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Abstract
Cooking is an ancient human activity which has long been characterised through deep social expectations which are often gendered. However, in tourism where food represents one of the key attractions, the scholarship has not given enough attention to investigating how cooking involves hierarchical gendered power relations. This paper reports on fieldwork research conducted in Moreomaoto Village, Botswana. It was found that while cooking is undertaken in both Meno A Kwena, an ecotourism camp, and the homes in its neighbouring village, Moreomaoto, the discourses used to justify who does the work are similarly gendered. Namely, it is considered normal for women to cook, whether at the camp or at home, as it is what they have always done. Women capitalize on the idea that cooking at camp and at home is the same as a means of gaining access to employment opportunities. Men, however, are increasingly moving into cooking jobs at Meno A Kwena, despite them not cooking at home unless they ‘have to’ or ‘feel like it’. This movement has been normalised as men are discursively constructed as capable cooks. As long as their cooking is taking place outside of the home and framed as different to that which is undertaken within the home, men are able to maintain the existing gender order. In a context that is increasingly characterised by environmental and financial fragility, being able to illustrate this type of adaptability means that men have been better able than women to diversify the tourism employment opportunities available to them.
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Introduction
Cooking is one of humans’ most ancient and personal activities. It showcases people’s ingenuity in adapting their environment, can be both representative of nationhood and individual identity, aids in our survival but can also be hedonistic and pleasurable. Therefore, cooking is part of ‘foodways’ which are the numerous “behaviours and beliefs surrounding the production, distribution, and consumption of food” (Counihan, 1999). According to Counihan (1999, p. 6), these foodways reveal “much about power relations and conceptions of sex and gender” and that by unpacking activities such as cooking one is able to explore, in a coherent and holistic fashion, the ways in which people manage culture in their everyday lives. Despite the seeming importance of unpacking activities such as cooking, little has been done in tourism scholarship to understand how cooking manifests and maintains gendered hierarchies of inequality both inside and outside ‘tourism spaces’, (Counihan, 1999, p.6).

Some scholars have made connections between food and tourism including a focus on tourists’ attraction to or repulsion of local food (Cohen & Avieli, 2004), an exploration of how food sectors are structured in tourism (Tikkanen, 2007) or the relationship between tourism, development and food (Hall, Sharples, Mitchell, Macionis & Cambourne 2003). However, little attention has been paid to
the act of cooking in tourism, this despite there being scholarly research on everything from the occult to the nutritional, structural, and cultural properties of cooking (Goody, 1982).

There is, though, increasing information to suggest that women are concentrated in cooking jobs in tourism (Baum, 2013; Purcell, 1997; UNWTO, 2010). However, as Peeters (2009) posits, more qualitative research is needed which unpacks how such divisions are manifested; particularly those which consider how the labour is articulated in time and space, because there is a blurring of boundaries between the home and 'work place' (McDowell, 2009; Zampoukos & Ionnides, 2011). Reproductive work (including cooking) is found in a variety of spaces (Zampoukos & Ionnides, 2011) but there is little scholarly discussion in tourism studies on how such activities are themselves gendered and/or how their change is carried out. If the same activity is being carried out in different spaces (a lodge and the home for example), is it being carried out in the same way, by the same people, and informed by the same discourses and structures? With this in mind, the aim of this paper is to identify the gendered hierarchies of inequality as they relate to the act of cooking in both an ecotourism camp and the village the camp is in a close proximity to.

The focus on Botswana and the nature of the question were spurred by a statement found within Botswana’s National Ecotourism Strategy (2002) which has clear assumptions about tourism’s potential to subvert existing gender relations:

Tourism development can lead to changes in family structure and gender roles, resulting in new opportunities for women and young people [as well as] leading to tension and loss of self-esteem for men and older generations (NES, 2002, p. 12).

While continuing to discuss the negative host-social and cultural impacts of tourism the NES (2002, p. 12) further states that “tourism can lead to gender inequalities in employment and the community” as well as a “reinforce and exacerbate existing social inequalities”. However, how tourism creates, subverts or reinforces inequalities is not clear nor is how such shifts may impact the boundaries of any given gender order. Identifying the contours of such gender orders can take on numerous forms all providing their own partial perspectives regarding how gender orders are structured and maintained. Instead of delimiting what does and does not constitute work prior to fieldwork, a useful means of identifying the contours of an existing gender order is to let participants themselves highlight which activities are the most important to the organisation of their lives (Glucksmann, 1995).

