are popping-up all over Greece. Some of the participants mentioned using these shops to secure basic foods such as flour and pulses. The other effect of the crisis is upon the take-up of privatised social reproduction solutions such as hiring help with cleaning the home and shop which shall be discussed next.

8.5.1 Crisis-driven depletion of privatised social reproduction

Many participants in Crete express the feeling that the crisis has affected them less than fellow Greeks who live in Athens, as illustrated by Kostis’ words: : “It’s easier to survive in the countryside as
at least the food is plentiful. Everyone has a garden or knows someone with a garden. We won’t go hungry like the Athenians”. However, even so, participants note that now ‘with the crisis’, they have to cut back on the employment of people to help with the shop or with social reproductive activities. For example Mariniki narrates how she used to “bring a girl to clean all the house and the shop”, but that now she does it all “out of necessity”, which is similar to what Elson (2012) observes happening in Chile, where faced with an economic crisis, women dismiss domestic help and complete the household work themselves, thus increasing the time spend doing unpaid social reproductive work.

Privatisation of social reproduction restrains gender role negotiation through the under-valuation of care as the commodified version of care is majorly performed by women and is lowly-paid, illustrated by the health-care workers examined by Cohen and Cohen (2006). The privatisation of social reproduction, also challenges the “neoliberal myth of self-sufficiency and independence” (Bakker and Silvey, 2008b, p. 8), as illustrated by migrant women who undertake domestic tasks away from their home, highlighting the global interdependence of productive and social reproductive work (Arat-Koc, 2006). Similarly, although Mariniki’s restricted ability to hire help (after relying on this solution for a number of years) may be viewed as a way in which she depends on the market for social reproduction, which according to LeBaron (2010) “goes against the household’s traditional purpose of fulfilling human need” (p. 907), this also strengthens her power to negotiate gender roles, indicated in the way she says she completes social reproductive work “out of necessity” as opposed to it being a given that she will shoulder social reproductive activities.

In addition, although the crisis-induced reduction in privatised social reproduction help indicates an increase in women’s social reproductive activities, this may not serve to re-define womanhood, but rather, according to Adkins (2009), point towards a “transformation of time” (p. 332) that acts to challenge current gender roles as the time women spend doing either productive or reproductive work is given similar value or ‘opportunity cost’. Adding on to the time equation, of particular significance is the fact that Mariniki and her partner can no longer hire a helper with the pottery-making. Mariniki undertakes this engagement even though it stretches her labour time to the limits, which results in her adhering more closely to hybrid forms of breadwinner-carer gender roles. The ability to switch between carer and breadwinner roles is facilitated by being self-employed and it is this “rescheduling” (p. 719) of time which Craig, Powell and Cortis (2012) cite as being the main reason women engage in entrepreneurship, but they found that in their participants this time-rescheduling did little to reduce the gendered division of labour. However, in the current study, by negotiating perceptions of social reproduction as valuable in terms of opportunity cost made visible by the temporality value of social reproduction, entrepreneurs do in fact seem to be achieving a
more equitable division of labour within the household as it becomes more acceptable to ask for help with social reproduction.

Ioanna also says how, before the crisis, she used to hire privatised help with her shop in the form of a shop assistant to stay in the shop for a few hours whilst she rested at midday. However, now they cannot afford this as she says: “We used to be able to get a girl to change us for 3-4 hours. Now we can’t, no, it doesn’t work financially. No way.”. What this results in, is an increasing amount of fatigue being experienced by Ioanna, which is a common feeling among women in economic crises according to Young (2003). Ioanna finds a solution for this during the summer (when I visited the year after my fieldwork was completed) by getting her son who was back from university for the summer, to manage the shop for a number of hours a day. This shift in responsibility for productive work to a younger family member is not uncommon in Greek tourism SMEs. Tsartas (2003) observes that young people in Greek tourism SMEs are often relied on by their family to “modernise” (p. 117) the business. However it does represent a return for Ioanna to completing more social reproductive activities, with debatable consequences on how gender roles are being negotiated as her husband and son become primary breadwinners because of her exhaustion.

So in conclusion, the economic crisis increases the intensity with which women’s time is required and by virtue of finding ways to re-distribute time between productive and reproductive activities, women challenge the notion that their primary responsibility lies with social reproduction. However, the entrepreneurs’ inability to hire help with either productive or social reproductive activities means that female entrepreneurs succumb to exhaustion and this has mixed effects on gender roles. Ioanna deals with the exhaustion by re-delegating productive work to her son, and Marinki asks for social reproduction help from her husband. When looking at how female entrepreneur participants perceive the crisis’s effects on them, it is interesting to also note that they now display an increased adherence to breadwinner roles, indicated by their focus on concepts of productive work. This change of focus is particularly evident in participants whose business is hard-hit by the economic crisis such as the Zagori tourism entrepreneurs.

8.5.2 “Let’s have a job, nothing else”: how the crisis genders perceptions of work

The majority of Zagori participants, indicate a reduction in time spent working in their business because they rely on domestic tourism for their income and since the majority of domestic tourists are experiencing losses in income or unemployment, the visitation levels of domestic tourists have dropped exponentially. The women’s cooperative’s entrepreneurs now alternate the days worked amongst themselves during the week rather than working every day as they used to do before the crisis. This decrease in paid work has increased the time spent on social reproductive tasks, as
narrated by BlondeK, one of the women from the cooperative who says: “Now that I work less, I work more at home. But I am not sitting, that is what is important!” A similar reduction in paid labour among women is also observed in Costa Rica where women’s labour force participation in the tourism sector dropped by 1% which did however result in a higher percentage of women becoming employed in the informal sector as this allowed them to combine family and work better (Espino, 2013). Whilst BlondeK’s narration relates to “good housewife” images that portray women as altruistic, hard-working individuals, who are not meant to adhere to masculine images of ‘sitting’ (Herzfeld, 1991a), this reduction in productive activity in Zagori, has prompted many female entrepreneurs I spoke to, to re-evaluate the significance of productive work to them.

For example, Anthoula places high importance on continuing to have a job and thus being one of her family’s primary breadwinners as she characteristically says, when asked how the crisis has affected her: “let’s have a job, nothing else”. Anthoula’s response illustrates the increased adherence to breadwinner roles that female entrepreneurs may experience because of the increased wage necessity created by the crisis. This may be construed as one of the ways in which a crack in the ‘capitalist icing’ sucks women further into the market system by making them prioritise working over social provisioning (Harman, 2010). However, during an economic crisis, when state welfare provisions frequently decrease, this increased prioritisation of work also generates complexities in how gender roles are being transformed as women experience increased pressure to be primary caregivers in the absence of any state assistance.

Anthoula herself experiences a crisis-induced cut in welfare provision in the form of her mother’s disability pension being stopped as a result of policies recognising disabilities over 80%, instead of 67% as used to be the case prior to 2012 (Kokaliari, 2012). However, for Anthoula, this crisis-induced cut has intensified the need for her wage double-fold, rather than intensify the need for her to act as primary carer, with primary carer responsibilities being shifted to her mother who undertakes most social reproductive activities within their common home, with Anthoula as a helper. Even so, Anthoula stresses how they struggle to get by, with her wage only being enough for paying the bills as she says when asked who takes the decisions on how to spend money within the family: “most times it is only the bills that I can pay – since the bills are taken care of, there is little left for anything else”. This illustrates how social reproductive gender roles are very much connected to productive gender roles.

Whilst Anthoula and Anna who are based at the handicraft school are not actively seeking alternatives in terms of increasing their income source, other female entrepreneurs respond to the crisis’s decrease in income by adhering to entrepreneurship ideals of innovation and risk-taking. For
example, many Cretan tourism handicraft entrepreneurs conceptualise the solution to their reduction in profits as being to invest in new designs and to reach out to international customers using e-technology such as e-shops. Frosso plans on opening an e-shop in order to sell her pottery abroad in order to have an income during the winter period when the physical shop is closed. Manolis also plans to sell his items via his webpage and e-shop, the completion of which he has neglected until now. Both Frosso and Manolis reach this decision as they realise that decorative items such as pottery are counted as luxuries in crisis-stricken Greece and so the likelihood of selling within Greece is severely reduced. As Manolis says: “I am trying to improve the quality of my items to attract more people and I am also attempting to find more clients from abroad via the e-shop I want to make”. The use of new technology is counted as innovation and looking at studies addressing entrepreneurship characteristics, innovation is one of the most common qualities associated with entrepreneurship (Gurel et al., 2010), which perhaps indicates how the gendered interpretation of the term ‘entrepreneur’ is changing as both men and women are equally ‘innovative’ in this study.

What is of particular interest in this section, is the gendered perception of work within tourism. Much literature speaks to how work within tourism is gendered with women occupying feminised positions such as chamber-maids, cleaners and cooks and men occupying managerial positions, undertaking guide-work and transportation services (Sinclair, 1997). Looking at the tourism handicraft sector in particular, there is also a degree of gendering with some crafts being acceptable for both men and women such as pottery, but others, such as crocheting, weaving or knitting are considered to have a feminine nature, thus excluding men. The transformation of these formerly female social reproductive tasks into productive activities accounts for the feminised nature of these activities within tourism as seen in research on female Bangladeshi handicraft-makers who feel empowered by earning money, but still consider handicraft work to be of low value (Le Mare, 2012).

The gendered nature of handicrafts often operates to exclude men as illustrated by the entrepreneurs who engage in ‘feminised’ crafts, such as the women who weave and make carpets at the Rizarios Handicraft School saying that the idea of men taking up weaving would be very odd to them. For instance Anthoula says: “Weaving is a woman’s occupation. It seems a bit weird to me for men to be doing it”, whereas Anna finds the idea that men would engage in such a feminised activity slightly ridiculous by saying: “If I hear of a man with a loom, I will laugh!”. Indeed, socialisation from a young age in various crafts, such as crafts taught at school, is important in the perception of how crafts are gendered, like for example learning textiles crafts being exclusively for women as used to be the practice in Greek schools in the 1960s (MrsE, interview) and currently still is in Finland (Kokko, 2009), promoting a link between femininity and textile crafts. The rise in feminised craft-making such as jewellery-making, knitting and crocheting within women’s circles in Greece is an interesting
phenomenon, which one participant says is a direct result of the crisis by saying “Now that the crisis is here, more women are learning how to make things for themselves” (Vaggelio, interview).

This raises the question of whether taking the domestic into the public is in fact a radical feminist stance to make the invisible visible or if this action operates to further gender the way these crafts are perceived and valued. Many women consider the participation in groups such as the new Stitch n’ Bitch group one of my participants told me she recently joined (Hara, personal FB communication, Oct. 2013), to constitute a type of activism, what Bratich and Brush (2011) term “craftivism” (p.234) by bringing what used to be an invisible social reproductive task into the open.

This may be seen as a way in which the necessity to make cheaper commodities created by the crisis strengthens stereotyped gender roles by reinforcing the connection of former social reproductive activities such as knitting to femininity, as well as creating the need for women to spend more time on social reproductive activities rather than paid labour (Elson, 2012). This analysis indicates how men are excluded from certain crafts, which means that even in the time of dire necessity, such as in the case of unemployment during the crisis, men are seemingly dissuaded by gendered stereotypes to engage in such activities. When applying the ‘rational man’ economic theory to this instance we see its discrepancies as a ‘rational man’ would try anything in order to maximise profit and since he is independent, he wouldn’t worry about social perceptions regarding whether the profit-making activity is gendered or not (Waylen, 2000).

8.5.3 Female entrepreneurs ‘recruit’ their partners into tourism handicraft entrepreneurship

Despite the apparent rise in gendering of crafts, the economic crisis has an interesting effect on the male partners of handicraft entrepreneurs. As economic crises such as in Asia, Argentina and Brazil (Young, 2003) generate high unemployment in male-dominated industries, such as construction (Verick, 2009), there is a pool of unemployed men created. In the current study, this pool of ‘idle’ men presents a unique opportunity for female tourism handicraft entrepreneurs to ‘recruit’ their partners’ productive capacity within their businesses. The first example is an instance where a male participant tries to permeate the border between what are considered feminine and masculine crafts, as seen in Panos, a middle-aged man who owns a small café-restaurant in Zagori together with his wife, Vaggelio. Both Panos and Vaggelio make handicrafts that they then sell via seasonal exhibitions in their café-restaurant. What is interesting is that Panos does not claim to sell them himself, and limits his agency in the entrepreneurial process by saying that he makes them for his wife: “I only make them for Vaggelio’s exhibition”. By limiting his agency and involvement in what he considers to be a feminised occupation, Panos strives to adhere to masculine subjectivities.
surrounding gendered craft-work such as making faux jewellery\textsuperscript{48}. His perception of what constitutes masculine and feminine activities is blurred as he stands at the divide between being perceived as a handicraft entrepreneur by producing jewellery for money and just doing it as a hobby. However, by saying that he studied \textit{“industrial design at technical school”} he justifies his adherence to masculinity whilst engaging in a craft he considers feminine. Here Panos seems to be distancing himself from craft-work’s feminised quality by considering his work more ‘valuable’ since he learnt the skills through a costly institution which is similar to how Vaughn (2010) observes the perception of craft-work to be changing in his research on quilt-makers in the US. The complex and contradictory nature of gender roles performed by Panos are in continuous negotiation as he picks up feminine subjectivities and then discards them again and is illustrated by the following ethnographic moment:

\textit{One day, while I was sitting and knitting with his wife, Panos came in and commented on how easy we (women) had it saying that “maybe I(he) should take up knitting rather than making the floor!”. My comment to this response was in form of the question, of why he did not take up knitting, wondering if other men would make fun of him. His answer was that “knitting is too delicate for me to learn”. This answer came as a surprise to me, not only because the wire jewellery he makes is very delicate itself, requiring dexterity, but also because just the previous week he had asked me to teach him a type of very delicate crocheting in order to incorporate the technique into his jewellery-making.}

This constantly fluctuating adherence to gender roles shows that Panos has a desire to adhere to feminine subjectivities by expressing a hidden preference to engage in knitting instead of fixing the floor, and he also accepts to learn crocheting (which is considered a feminine craft), but only for the sake of making his jewellery, a domain which he feels does not inhibit him adhering to masculine subjectivities. So Panos, shows the signs of a ‘crisis in masculinities’ occurring as he switches between masculine and feminine subjectivities challenging what crafts counts as ‘feminine’, as well as becoming a ‘helper’ to his wife by producing handicrafts for ‘her’ bazaars. Indications of a crisis in masculinities is also seen in Vietnamese men whose wives have migrated, as they transform their roles into primary carers only on the premise that they are still externally considered primary breadwinners, at least in appearance, as their wives’ salaries are often much higher than their own (Hoang and Yeoh, 2011). Another example of how men are struggling to re-conceptualise masculinity in terms of financial difficulty is observed by Leung and Chan (2012) in their research on how the use of support services by Hong Kong men is low because of men continuing to interpret masculinity in

\textsuperscript{48} There is a distinction between silversmithing and making ‘faux’ jewellery as silversmithing has historically been a masculine craft.
terms of self-sufficiency and powerfulness, when in reality their dire living conditions indicate the contrary. For Panos, refusing to fully take up an occupation that he considers feminised may actually be beneficial to him in the long term, as he strives to avoid being associated with the low female wages which accompany feminised labour. Feminised work prompts women to internalise their low status in periods of unrest such as those caused by economic crisis as observed by Beneria et al. (2000). The reality of Panos’s situation can be conceptualised as being somewhere in between. In the financial vacuum created by the Greek economic crisis, Panos’s handicraft labour power is being recruited by his female entrepreneur partner in order to supplement the dwindling family income, thus making him a secondary breadwinner, a role that he superficially rejects, despite the income made from the jewellery sold increasing their communal family welfare. Difficulty in accepting a secondary breadwinner role has been linked to men trying to bolster their masculinity which they feel threatened, as seen in research looking at how dual-career couples negotiate whose career will take precedence by Livingston (2011) which may explain why Panos also strives to create a disconnect both from his activity as secondary ‘helper’ breadwinner and from the association of his creations to feminised handicrafts such as knitting.

In other crises, women have stepped in to supplement the family income in an economic crisis like Mannon’s (2006) female entrepreneur who started boarding students in her house when the crisis in Costa Rica struck. So, what is happening in the context of some tourism handicraft entrepreneurs in this study is intriguing as it seems that the Greek economic crisis is having the opposite effect, with under/un-employed men being ‘recruited’ by their female entrepreneur partners. Another example where this ‘recruitment’ of male partners occurs is when Ioanna gets her husband to operate her second handicraft shop. As Ioanna’s husband’s profession is skilled construction working and the crisis severely affected the construction industry with employment figures for construction falling from 330k in 2010 to 213k in 2012 (a roughly 50% decrease in construction jobs) (Hellenic Statistical Authority, 2013) the crisis has resulted in him being underemployed for a number of years. A solution to his reduced productivity is found in the form of him working for his wife by managing one of her two tourism handicraft shops in Rethymno. Indications of Ioanna’s primary role in this joint entrepreneurship venture are seen in the fact that as well as crocheting some of the items herself and thus being primary producer, she is in charge of ordering products for both shops and also has a better knowledge of the fabric products. Her husband is not so well acquainted with the product, which perhaps makes him a second-rate salesman, which Ioanna verbalises by gently criticising her husband’s salesman abilities: “he says
things somewhat mechanically, from having heard what I say to sell things...okay\(^{49}\)....”. Ioanna’s husband’s refusal to participate in the current study, means that his opinion on this matter is restricted, however his action of non-participation may indicate that he perceives his knowledge of handicrafts to be secondary to his wife’s.