Consequently, when fieldwork was carried out its main purpose was to answer whether the organisation of labour in an (eco)tourism lodge subverts broader gender orders in Botswana which shape how labour and life are organised generally? If so/not, how? During the course of fieldwork in Moreomaoto, four main 'labour activities' (Glucksmann, 1995) were identified as central to the organisation of people’s lives, namely: cattle, crop, and child care as well as paid employment. Food emerged as something central to all of these activities; whether it was the acquiring of food materials through crop and cattle care, the obtaining of money to buy food products, or the cooking of food in order to care for others (family, children and tourists). Considering cooking is one of the few activities which happens both at home and at the camp it provides a unique means of trying to understand the ways in which the respective gender orders may be structured on similar of different gendered discourses. It is, therefore, hoped that by using cooking as a focus of this paper, we will generate a deeper understanding of how life in Moreomaotoo is structured through gender but also how such structuring may be subverted (whether positive or negative) through tourism.
Theory

A subversive act is not necessarily something that goes against the law but is rather something which challenges what is contextually seen as normal (Alvesson & Deetz, 2006, p. 266; Butler, 1999; Foucault, 1978). Through his concept of ‘biopower’, Foucault (1977, 1978) explores how powerful the ‘norm’ is and how it not only subjugates but also produces. Through a series of discourses about aptitude and capacity (anatomo-politics), particular populations (bio-politics) are subjugated and continue to produce/practice particular identities which in turn have a normalising effect on how social orders are structured through practices of inclusion and exclusion.

For Foucault (1978) the best way of attempting to understand people’s most taken-for-granted assumptions about how life should be organised is through discourses. That is, discourses which people have naturalised and do not question (or subvert). For Foucault this is tied to issues of knowledge because what knowledge is considered ‘true’ or ‘normal’ is a matter of power relations. What people think to be ‘true’ is generally prescriptive delimiting what is encouraged and not. Therefore, to ask what is true is not a useful analytical question because it exists within the power dynamics that produce knowledge. Rather, one should ask how such knowledge is produced and to then identify the power which made it possible (Foucault, 1978, p. 92). Therefore, the research must identify, through participants, what is considered ‘the norm’ and see whether the presence of (eco) tourism has managed to disrupt it. Indeed, the objective of this research is not to prescribe how gender and (eco) tourism should interact but rather to open up an enquiry of trying to understand how they do.

The normalisation of gender roles and practices is achieved through the process of configuring space and practice into what is perceived as being normal action for women and men (in fact the very categories of ‘woman’ and ‘man’ are a product of such normalisation). The barometer for normalcy is context-specific and shaped by lived experiences and desire. When someone states that something is ‘natural’ for a woman or man they are simultaneously being prescriptive and outlining what their gendered expectations are and the practices they should do to fulfil them. In these statements and metaphors it is generally ideal types which are expressed – achieving these hegemonic ideals is largely impossible but the pursuit of them is what guides action giving indications for ‘correct’ behaviour which is both enabling and restrictive (Connell, 1995). In turn, the gendered acts and webs of gendered relations which establish daily life, when mapped together, can be called ‘gender orders’. In order to identify whether a gender order has been subverted one needs to identify the performative actions that have established it (Butler, 1999, p. 188).

Gender orders are resilient and generally resistant to change but they are also malleable because they are formed through a ‘repetition of acts’, which Butler (1999) calls ‘performativity’. Using a play as a trope, Butler (1999) explains how through continuously practicing gender, scripts are maintained and that those who veer off their scripts of femininity or masculinity are likely to face punishment even though the ideal attainment of them is impossible. A ‘hegemonic gender order’ is the most agreed upon and least problematized of orders and generally one to which other orders aspire, that is an ideal type or norm (Connell, 1995). Therefore, the performative actions which inform gender orders may be different at the organisational level versus a larger, broader level and these varying orders continually crash into, shape, and contradict one another. They are not necessarily uniform, with each being shaped by their own historical processes and shaping future gender processes too. It must be understood that no-one can exist outside of a gender order; rather individuals are continually negotiating them, building on them and resisting them in conflating and contradictory ways. Nonetheless, the idea of gender as something in motion is powerful because it opens up the possibility for subversion, and even change in how labour and work are structured.
There is a long history of feminist thought which has attempted to disrupt what is considered labour and the economy (Acker, 1990, 2006; Adkins, 2001; Cameron and Gibson-Graham, 2003; Hartsock, 1983). This has involved bringing ‘the reproductive realm’ to the fore and highlighting how ‘the formal economy’ is contingent on care work. Cameron and Gibson-Graham (2003) envision non-capitalist economies which are more dynamic than ‘just’ money but are, rather, “emptied of any essential identity, logic, organising principle or determinant” (Cameron & Gibson-Graham, 2003). However, the intention of this research is not to understand the economy of (eco) tourism, but rather to understand the gendered organisation of labour (in this case cooking) related to an (eco)tourism camp and the implications this has for broader social organisation.