Apart from a modification in primary/secondary breadwinner roles, there also seems to be a relationship between Ioanna’s husband’s new breadwinner role and social reproduction gender roles, indicated by Ioanna saying that since her husband started working in the shop, he helps more with social reproductive duties which she explains as being because he “has more understanding because he also works many hours”\(^{49}\). In this situation, both Ioanna and her husband work in the same occupation and thus have little difference in earning capacity. Whilst Ioanna is a better and more knowledgeable saleswomen and primary producer, her husband’s shop is located at a more central location, thus having more potential clients than her shop. Literature on the gendered gap in pay which criticises how women occupying similar positions as men get paid less for their efforts (Booth, 2009) is not visible in Ioanna’s situation, however the importance of time in gender role negotiation is evident. Drawing on the importance of time in negotiating gender roles I conceive temporality as being significant to the valuation of labour whether it is paid or not. More specifically, I draw attention to how gendered subjectivities are re-negotiated. As Ioanna works exactly the same hours as her husband, her paid and unpaid work becomes simultaneously more valued by adopting a more laden-breadwinner role, whereas her husband’s reaction to this experience of working for as many hours as his wife, encourages him to adhere to a version of masculinity that allows for the increased participation in social reproductive activities. Ioanna mentions on a couple of occasions how doing the same job has helped in the re-distribution of social reproductive activities by saying how her husband is more considerate of the social reproductive burden she shoulders: “now he understands more, that is why it is good for both partners to do the same job”. Prior research shows that occupations are often gender-segregated, with men who move into gender-inconsistent occupations being penalised (Heilman and Wallen, 2010). Heilman and Wallen’s study shows that men who are good at female-gender type jobs are characterised as ineffectual, whereas women who are good in male-gender type jobs are often disliked by colleagues, illustrating how gender roles segregate occupations that men and women can successful engage in. However, Ioanna and her husband manage to survive under the current austerity measures by re-negotiating gendered subjectivities relating to entrepreneurship and social reproduction adhering to hybrid gender roles of breadwinning and caring which seem to be more resilient in times of financial crises.

\(^{49}\) "okay" ("endaxi" in Greek) in this instance, because of the tone of voice it was said in and the facial expressions that accompanied it, represent Ioanna’s appreciation that her husband has an obvious disadvantage in selling this type of product as he doesn’t know as much about it as she does.
The above examples whereby female entrepreneurs ‘recruit’ their male partners’ labour power illustrate instances of how politico-economic specificities of financial crises transform feminised work into a vehicle of mobilisation of men and women’s agency to challenge gender roles. By recruiting their partners, female entrepreneurs negotiate gender roles relating to their status as primary breadwinner and negotiate more equitable distribution of social reproductive activities, but also allow their husbands to adhere to traditional notions of masculinity. So female entrepreneurs, act as ‘altruistic-rational’ women by allowing their husbands to retain (partial) breadwinner status and thus give their husbands the opportunity to have a sense of belonging within masculine social constructions. In this situation, the said female entrepreneurs are also acting *rationally* by getting their partners to contribute to the family income and thus ensuring the survival of their family unit. The perceived necessity for men to retain their breadwinner status is well illustrated by Liana who comments on how, for men, unemployment is worse than it is for women, by saying:

*I am not of the opinion that a man should not do anything at home, but if a man is unemployed it is soul-destroying. The woman has got used to this…even if she does only household work it is okay, whereas a man would feel terrible... a man should from his own initiative be sure about himself and bring money home, so he can feel good about himself. He shouldn’t be asking me money to get cigarettes for example!*

Hence, recruiting men into handicraft tourism entrepreneurship prevents men from being unemployed (Mannon, 2006, p. 524) or reaching more drastic measures such as committing suicide as their masculinity is irreparably damaged due to its inseparable connection to their now lost breadwinning status (Thébaud, 2010).

As seen in past literature (Mannon, 2006, Cupples, 2005), women’s roles in reinforcing stereotypical conceptualisations of masculinity as being linked to breadwinner roles is not novel, but the novelty of the situation arises because in periods of financial crises more men become unemployed than women. So perhaps a partial solution for one of the crisis’ effects would be to create tourism development projects aimed at female tourism entrepreneurs producing and selling handicraft souvenirs, offering them incentives to involve their male partners, thus reducing rates of male unemployment.

---

50 Depression and suicide rates in Greece rose by approximately 50% from the start of the crisis in 2008 until 2011 as reported by Economou et al. (2013)
8.6 Chapter summary

Tourism entrepreneurship involvement offers women a flexible solution to adhere to caring roles but also plays a significant role in changing women’s perception about how ‘correct’ it is to take on the full burden of both caring and working. This perception of altering the ways in which social reproduction gender roles are structured is illustrated by the gradual change in how entrepreneurs deal with the division of social reproduction tasks.

Hence, in this chapter, the focus has been on how hegemonic gendered articulations surrounding work, femininities and masculinities are restructured because of involvement in tourism handicraft entrepreneurship in the Greek context. By viewing productive and social reproductive elements of the economy as co-constitutive (Cameron and Gibson-Graham, 2003), I explored the relationship among these fluid constructs by analysing how participation in gendered discourses surrounding ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘social reproduction’ create new ideals for tourism handicraft entrepreneurs. Taking a feminist economics view to deconstruct masculine interpretations of what entrepreneurship symbolises (Bruni et al., 2005), this analysis criticises classical economic theories, such as those conceptualising all entrepreneurs to act as ‘rational men’ with little regard for matters outside work (Waylen, 2000). ‘Rational man’ theory upon which many economic models are based, is criticised for failing to include women by assuming them to altruistically take on caring responsibilities (Bergeron, 2011). The representation of women as altruistic care givers prompts the use of altruism as a concept, to further investigate the extent to which changes in gender roles are occurring by exploring how female entrepreneurs relate to the concept of altruism both through their perceptions of entrepreneurship and their constructions of femininity (Brickell and Chant, 2010). Along with altruism, I focus on the significance of time in gendered negotiations by exploring how entrepreneurs justify departures from past gender roles by citing the re-distribution of time as their prime negotiating tool (Adkins, 2009).

Whilst participant entrepreneurs use various negotiating tactics such as nagging, making a person feel guilty, storytelling and reminding, the most common way in which participants negotiate gender roles is by internally negotiating. Looking at how these internalised perceptions form and are expressed, many of the participants view entrepreneurship as more than just an economic phenomenon, but as a social process within which they are embodied as entrepreneurship intertwines with their life rather than simply being a way to make money (Morrison and Skokic, 2012, Tucker, 2010). Accordingly, many female entrepreneurs’ interpretations of entrepreneurship include elements of altruism, such as working for the collective good and more specifically for their family’s benefit, like for example Frosso, who cites one of the reasons her work is respected is because she
“bring[s] money to the family”. The burden of socially-imposed altruism on women produces complex negotiations, as seen in female entrepreneurs who struggle to comply with ‘intensive mothering’ ideals whilst at the same time also adhering to ‘hyper-economic’ ideals. These two gendered expectations compete for time, prompting the introduction of the ‘time-poverty’ concept (Bardasi and Wodon, 2010) and thus highlighting how women’s time is not in fact “infinitely elastic” (Young, 2003, p. 113) as assumed by earlier economists. Female entrepreneurs hence use time as leverage to negotiate gender roles related to women’s primary responsibility as carers, thus resulting in their time being valued more by asking for help from their male partners and delegating social reproductive tasks to their children.

Furthermore, female entrepreneurs transform inaction into action by openly neglecting household duties and thus negotiating for a shift in the responsibility for these duties to other family members, as well as making their social reproductive work visible. This concept of inaction as active negotiation is significant in the Greek context where femininity is closely connected to ideals of cleanliness and immaculate housekeeping (Lazaridis, 2009) and ‘sitting’ is considered a masculine prerogative (Herzfeld, 1991a). However this is not to say that women fully depart from gender roles of caring, but rather that they adopt hybrid identities. As the market urges them to be more rational and individualistic, women become less altruistic thus blurring the boundary between full responsibility for social reproduction and being an entrepreneur.

A transformation in gendered subjectivities also occur for male entrepreneurs as they adjust to women’s new capacity to earn, a process which Kabeer refers to as “painful” (2007, p. 9) as men struggle to adjust to new conceptualisations of masculinity, but do so in novel ways. For example, Manolis draws on the concept of ‘opportunity cost’ (England, 2010) to justify his involvement in social reproductive activities by referring to how “either if you pay someone or you do them yourself, thus losing time from work, it is the same thing”. This also speaks to the increasing commodification of social reproductive work which has made the value of invisible social reproductive tasks more significant and visible, a quality used by Manolis to justify his involvement in these tasks. Other male entrepreneurs show signs of how masculinities and entrepreneurship ideals are changing by expressing the feeling of being “in the middle” (George, interview) of family obligations and work, thus indicating a deviation from ‘rational man’ ideals of entrepreneurship as being detached from one’s surroundings, prompting a conceptualisation of entrepreneurship as a “social change activity with a variety of outcomes” (Calas et al., 2009, p. 553).

Adding to the complexity of the social change brought about by entrepreneurship involvement is a phenomenon common within tourism, that of seasonality. Whilst much literature has focused on
the economic and social effects of seasonality (Andriotis, 2005, Deery et al., 2012), little has been written about the effects of seasonality on gender roles. The current study addresses this gap in literature by pointing towards an interesting situation arising as the liminal period at the beginning and end of the tourism period prompts gender role negotiations to be assumed and then dissolved again. Seasonality’s effect is seen in how many of the participants note that “things are different in the winter” (Katerina, interview) and in the absence of the negotiation tool of temporality, female entrepreneurs adopt full responsibility for social reproductive tasks in the tourism shoulder period, but simultaneously still adhere to entrepreneurship ideals as they continue to produce handicrafts and think of innovative ways to promote their business. Seasonality also instigates the temporary ‘seasonal relocation’ of social reproduction as entrepreneurs’ parents move to their children’s place of work to help them with social reproduction (as well as having a holiday). As this is a form of ‘temporary’ migration, it is useful to draw on literature pertaining to gender roles within migration to illustrate the similarities between the two, as during the ‘temporary’ migratory period female entrepreneurs temporarily off-load social reproductive work onto their parents, just as women who migrate to other countries in search of work do (Hoang and Yeoh, 2011).

As well as representing a spatial transfer of wealth, this temporary migration also represents a relocation of social reproduction of the parents themselves with the associated economic impacts. Seasonal relocation links to tourism mobility, which is conceived of as having uneven effects (Duncan et al., 2013) and in this case the entrepreneurs’ parents’ seasonal mobility acts to temporarily stall social reproductive gender role negotiations. The guilty feelings that many female entrepreneurs mention having during the busy tourist season when their parents are helping with social reproduction point to how female entrepreneurs still struggle to adhere to ‘intensive mothering’ ideals despite working and having help from their parents. This illustrates both the limited capacity of seasonal relocation in altering gender roles surrounding social reproduction and how gradual the process of gender role adaptation is.

Apart from seasonality, in the current study, the Greek economic crisis has an effect on the relationship between entrepreneurship and gender roles. As ‘real wages’ decrease, women’s labour power is required with a historically unique intensity (Mannon, 2006), which makes women’s work a necessity rather than just a supplementary source of income. With male unemployment rising during the crisis (Karamessini and Rubery, 2013), female tourism entrepreneurs are proving resilient by working even harder and often acting as primary contributors to the family income thus “cushioning” (Peterson, 2005, p. 514) the impact of the crisis on household income. However, as women are still constituted as primary carers, they often feel “squeezed for time” (Katerina, interview) as state welfare contributions for social reproduction diminish (Matsaganis, 2012). Privatised social
reproduction solutions are no longer financially viable for many of the participants, which has mixed effects on gender role negotiations as exhaustion sets in and re-delegation of both productive and social reproductive activities occurs. A crisis-induced adherence to breadwinner ideals is observed in many female entrepreneurs who stress the importance of them having a job, illustrating a shift towards prioritising work over social reproduction. This also indicates a shift in feminine ideals of good housewife/mother as these ideals become more intimately connected with being able to provide economically for their family (Harman, 2010). Crisis-driven welfare state policies also support this shift of femininity being connected to providing economically rather than socially as seen in the crisis-driven alteration of eligibility rights for people receiving disability pensions which results in Anthoula’s role becoming more heavily that of breadwinner than of carer when her mother’s disability pension is cut.

Another interesting effect that the crisis has in the context of tourism handicraft entrepreneurs, is the ‘recruitment’ of male partners by female entrepreneurs. Utilising the pool of ‘idle’ men created by crisis-induced male unemployment, female entrepreneurs encourage male partners to become involved in what is considered as a ‘feminised’ occupation, thus both negotiating the gendered nature of these occupations and promoting for a higher value to be placed on social reproductive activities as both partners complete the exact same work. The ‘recruited’ men display a lack of agency in participating in these occupations, hinting towards a crisis in masculinities as men strive to be perceived as breadwinners by engaging in what is perceived as a feminised occupation in order to survive. This illustrates how although men are often penalised for shifting into gender-segregated occupations (Heilman and Wallen, 2010), the financial crisis is dissolving these boundaries, prompting new conceptualisations of both entrepreneurship and gendered subjectivities.

Having discussed how entrepreneurs negotiate concepts of gendered social reproductive subjectivities via their involvement in entrepreneurship and how this involvement serves to create new conceptualisations of what entrepreneurship is by focusing specifically on the effect of two external factors, those of seasonality and an economic crisis, I suggest how further research into the various issues highlighted can offer avenues to more gender equality. Hence, in the concluding chapter which follows, I suggest what further research on gender roles and entrepreneurship can be carried out with the aim of monitoring the gendered forms of social reproduction metamorphosis and the associated significance of using gender as a variable in tourism development programs. In addition, by highlighting the emergence of new interpretations of entrepreneurship, I discuss how these interpretations can inform current theories of entrepreneurship using feminist economics to
critically deconstruct classic economic theorising which is based on ‘rational man’ and ‘altruistic women’ concepts.
Chapter Nine

9 Conclusion and recommendations for further research

As presented in the eight previous chapters, this study’s contribution to knowledge lies in bringing together elements of the productive and social reproductive economy to investigate tourism’s social impacts from a feminist political economy viewpoint, focusing on gender roles and relations in the Greek context. Looking at this relationship, allows for the ways in which gender permeates performances of the economic to be investigated. The relationship between the productive and social reproductive economy is explored by looking at people’s involvement in tourism entrepreneurship and their negotiations of social reproductive duties. Simply put, by looking at how tourism entrepreneurs negotiate social reproductive duties, parallels regarding the ways in which gender roles both operate and are transformed, can be drawn. Moreover, applying feminist critical theory to entrepreneurs’ experiences of entrepreneurship, new theorisations of entrepreneurship are prompted.

Hence, in this section, the major contributions that this study makes to social reproductive gender roles and tourism handicraft entrepreneurship in rural Greece are presented, starting off with a discussion of the dynamism in combining literatures of social reproduction, gender and tourism. I then illustrate the novel methods this study suggests for studying social reproductive gender roles and provide a snapshot of contemporary handicraft tourism entrepreneurs in terms of age, education level, origin and type of economic activities they engage in. The next section within this final chapter focuses on the nuances of the relationship between entrepreneurship and gender roles in terms of: how the market operates to transform social reproductive and entrepreneurial gender roles; the significance of virilocal ties within rural entrepreneurship; how immigrant entrepreneurs are not bound by local gender norms and can escape stereotypical expectations with regards to how they operate; the continuing invisibility of women working within family businesses, whose work is under-valued by being constituted as ‘helpers’; the significance of the ability to re-distribute time in prompting negotiations of social reproductive gender roles; how masculine conceptualisations of entrepreneurship that prioritise individual profit are challenged by the way in which feminine caring roles prompt the prioritisation of community goals over individual goals; and how tourism development affects the distribution of emotive social reproduction, thus altering familial cohesion. Then, I explore the ways in which external influences such as the economic crisis and seasonality affect the structure of social reproduction and conceptualisations of handicraft tourism
entrepreneurship. To follow this, I focus on the significance of children’s roles within the productive and social reproductive economy, bringing to light the increasing role children have within tourism in Greece, especially in the context of the crisis where using market solutions in the form of hiring help are becoming increasingly less viable. Having presented this study’s most significant findings, I make policy recommendations based on these findings. Finally, I make recommendations for further study with the hope that future studies can build upon the current one and advance understanding of current social reproductive gender roles, handicraft tourism entrepreneurship and the relationship they have to each other.

9.1 The dynamism of combining literatures

The dynamism of bringing together literatures on social reproduction and tourism development and using critical feminist theory to draw out the gaps in knowledge that this study aimed to fill, should not be underestimated. By combining these literatures, issues that much development literature omits have come to the fore. For example, the complications for entrepreneurial involvement that the lack of provision of childcare for under three-year olds may cause, or the effect that the lack of state childcare provision during the summer months when the tourism entrepreneurs in Greece are most active, has on children’s roles (Jappens and Van Bavel, 2012).

Furthermore, I consider the various elements that constitute social reproduction and question how these elements are permeated by prevailing gender norms and how politico-economic structures support this gendering of social reproduction. This questioning allows for the more in-depth examination of what is constituted as valuable in economic discourses to be carried out by looking at how social reproduction is commodified (Kilkey and Perrons, 2010). This is done by analysing the value that is attached to social reproduction in terms of time re-distribution and relating this to how feminised social reproductive activities are often perceived as being performed altruistically. Drawing on feminist work on the value attached to housework (Federici, 2012), the possibility of viewing economic value in terms of temporality, that is, in terms of the re-distribution of time rather than ‘clock-time’, becomes apparent (Adkins, 2009).

Development literature (Kabeer, 2007) combined with feminist theorising (Fenstermaker and West, 2013) brings into focus the insight that women do not have shared realities. Despite many development programs’ main goal being to achieve economic growth (Griffin, 2010), I question how applicable it is to view women solely as economic agents, as feminist work shows that they are
embedded within cultural contexts. By combining this insight into how development values are based on the achievement of economic goals rather than social achievements, with entrepreneurship literature that is largely guided by masculine norms, the ways in which gendered economic structures operate are opened to further scrutiny. Indeed, the recent call for more attention to be paid to the social side of entrepreneurship (Tucker, 2010) and the importance of viewing entrepreneurship as a social process (Morrison and Skokic, 2012), are essential when considering what focus research into contemporary entrepreneurship theorising should take (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). Investigating tourism entrepreneurship using social reproduction as an indicator of social impacts as suggested in this study, responds to this gap in knowledge within entrepreneurship and contributes both to furthering entrepreneurship theorising and further theorising about the role of gender within tourism processes.

Answering this study’s guiding research question required full immersion into participants’ lives. This was an intense experience and so I focus on it next by highlighting the methodological points of practical interest that emerged whilst engaging in fieldwork.