Relly (2008) is unique in challenging researchers to focus on the household as a means of understanding multiplier effects of tourism and non-labour lodge expenditure. Sadly, however, the analysis remains in the economic realm not focusing on the ways in which such economic benefits are distributed/created socially and what the impacts are of tourism in the home lives of those working at or living near a tourism establishment. By contrast Chant (1997) illustrates how women and men’s status within their home and community lives (in Mexico and the Philippines) shape not only the types of jobs they are able to gain access to in tourism (if at all) but the spaces in which they can move, both of which are informed by perceptions and preferences of employers resulting in distinctly feminised segments of tourism work. For Chant (1997), the economic impacts of tourism must be understood as crafted by social relations and cannot be understood in isolation from their gendered construction. In this discussion, Glucksmann (1995) urges us to avoid viewing the economy as complete (much like Cameron and Gibson-Graham) but as enmeshed in a web of relations which are socially messy and certainly gendered (like Chant). More to the point, Glucksmann (1995) states that:

‘Work is inscribed in a web of gendered, personal, and often sexualised relationships. If the structure of relationships and the division of labour of paid work do not exist in a vacuum there is no sense in which it could be viewed as ‘purely economic’…. (Glucksmann, 1995, p. 66).

Therefore, Glucksmann (1995) encourages analysis which avoids divisions of labour within different spaces as autonomous from one another, particularly if there are activities which cut across them. Therefore, in order to heed Glucksmann’s theoretical proposition of following the activities people find most important in their lives and on which they believe they exert the most energy, one needs to not only recognise that there is labour within the reproductive realm or that there is a home/work divide but that the relationships and activities within them are related and influence one another and may, very well, disrupt what is considered normal (that is, subvert) (Butler, 1999).

Glucksmann’s (1995) focus on activities is critical to understanding how discourses and activities are porous and move between different spaces. That said, because one of the gender orders under consideration is one within a work space it is useful to have a theory which assists in understanding how labour within a work place may be arranged according to difference. Acker’s (2006) ‘inequality regime’ contemplates how gender, race, and class are ordered in institutions through a variety of practices which have varying visibility and legitimacy. These process structure organisations according to gender and often result in the concentration of ‘particular types’ of people in specific jobs. These are cemented in a variety of controls some of which are obvious (such as payment and hiring practices) and others which are naturalised and internalised (such as beliefs about who should be doing what work). By looking at the bases of inequality which contribute toward the organisation of inequality within a particular work place we should be able to identify some of the taken-for-granted assumptions which contribute toward the establishment of a tourism camp’s gender order.
Research context and method

Fieldwork was undertaken for three weeks during March 2014 in Moreomaoto, a small village of roughly 1 000 people in Central District, Botswana and an ecotourism camp (Meno A Kwena) on its peripheries (Figure 1). At the time of the fieldwork, all 15 ecocertified camps were contacted regarding their interest in this research but only Meno A Kwena responded favourably, which is not surprising considering it is only one of three ecotourism camps which are privately owned and managed (as opposed to being operated by Wilderness Safaris). However, the focus on one camp and its neighbouring village was also favourable as it allowed a detailed view of the given environmental and social constraints in the area. Of the 45 participants who participated in this research, 30 came from Moreomaoto and described the process of accessing food in the village as a dynamic one involving a variety of labour.