9.2 Methodological points of practical interest

Whilst the literature review informs the academic space which this study aims to occupy and hence to some extent prepared me for the possible insights into entrepreneurs’ economic involvement that I might gain, I was less prepared for the hurdles presented by methodological practicalities. This is largely because literature on ethnographic techniques rarely goes into detail on ‘technical details’ of how, for example, access to undertake participant observation can be achieved (Schensul and LeCompte, 2012). Overcoming the challenge of validating participant observation as a research method, in the participants’ eyes, was one of the first and major obstacles I had to overcome. I did this by devising an ‘introductory’ set of semi-structured interview questions and asking potential participants if they could teach me how to make handicrafts. The use of interviews in this manner was necessary in order to ‘validate’ participant observation as a research method and not jeopardise the whole research project and illustrates to the importance of maintaining flexibility when carrying out research projects (McCormack et al., 2013). I bring attention to this here, in the hope that more researchers will share details of their fieldwork techniques, to assist new researchers and potentially develop knowledge regarding the methodological consequences of specific qualitative research techniques chosen. For example, I wonder how the quality of information co-constructed between participants and myself differs amongst participants who also taught me a craft and those who did not. Investigation of such methodological questions could provide a more
nuanced insight into how social relationships in the field operate and how they influence the quality of information presented in studies.

Another methodological nuance that arose when completing fieldwork for this study was the variable applicability of the ‘snowballing’ technique as a method of getting participants for a study. I found that whilst in villages, it was relatively easy to get introduced from one entrepreneur to another, in the semi-urban centre of Rethymno where competition was higher and work-hours were also more intensive, snowballing was a less effective technique. This finding questions the perceived universality in the effectiveness of using the snowballing technique to find participants within both rural and urban areas.

The methods employed in this study highlight the importance of reciprocity in research which talks to the interconnectivity between the production of knowledge and the ethics of production (Trainor and Bouchard, 2012). As researcher, I felt the need to reciprocate the precious time that participants spent with me and make up for the vulnerability that I introduced to their lives by my questioning. Although the perceived boundaries of power, perspective and position within my research were difficult to define, I tried to reciprocate participants’ input by helping them in any way I could, for example fundraising for the Rizarios Handicraft School. Perceiving reciprocity as a stance, rather than just the act of exchanging things of equal value, I feel that taking this stance improved our research relationship as participants did not feel that I was taking them for granted or using them and this improved the trust they had in me, which, in turn, contributed to more honest accounts from participants.

One of the significant contributions this study has made is to introduce a new method for researching social reproduction. By using a list of what tasks male and female participants perceive as social reproductive tasks and then questioning how the perception of what constitutes a social reproductive task changes over time, I was able to investigate how social reproductive gender roles are altering over generations. An example of this inter-generational change in gendered social reproductive tasks, is the paying of bills which most younger participants perceived to be a female responsibility, where as elderly participants perceived to be a male responsibility. This alteration in social reproductive gender roles raises discussion regarding the permeation of the capitalist pressure to accumulate into social relations. As ideals of femininity become more closely associated with the ability to provide economically for their family, social reproductive roles alter to reflect this change showing how the increased amount of capitalist control in people’s lives channels human activity into forms led by the need to be productive.
Having suggested ways in which future research on social reproduction and gender roles can build on the findings from the present study, I focus on the most significant findings this study has derived regarding the relationship of female tourism handicraft entrepreneurship and gender roles and relations in rural Greece.

9.3 Handicraft tourism entrepreneurship in Greece

With regard to the state of handicraft tourism entrepreneurship in Greece, limited studies have recently addressed its current status (Perivoliotis, 2002), most only including handicrafts as an activity promoted within rural tourism or agrotourism development initiatives that target increasing female employment (Skuras et al., 2006, Aggelopoulos et al., 2008). Whilst the current study does not provide a comprehensive analysis of handicraft tourism within Greece, it does provide a snapshot into this sector.

Based on this snapshot, handicraft tourism in Greece is characterised by small, often family-run businesses, and some cooperative structures such as handicraft schools and women’s cooperatives. In contrast to the general perception that handicraft tourism entrepreneurship is attractive because of its low-entry requirements, which often pre-supposes that this type of entrepreneur has low levels of education, a large majority of participants in this study were educated to university or college level, indicating how participants engage in this type of entrepreneurship out of choice, rather than it being a last solution. It is also interesting that participants in this study engage in the production of a variety of handicrafts from pottery, to crocheting, to silversmithing with no clear definition of feminine and masculine crafts emerging, apart from in the case of the cooperative and handicraft school in Zagori, which operated exclusively with women’s labour. With regards to the age of handicraft tourism entrepreneurs, whilst literature I studied prior to entering the field prepared me for elderly ‘women in black’ to dominate the field, this was not the case and the majority or participants were in their early 40s. Also of interest in this snapshot, is that many of the handicraft tourism entrepreneurs were not local, a finding which if investigated with more statistical vigour, could have possible implications for rural tourism development policies aiming at attracting people from urban centres to re-populate Greece’s deserted rural villages.

One of the other characteristic of handicraft tourism entrepreneurs in this study is that they are pluriactive. Especially Cretan participants who experience high seasonality are often pluriactive, and engage in a variety of activities including attending to their olive groves, teaching pottery to children or adults, holding free felting workshops for children and organising a Christmas pottery fair.
During the off-season. Whilst this pluriactivity corresponds to peasant entrepreneur characteristics (Tucker, 2010), in this study, pluriactivity is constituted as a response to seasonality, as many handicraft entrepreneurs who do not have peasant connections engage in these activities during the shoulder season, indicating a need to supplement their income.

With regards to the funding that handicraft entrepreneurs receive from tourism development programs, this study finds that there is very limited funding specifically of this type of tourism. Some of the handicraft tourism entrepreneurs receive help from EU-instigated rural development programs such as LEADER. EU rural development funding in combination to various (not tourism- or handicraft-specific) national development funds help handicraft entrepreneurs to renovate buildings to use as shops and studios, buy equipment (e.g. ovens for the potters) and build websites to promote their handicrafts online. However there is no specific funding for tourism handicraft entrepreneurs and since the demise of EOMMEX (Greek organisation for handicraft SMEs) in 2012, little support is available to promote handicraft tourism in Greece, with most tourism development funds in Greece being channelled to the hotel sector (Tsartas and Lagos, 2013). The handicraft sector plays a big role within Greek tourism, as after securing a place to sleep and food to eat and taking tours or going to the beach, shopping is one of the main activities tourists engage in. This obvious lack in funding for original, hand-made items results in the proliferation of cheap souvenirs with the obvious implications for Greece’s image when tourists take back ‘a bit of Greece’ to their home country.

9.4 How entrepreneurship and social reproductive gender roles relate

Presenting the ways in which participant entrepreneurs conceptualise themselves as entrepreneurs is a complicated endeavour indeed, due to participants’ varied and often contradictory accounts of their entrepreneurial experiences.

In answering the overarching research question, I have interrogated the ways in which gender permeates the economic, and come to various conclusions regarding the relationship of handicraft tourism entrepreneurship to gender roles and relations in Greece. Central to this relationship are entrepreneurs’ internal negotiation practices, which restructure hegemonic gendered articulations surrounding work, femininities and masculinities.

The first key outcome of this study is that participation in gendered discourses surrounding ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘social reproduction’ creates new ideals for tourism handicraft entrepreneurs. Whilst female entrepreneurs are often represented as altruistic care-givers, I find that
female entrepreneurs’ are using the leverage of time, which is intricately woven in to life-processes (Adkins, 2009, Federici, 2012), to re-negotiate social reproductive gender roles. By asking for help from their male partners or children, in social reproductive tasks, because they do not have enough time to complete them, female entrepreneurs in this study ask for recognition of the time spent completing household tasks. They do this by making the time spent completing social reproductive tasks visible, as they either stop completing them or ask for help with them. Hence, time constraints that are created by women’s engagement in the productive economy urge for a value to be put on the time spent completing social reproductive tasks, hence time is used as a negotiating tool for more gender equality. Asking for help from male family members is especially significant in the Greek context where femininity is closely linked to housekeeping ideals and ‘sitting’ is considered a masculine prerogative (Lazaridis, 2009, Herzfeld, 1991a).

Ultimately, female entrepreneurs’ prime negotiating tool is the re-distribution of time, which they use to depart from past gender roles, as seen in the comparison between collective and individual entrepreneurs. As it emerges, the crucial difference between the two business structures is the ability to re-distribute productive activities amongst collective entrepreneurs, which is associated with decreased levels of gender role negotiation. Whilst re-distribution of time is possible for collective entrepreneurs, this results in a diminished ability to negotiate social reproduction gender roles, compared to individual entrepreneurs who achieve a higher level of social reproductive gender role negotiation as they delegate tasks to husbands and children more frequently than collective entrepreneurs. However, whilst within cooperative structures, the increased ability to re-distribute time within the productive sphere does not necessarily translate into an increased ability to re-negotiate social reproductive gender roles at home, it does challenge masculine representations of entrepreneurs operating in isolation to the family. The importance that female entrepreneurs within cooperative structures attach to the ability to re-distribute time by swapping shifts amongst themselves, highlights the importance of completing social reproduction in parallel to working and urges us to think about how things would be different if economic structures worked for humans rather than vice-versa as is the case now.