Figure 1
Map of Botswana, with ecocertified camps
Firstly, there are men who are the central figures in the rearing and care of cattle that are used as a source of labour themselves but also as an edible, financial, and social resource (Hovorka 2012; Townsend, 1997). However, where men are overtly associated with the care of cattle both men and women are involved in crop care, although differently (Cassidy, 2001; Omari, 2010). Women tend to be concentrated in tasks related to the weeding and cleaning of the fields as well as the harvesting of the crops, whereas men erect fences to protect the crops, both are associated with the ploughing of fields, however when it involves ploughing together with cattle it is thought to be the preserve of men (Cassidy, 2001; Hovorka, 2012; Omari, 2010). However, the construction of a fence which zigzags the Boteti River has made access to food and water as well as the act of farming more complicated (Gibson, 2010). It has also put the village and the camp (Meno A Kwena) at odds with one another as the camp tries to conserve land and water for wildlife and villagers try to do the same for their cattle and crops.

In terms of the camp, Meno A Kwena employs 38 people (including David), 25 are permanent staff, 3 are on 3 month probation periods but working full time, and 10 are on temporary contracts paid per day or per month depending on the given agreement. There are several people who work toward food production at Meno A Kwena (See Figure 2 of it’s ‘inequality regime’; Acker, 2006). The most obvious being those who work in catering which includes the cooking and serving of food for staff and guests. Three women work in administration (Emma, Tshiamo, and Zoe) which involves the ordering, buying, and delivery of food to the camp. The housekeeping staff are tasked with cleaning the dishes that are used to make and consume food. The maintenance men collect firewood for the ovens and one of them is also a driver and as such needs to collect supplies (including food) from Maun.

Of these 38 people working in Meno A Kwena, 15 come from Moreomaoto, 17 from elsewhere in Botswana, and 6 are from outside of the country (including Australia, Brazil, United Kingdom, and South Africa). 28 of these 38 people participated in the research (See Table 1 for further details).
Table 1
Participants working at Meno A Kwena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>From Moreo</th>
<th>Family tree</th>
<th>Interview Translated</th>
<th>Recorded (alone)</th>
<th>Recorded (groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amogelang</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:42:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dineo</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:22:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>03:30:13</td>
<td>40:08 (Joshua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:28:49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itumeleng</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>02:39:04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kealaboga</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>02:02:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>DI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesedi</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:46:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorato</td>
<td>LO</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>01:39:48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onalenna</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reneilwe</td>
<td>RN</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>48:41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sethunya</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:31:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshiamo</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>31:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>ZE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>57:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>From Moreo</th>
<th>Family tree</th>
<th>Interview Translated</th>
<th>Recorded (alone)</th>
<th>Recorded (groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akanyang</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruti</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:01:33 (Mogotsi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>02:52:02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>JK</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:51:29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>JA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:13:11</td>
<td>40:08 (Emma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopano</td>
<td>KO</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>37:04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebogang</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>27:46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motsumi</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:30:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mogotsi</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:13:58</td>
<td>01:01:33 (Baruti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofentse</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>54:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pano</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01:04:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>01:12:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topiwa</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One will note in the above table that while 23 of Meno A Kwenas employees participated in interviews, 22 also participated in the generation of family trees. The use of family trees emerged during the course of fieldwork as an effective means of trying to understand the complicated, extended families people spoke of during their interviews. While those who work at Meno A Kwenas were asked about their lives and the activities they undertake in general (not only what they do when at the camp) it was important to also speak to people not working within the camp. Consequently, 16 people who do not work at Meno A Kwenas were interviewed (Table 2) about their normal, everyday lives in Moreomaoto. These individuals provided useful information regarding activities in the village as well as how such activities are impacted on by the availability, or lack thereof, of paid employment. They also offered insight in the way of peoples mobility and their gendered access to space.
Lastly, in addition to the aforementioned interviews and family trees, extensive notes and observations were made during the course of fieldwork. I stayed at Meno A Kwena for the full three weeks of fieldwork placing myself in numerous ambivalent positions of insider and outsider (Sultana, 2009). These ambivalent positionalities were documented together with other observations as field notes. These notes and the transcribed interview manuscripts were later coded using Atlas.ti software. 827 codes were made in total and these were later organised into 37 ‘code families’ where connections relating to particular activities became increasingly apparent. Prior to fieldwork, during fieldwork and in the coding of information it became overwhelmingly apparent that the division of labour in the production of food is complex and that the discourses about the act of cooking provided an interesting means of exploring some of the contours of both Meno A Kwena and Moreomaoto’s gender orders.