Apart from the temporal negotiation tool, for most female entrepreneurs, working outside the house provides a spatial separation from the household and the related social reproductive tasks. Having a shop and studio offers female entrepreneurs a refuge from the completion of social reproductive tasks, illustrated well by a female potter in Crete, who says: “My shop is my refuge. Here I am away from everyone and everything. I am in my own world.” (Katerina, interview). The continuing pressure to adhere to gendered norms is evident in this study because whilst participants are empowered through the market, non-conformation to gendered ideals concerning prioritising
childcare over work means that social penalties are imposed on female entrepreneurs, such as Flora, in the form of guilt. The importance placed on freedom from control by participants who work outside their house and how this freedom is related to physical location exposes how gendered structures continue to internalise the connection between femininity and the domestic sphere in Greece. Whilst this illustrates how entrepreneurship can create a gender-free space for women, their freedom is limited to the market because as soon as they step out of their ‘refuge’ they are greeted by gendered social reproductive obligations. However, in examples where the house and shop are located in one building, hybrid forms of gender roles are emerging as both male and female members of the family work and help with domestic tasks, highlighting how the entrepreneurs’ work-place’s physical location and the permeation of gender into economic roles, are linked.

This illustrates how for female entrepreneurs, entrepreneurship is more than just a method of improving their economic standing, but is a social process of transformation. This is highlighted by how female entrepreneurs’ conceptualisations of entrepreneurship include community-care elements. I find that feminine subjectivities of caring allow for a less individualistic image of an entrepreneur to evolve, as female entrepreneurs place importance on operating for community gain rather than solely selfish motives of individual profit. In effect, female entrepreneurs in this study create space for conceptualising entrepreneurship alternatively by expressing entrepreneurship in terms of enabling them to help others and perceiving their labour’s value in terms of the impact it has on the community, rather solely in terms of profit. Taking into account the significance support for this kind of entrepreneurial practice could have on long-term and sustainable development of rural communities, encouraging this kind of entrepreneurial ideal could be beneficial in terms of development. However, current economic structures that reward people more generously when pursuing individual rather than community goals and often overlook long-term contributions, do not support this type of entrepreneurial conceptualisation. Helping the community is largely considered a feminine activity, so, encouraging both male and female entrepreneurs to pursue community goals would promote gender equality and dispel the idea that entrepreneurship’s primary goal is selfish gain, as well as having positive effects on the community.

Indeed, the community is a very important part of entrepreneurial experiences, and this study highlights the importance of virilocal ties within rural entrepreneurship. Considering the difficulties faced by entrepreneurs who were non-local to the area they operated from, because of a lack of trust of outsiders, there is scope to create policies to ease the entry of non-local entrepreneurs into rural communities. Whilst non-local entrepreneurs in this study did in fact feel more accepted into the community via their identity as economically active actors, this shows how dominant masculinity present in classic interpretations of entrepreneurship has normalised such positions. If gender
equality is to be achieved, strategies that ease female entrepreneurs entry into rural areas which they have no virilocal ties to, would be required.

Talking to the ways in which the market transforms social reproductive and entrepreneurial gender roles, this study highlights how, whilst market solutions to social reproduction can often reduce any negotiation of gender roles as social reproduction is simply off-loaded to poorer women, cultural structures may limit the extent to which social reproduction is subsumed by the market. In the Greek context, in the last twenty years, there was a large increase in the number of households that outsourced social reproductive tasks like cleaning and ironing to migrant labour and hiring a ‘girl’ to help with domestic chores became connected to status. A proliferation of establishments offering ready food has also occurred in Greece in the last twenty years, especially in urban centres, but also in rural areas, which means that male participants in this study who worked away from home, simply bought ready food rather than cook themselves or negotiate for their wife to provide this social reproductive need. Indeed, the solution of ready meals such as pizza, also removes the need for female participants to negotiate for an equal distribution of cooking duties with their family who view it as a quick solution to proving food for their family that they perceive to be their responsibility. Hence the marketisation of social reproduction is not perceived to prompt negotiation of gender roles, but rather is just another way in which capitalism pushes for the commodification of more and more aspects of life as lack of time, due to productive engagement, leads time-poor entrepreneurs to outsource social reproduction to the market.

However, in the present study I find that some participants do not want to outsource social reproduction to the market. They choose not to hire help with social reproductive tasks as they do not want ‘outsiders’ entering their house, which shows how the cultural regulatory mechanism of gossip operates to stall the complete marketisation of social reproduction. As in Greek culture, allowing outsiders or ‘ksenoi’ to enter the house is considered an invitation for gossip to exit the house, many participants stress how they purposefully do not hire domestic help, which shows how cultural mechanisms can curtail the marketisation of social reproduction. Complexity is added to this observation by the fact that private tutors hired to help children with their school work from as early as six years old, are allowed into people’s houses with far more ease. Whilst the proliferation of shadow education in Greece means that education is highly marketised, the question arises of if a different value is given to labour carried out by educators to that carried out by cleaners and it is that value which marks the difference in perception of what constitutes a polluting element entering the house.
One aspect of social reproduction that cannot be easily commodified is the emotive constituent of social reproduction which is largely intangible, such as showing family members that they are loved. As tourism entrepreneurship is characterised by anti-social hours, this means that participants cannot complete many of the emotive elements of social reproduction, such as serving the family at the table, which promote greater social cohesion. This illustrates how tourism entrepreneurship can alter the emotive side social reproductive structures through its demanding working hours and should be taken into consideration when attempting to address problems with familial and societal cohesion within tourism communities.

Another interesting aspect of handicraft tourism entrepreneurship that emerged in this study relates to how immigrant entrepreneurs are not bound by local gender norms and can escape stereotypical expectations with regards to how they operate. As ‘outsiders’ to the community, immigrant women reject many tenets of gendered economic theorising, thus creating new interpretations of entrepreneurship by not feeling the need to strictly adhere to gender norms of the country they are economically active in. This has advantages for immigrant women engaging in entrepreneurship as illustrated by Ioanna, an immigrant handicraft tourism entrepreneur, who differs in her interpretation of entrepreneurship from other female participants in that she is innovative and risk-taking. Ioanna innovatively adapts to market needs by creating unique mini- curtains to suit Scandinavian tourists’ needs, which no other crocheters in Rethymno make, and also recruits her unemployed husband into her business by opening another shop. The latter may be a response to the crisis as discussed in further detail in section 9.6, but the point I make here relates to how, as an immigrant entrepreneur Ioanna is less bound by cultural norms of shame and honour. Shame and honour norms may have limited her ability to be her husband’s boss, as it is considered ‘shameful’ in Greek society for men to be subordinate to women. Indeed, involvement in entrepreneurship in this way also seems to have advantages regarding the negotiation of social reproductive gender roles as evidenced by the equal distribution of social reproductive tasks amongst children, husband and wife in Ioanna’s family.

Within family businesses which characterise Greek tourism entrepreneurship (Tsartas and Lagos, 2013), I find that female entrepreneurs’ contributions are limited to “finishing things off” (Mariniki, interview), rather than being innovative. Their positions as ‘helpers’ within family businesses act to feminise and this devalue their labour, which acts to perpetuate how femininity is associated with completing labour on an altruistic basis. The way in which they are constituted as helpers also indicates how especially for women within family businesses gender-assigned social reproductive tasks are embedded within entrepreneurial conceptualisations. Even in female-led family businesses such as Frosso’s pottery business, family obligations limit growth. For example
Frosso, purposefully keeps her business off the main road and hence limits her sales, in order to prioritise family over working. These findings offer the impetus to critique neoclassical interpretations of entrepreneurship, just as Marlow (2013) critiques the entrepreneurial status quo by questioning the female ‘underperformance myth’. Another key finding is that male entrepreneurs also negotiate gendered subjectivities through their engagement in entrepreneurship and they do this by drawing on the concept of ‘opportunity cost’ (England, 2010), to justify their increased involvement in social reproductive activities whilst still adhering to masculine ideals of productive engagement. This observation shows how neoliberal individualistic reponsibilisation for social reproduction restructures social relations by embedding the household into the capitalist system of production and also confirms LeBaron’s (2010) reasoning that the household has become pervaded by “logics of market dependency and commodification” (p. 907) and is related to the discussion of marketisation of social reproduction covered earlier.

Male participants experience internal turmoil as gender and entrepreneurial roles transform, which is illustrated by male entrepreneurs’ novel feeling that they are “in the middle” (George, interview) of family and work, indicating a departure from entrepreneurial ideals that favour economic actors as being detached from their surroundings. This shows how, within the study’s context, entrepreneurship involvement forges an avenue to allow men’s adherence to alternative gender scripts where male entrepreneurs can adhere to masculine subjectivities that combine social reproductive and productive priorities.

9.5 Children’s roles as producers and reproducers within tourism

As discussed in Section 2.2.5 and Section 6.3, children are the neglected actors of tourism. Children’s role within the economy is significant, but often overlooked in political economy literature, since thinking based on Western models of childhood as a care-free time when they are cared for by their parents (indeed often ‘intensively’ cared for as discussed in 7.2.3.3), often acts to disempower children as socio-economic actors with an opinion of their own. Despite being affected by and affecting what happens in the international and domestic arena, children are ‘glaringly’ absent from political economy analyses, rarely being afforded the voice to critique their position and hence contribute to knowledge regarding how children perceive themselves being affected by politico-economic events (Watson, 2004). Whilst the current study only offers a glimpse of how children perceive themselves as entrepreneurs and domestic helpers, largely because of the study’s ethics permission limitations (that people I spoke to would be over 18 years of age), I hope to provide
the impetus for further research on children’s position within the global economy, by stressing the significance of their roles in the global economic structure of tourism.

In the current study, I find children to be an important part of the tourism economy as they take on significant productive and social reproductive roles. I often observed how tourism handicraft entrepreneurs’ children would clean the house and cook when their parents were working and then transform into tourism entrepreneurs for a few hours to give their parents a rest from the gruelling 14-hour days. Indeed, the entrepreneurs who did not have children to help them, found it harder to maintain their businesses in a viable manner, as in the case of Ioanna who contemplates closing her second shop now that her son is away at university and her daughter is not old enough to replace her at the shop during the midday. Kunz (2010) also draws attention to how children play an important role in the restructuring of social reproduction by becoming “nannies, workers, protectors and much more” (p. 928) when their mothers’ migrate. Whilst capitalism can be blamed for applying increased pressure to accumulate and blurring the boundaries between the public and private economic spheres (Sykes, 2003), tourism, with its intense work-days intensifies this blurring. It is this blurring that encourages children’s participation in economic activities.

The roles that children play as economic actors are gendered, with girls taking on more feminised domestic tasks than boys, whereas girls are often excluded from entrepreneurship as they are thought to be too ‘vulnerable’. Some entrepreneurs have other motives apart from simply finding an unpaid worker to help them in the form of their children. I find that some mothers-entrepreneurs encourage their children to become active as tourism producers, in order to fulfil their motherly role as ‘educator’ and at the same time as ‘protector’, as they perceive the work environment to be a safe place for their children to be. However, tourism work is often performed in environments with far from perfect temperature conditions, often in cramped areas, which questions to what extent children’s rights to comfortable living conditions are being upheld. Crucial to understanding children’s role within tourism and improving gender equality is to hear their voice and hence policies that address this issue are recommended as outlined in Section 9.7.

9.6 External influences: Economic crisis and seasonality

Whilst seasonality has been investigated from various angles as a structural cause of disruption to economic processes, little has been written on the effect of seasonality on gendered entrepreneurial subjectivities. By illuminating how seasonality acts upon the relationship between entrepreneurship and gender roles, this study contributes to knowledge on tourism seasonality’s
socio-economic impacts. To this effect, I find that a liminal period at the beginning and end of the tourist season acts as an entropic accelerator for entrepreneurial negotiations. This is indicated by how female entrepreneurs note that during the shoulder season female entrepreneurs partially return to stereotyped notions of femininity that connect it to caring. As Katerina says: “things are different in the winter” (Katerina, interview) which illustrates how in the absence of the negotiation tool of temporality, female entrepreneurs have to re-negotiate gendered social reproductive responsibilities. This also points to how, during ‘the summer’ (i.e. the tourist period), female entrepreneurs draw more intensely on breadwinner roles to negotiate feminine responsibilities of caring. However, since many female entrepreneurs reveal that they engage in a combination of productive and social reproductive tasks during the winter as well, and hence in the absence of the seasonal time pressures, this indicates how entrepreneurship continues to affect social reproductive gender role negotiations well into the shoulder season, creating long-lasting negotiations of social reproductive gender roles.

Another intriguing aspect of seasonality is that it promotes the mobility of social reproduction. What emerges from this study is that handicraft tourism entrepreneurs’ parents temporarily migrated to help their children with social reproduction. Whilst largely invisible within tourism literature, this tourism-induced seasonal relocation acts to restructure social reproduction as female entrepreneurs off-load social reproductive tasks onto relocated others which results in temporarily stalling or disrupting gendered negotiations surrounding social reproduction. A lack of state support for childcare during the summer months acts to compound the essentiality of relocated others’ seasonal help, an observation that can open the door to the creation of alternative state policies to achieve greater gender equality, by providing seasonal childcare solutions for tourism entrepreneurs.

Another external factor that influences the relationship between entrepreneurship and gender roles is the economic crisis and its associated austerity measures, which have resulted in a decrease of ‘real’ wages and an increase in male unemployment. The concept of depletion of social reproduction arises (Elson, 2012) since female entrepreneurs experience exhaustion from increased participation in economic activities, as they both work more hours and take up the social reproductive slack left by governments who impose crisis-induced welfare cuts. I find that female entrepreneurs deal with this exhaustion by delegating social reproductive tasks within the family, hence prompting the negotiation of gender roles.

This also shows how the crisis evokes a transformation of the value of women’s time, which, as Adkins (2009) also stipulates, is instigated by the negotiation of current gender roles, since the time women spend doing either productive or social reproductive work is gradually awarded a similar
value. As Mariniki states “it is time for men to realise that ‘whatever I do, my wife does’”, indicating how entrepreneurship is empowering women to demand that value be attached to their work. This shows that the crisis, which has resulted in women’s wages being required with a novel intensity, effectively adds value to women’s time in terms of ‘opportunity cost’.

Female entrepreneurs gained an increased ability to negotiate social reproductive tasks which is illustrated by the female entrepreneurs in this study feeling comfortable to ask for help with household work. Whilst many women still perceive social reproduction as their responsibility, as Katerina says: “I made the family, I have to be responsible for the whole thing”, handicraft tourism entrepreneurship impacted by the crisis-induced pressure to increase productive work, results in increased male participation in social reproduction which Mariniki illustrates by saying: “in times of pressure, he (her husband) will put the washing machine on, hang out the clothes, when in need”.

The economic crisis is also having an effect on masculine roles, as unemployed female entrepreneurs’ husbands are recruited into handicraft tourism entrepreneurship and thus re-negotiate gendered subjectivities relating to entrepreneurship and social reproduction. This study shows how female entrepreneurs are recruiting their husbands into handicraft tourism entrepreneurship, exemplified by Ioanna opening another crocheting shop that her husband runs in Rethymno, and Vaggelio encouraging her husband to make wire jewellery for the handicraft exhibition she coordinates. Men who take up these hybrid roles of breadwinning and caring, are proving to be resilient to the Greek financial crisis, as they continue to contribute to family survival.

Indeed, the crisis has an effect on the conceptualisation of female entrepreneurs’ role in the creation of resilience, because by acting as ‘altruistic-rational’, female entrepreneurs give their male partners a sense of belonging within masculine constructions. They do this by altruistically allowing their male partners to retain partial breadwinner status and rationally encouraging them to contribute to the family income and thus ensuring survival of the family unit. In ‘recruiting’ their male partners, female entrepreneurs’ negotiate for an increased contribution of their male partners to the household, thus prompting for the negotiation of gender roles as well.

In the financial vacuum created by the economic crisis, male partners’ labour power is recruited by their female entrepreneurs, making the men also handicraft entrepreneurs, which is however, a role the men superficially reject as they do not fully acknowledge their roles as handicraft entrepreneurs. Thus, in the absence of other paid work, by recruiting their husbands, women utilise entrepreneurship as a vehicle to gently challenge gender roles relating to women’s status as primary breadwinner and negotiate for a more equitable distribution of social reproductive activities, whilst allowing their unemployed husbands to adhere to notions of masculinity connected to breadwinning.
Indicative of this is how Ioanna says her husband has become more appreciative of the work she does since she more closely adheres to a breadwinner role, which she explains as being because he “has more understanding because he also works more hours” (Ioanna, interview). This “more understanding”, results in Ioanna’s husband adhering to a notion of masculinity that allows for the increased participation in social reproductive activities, illustrating how crisis-induced entrepreneurial actions affect social reproductive gender roles. Hence, it seems that the economic crisis is breaking the mould of the gender-segregation that characterises tourism labour, by making it more acceptable for men who transcend into gender-inconsistent occupations, to be characterised as successful.

9.7 Policy recommendations

Taking into consideration the main conclusions presented in this chapter, various policy recommendations are made which are outlined below:

1. In order to facilitate a better understanding of tourism’s future as a global economic system it is recommended that policies are created to better represent children as socio-economic actors within tourism, by creating an annual forum or municipal committees where children of tourism workers can voice their opinion on their roles as gendered socio-economic actors, thus recognising children’s contribution to the economy, giving children agency, constituting children’s knowledge as ‘legitimate’ and creating the basis for more inclusive politico-economic analyses of gender in tourism.

Policies that encourage parents to recognise their children’s contribution in terms of productive and reproductive labour within tourism would also be useful in strengthening the perception that children have an active role in shaping society, hence increasing children’s agency. Recognition could be given in the form of coupons for books, electronic devices, clothes or lessons that the state would provide to parents of children who work within tourism; in the form of participation in international conferences where children’s voice would be heard; or in the form of certifications valid for academic institution applications. Of course, the best thing would be to ask the children themselves what form they would like the recognition to take! It is important that these policies regarding children’s recognition as actors

51 Perhaps based on the model of Norway’s Children’s Municipal Committees, where children are given part of the municipality’s budget and allowed to decide how to spend it on youth activities (Norwegian Ministry of Children and Equality, 2008)
within tourism are offered to all children, irrespective of the gender roles children take up, and that discussion on issues of gender roles are encouraged, so as to promote further gender equality within tourism.

2. Policies that embrace tourism handicraft entrepreneurs’ pluriactivity, for example offering tax incentives for completing activities within the shoulder season, could improve the tourism entrepreneurs’ lives. Also by supporting pluriactivity, activities such as organising craft fairs or offering crafting lessons during the off-season could be supported in a more legitimate manner, improve the tourist product and enhance productivity within the shoulder season.

3. Tourism development programs that offer incentives to female handicraft tourism entrepreneurs to involve their male partners in entrepreneurship could provide a partial solution to crisis-induced male employment in Greece.

4. Policies aimed at encouraging women with no virilocal ties to enter rural entrepreneurship and providing support for these women in the form of community integration help. Incentives could be offered for local women to welcome non-local women who want to set up business, into their community.

5. Policies to increase the involvement of immigrants in tourism entrepreneurship in Greece as immigrants can challenge stereotypical gender roles and introduce innovative products to the tourism market.

6. Policies that promote the recognition of women’s role within family businesses will promote gender equality as women’s labour will be perceived as more valuable.

7. Policies that reward entrepreneurs who pursue community goals as this will ensure the sustainability of communities, promote cohesion within rural communities and help provide services that may be lacking in rural communities. This type of policy can also increase gender equality as alternative conceptualisations of entrepreneurship are possible for male and female entrepreneurs.

8. Policies for the creation of systems that measure the long-term contribution of entrepreneurs will reward entrepreneurs who have community gain as their goal.
9. Record the intergenerational change in the definition of social reproductive tasks in tourism communities which are targeted by tourism development programs addressing gender equality, in order to have a current interpretation of what gender roles are present in the community on which to base development plans.

9.8 Further recommendations for research

Many interesting aspects of the relationship between female handicraft tourism entrepreneurship and gender roles emerge from this study; however there is scope to gain more insight into gender and tourism development by conducting further research into some of the emerging topics. Hence, I suggest that further research is undertaken in the subjects of resilience, seasonality, long-term development and mobility in tourism and recommend that the roles of children in tourism be investigated in more depth than was possible in this study.

Initially I expand upon how further investigation into the relationship between tourism entrepreneurship and gender roles can provide insight into how tourism structures can be made more resilient (Martin, 2012). One avenue for further research on the topic of resilience is highlighted by the way in which female entrepreneurs ‘recruit’ their husbands into handicraft tourism entrepreneurship, thus both offering a solution to male unemployment and increasing the value of the female entrepreneurs’ labour time. A wider investigation around the extent to which this is happening in other types of tourism entrepreneurship would provide more insight into how this contributes to resilience to an economic crisis.

The importance of the gender element of entrepreneurial subjectivities in providing resilience is further displayed by the women’s cooperative members’ business tactics, such as the aversion to taking out loans. This tactic highlights how non-adherence to ‘typical’ entrepreneurial characteristics such as risk-taking may increase resilience. Further investigating how feminine entrepreneurial practices contribute to business viability during the economic crisis, may provide indications of how feminised practices may act as an ‘antidote’ to some of the effects of the economic crisis, as the crisis is ultimately embedded within, and generated from, masculine interpretations of the economic. Indeed, further investigation of the ways in which gender operates within entrepreneurial subjectivities to create resilience would be of great use in informing tourism development policies which could potentially offer incentives for women to employ male relatives in their businesses and thus ‘kill two birds with one stone’ by achieving both greater gender equality and a reduction in male unemployment.
Indications that female tourism entrepreneurs in this study’s rural ethnographic areas offer services which would not be available otherwise, such as the felt-makers in Zagori teaching young children how to weave and knit for free, suggest the need for further investigation into how female entrepreneurship contributes to the long-term development of rural areas. Gendered subjectivities that connect femininity to notions of community care feature highly on female participants’ conceptualisations of entrepreneurship and so further research into how tourism contributes to the long-term development of rural areas should be undertaken to look specifically at what activities female tourism entrepreneurs do for the community.

In addition, since it emerges that female entrepreneurs often voluntarily provide community services, researching to what extent voluntary services are offered by female tourism entrepreneurs could also be instrumental in expanding upon how gender contributes to the generation of the ‘alternative economic processes’ referred to by Gibson-Graham (2008). This would be central to facilitating a more holistic view of the ‘economy’ by including gender elements that are at play within alternative economic transactions.

Another topic that warrants further investigation relates to how mobility within tourism causes a restructuring of social reproduction. This is highlighted by the relocation of social reproduction when female entrepreneurs’ parents come to assist their children with social reproduction during the tourist period. As care is increasingly commodified and relocated outside the house, keeping social reproduction at the place of production is significant and is often the subject of political action (Sevenhuijsen, 2003), making investigating social reproduction mobility a significant topic to probe. Furthermore, investigation into how tourism entrepreneurship and gender roles initiate and sustain the geographical relocation of social reproduction can provide insight into tourism economic analyses. Accordingly, measuring the capital flows created by increased economic transactions through the labour power and consumption of relocated entrepreneurial parents, will provide valuable information regarding the effects of tourism entrepreneurship on the economy. Furthermore, such research can provide insight into how capitalism operates as “irresponsible stalker of the world” (Katz, 2001, p. 709) by transferring relocated parents’ wealth to the site of tourism production.

As the mobility of social reproduction is on a seasonal basis, this brings to the fore another topic, the investigation of which could contribute significantly to knowledge on tourism processes, that of tourism seasonality’s effects on producers. To this extent, more research should be carried out with female tourism entrepreneurs specifically during the liminal period in which gendered entrepreneurial subjectivities are negotiated, that is at the beginning and end of each tourism
season, in order to identify how gender roles are negotiated at this crucial time period. Questioning female entrepreneurs at these time periods will contribute to the body of knowledge on tourism seasonality’s social impacts as well as to the literature of gender within tourism, providing information during what can be perceived as gender roles’ ‘renaissance’ period.

As a final remark, further to contributing to the body of knowledge on gender and tourism, my hope is that this study can one day go towards informing tourism development policies with gender equality elements, and hence be of use to women and men globally. I acknowledge the role all the men and women who engage in handicraft entrepreneurship and who participated in this study, have played in the advancement of tourism entrepreneurship theorisation and gender role conceptualisation and will strive to promote their concerns and experiences through the dissemination of their world-views and life-experiences via published articles. Especially, at this difficult stage in Greek economic and social life, I hope that the participants are able to positively gain from new knowledge that has been created based on this study’s findings.

Finally, I hope this study will contribute to the better representation of how current Greek gender roles and relations are changing and which I think were summarised well on ‘Women’s Day’ (8th March, 2014) by my Greek friend Tonia, who posted the picture below (Figure 9.1) on Facebook that says ‘Nobody’s wife, nobody’s slave’ (from the Greek ‘Oute doula, oute kyra’).

![Figure 9-1 Facebook posting of feminist graffiti on Athens building, 8th March, 2014](image)

I believe this statement, although most likely created by a Greek anarchist feminist group and thus may be considered by some an extreme viewpoint, none-the-less indicates how Greek society is changing and becoming more reflective regarding gender roles. Indeed, the acceptability of posting such a graffiti on social media is in itself an indication that societal perceptions regarding gender

---

52 The actual words chosen ('doula' = servant/slave and 'kyra' = wife/housewife) in the graffiti are very relevant as there is the common saying in Greece ‘’I kali noikokyra ine doula kai kyra’, i.e. “a good housewife is a servant and a wife”
roles in Greece are slowly altering towards the appreciation of the existence of gender stereotypes and the subsequent effort to challenge these roles.
Appendix

Semi-structured interview questions

Introductory set of interview questions

Entrepreneurship

1) Would you like to tell me the story of your involvement in tourism entrepreneurship (when, why, specific event that made you enter)
2) Do you think the hours/days you work combine well with your family life?
3) Do you feel empowered on a financial level since you started working in tourism?
4) Do you feel empowered on a social level since you started working in tourism?
5) Have you benefited from any state/EU development programs? In what way/s did this help you (e.g. training, financial help, etc). If no development program was utilised, was this done consciously and why?
6) Do you export your handmade items?
7) Are you part of a cooperation?

Involvement with handicrafts

1) Would you like to tell me the story of how you got involved with your particular craft? (age, who inspired you/taught you)
2) How did you take the decision to make your handicraft-making into a profession?
3) What are you inspired by when you make your handicrafts?
4) Why have you chosen the specific materials to make your handicrafts?
5) Do you believe that your craft is historically a woman’s/man’s craft? Why?
Second set of ethnographic interview questions

Household economy

1) In your family, how are the everyday household tasks divided amongst you?
2) Since you first engaged in tourism handicraft entrepreneurship, had anything changed in the division of household tasks?
3) Thinking back to the past and perhaps thinking of your parents, do you believe you are in a better position with regards to how many of the household tasks you do? Do you have more on your plate by combining entrepreneurship and household tasks?

Financial crisis

1) Has your business been affected by the financial crisis? In what ways?
2) How has the crisis affected you as a professional? (e.g. psychologically, confidence, creativity)
3) How do you think the crisis has affected the division of household tasks? (e.g. did you use to have paid help that you can no longer afford?)
4) How do you feel your area’s tourism development has been affected by the crisis? (e.g. fewer grants?)
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