Women cook because they are at home

It is discursively constructed that men are working in employment, at the cattle post or in the fields, which is enough reason for them to assume little to no responsibility for cooking. Men are framed as moving between different spaces making the availability of their labour within the home limited. Take for example, when Pano (a male Motswana from Moreomaoto) explains why women do all the cooking and cleaning at home:

PO: Because men they’re not always home. They are not always home. Every morning they will go out to dig up some money for piece works out there maybe at the kraal, maybe at the farm.
Not only does Pano imply that women are always home, he uses *men’s movement* to explain women’s dominance in household activities. Men are spoken of as in movement (‘go out’, ‘out there’) and with a variety of spaces (including the ‘kraal’ and ‘farm’) which is in contrast to women who are viewed as still and stagnant, collapsed with one space - the home. Women’s identities are greatly associated with cooking because they are profoundly associated with the home and their identities are wound up with the space too. Women are, on a constant basis, collapsed into this space. Women cook, clean, and look after children *because* they are at home and, in turn, *because* they are home they do these activities.

Women have managed to use this deep association of them with the home and the act of cooking to their advantage in accessing jobs in tourism. At Meno A Kwena, there are five people who cook, four for tourists and managers and one for staff. Of these five who cook, three are women. Meno A Kwena’s head chef and longest serving employee is a woman (not from Moreomaoto) who started working at the camp in 2003 as a trainee housekeeper and cook and is now the highest paid person in the kitchen (3,663 BWP). Unfortunately, during the time of field work she was on sick leave for an extended period. Due to her absence another woman, who has worked as a chef in two other tourism camps in the Delta, was hired on three month probation (50BWP per day she is needed). Lastly, one of the housekeepers (a woman) also doubles up as a ‘staff cook’ preparing meals for the staff, generally ‘papa and soup.’ She is from Moreomaoto and has had this position since she started working at Meno A Kwena in 2011. Other than the one waiter on probation (earning 1,000BWP per month), she is the lowest paid of those working with food (1,100BWP). While it is expected that women will cook in tourism because ‘it’s what they do at home’, there is an increasing number of men cooking at the camp.

Of the five people who cook for tourists, one includes the assistant manager who was a chef prior to being promoted in 2013. He is often found in the kitchen with another male chef who earns comparatively less than him (3,025 BWP vs. 1,760 BWP). Both men are from Moreomaoto and both started working at the camp as waiters (one in 2006 and the other in 2008) before being promoted to chefs two years thereafter (in 2008 and 2010 respectively). Kagiso (a man from Moreomaoto), a former employee at Meno A Kwena, was also a waiter, before becoming a chef and later an assistant manager. Because of the increasing numbers of men working with food (there is also one male waiter working with two female waitresses), participants often refer to the relative numerical parity of women and men in catering, as opposed to housekeeping and maintenance which is highly bifurcated. Many say that cooking is no longer *just* a woman’s job and that *even* men cook now which is, in fact, an international trend in tourism with men and women both in catering (Baum, 2013). However, the increasing numbers of men cooking at the camp does not necessarily translate into them cooking at home too. Itumeleng sums up this tendency:

*IT: Something like maybe the chef here, the boys. I don’t think they cook at home, they are lazy to do it. It’s only their sisters. They only do it here just because the work forces them to. At home you can’t find him cooking, unless he’s alone that’s when he can do the cooking.*

Both men who currently work as chefs at Meno A Kwena, as well as the one who used to work at the camp all say that they sometimes try to cook what they learn at camp at home but that they, much like other men in Moreomaoto, only cook when the women in their lives are unavailable (as suggested by Itumeleng above). This is because if a particular woman is unavailable to carry out her duties of cooking she will rely on female networks of labour to get the cooking done, whether it is a sister, aunt, mother, or daughter who helps. “When I’m home I’m the one who’s doing the cooking but sometimes [it is] my mum,” Itumeleng explains how her mom helps her while she is at Meno A Kwena.
However, there may be situations in which men have no women on which they can rely to get the cooking done. For example, Ofentse (a Motswana not from Moreomaoto) cooks for himself because he lives alone following the death of his girlfriend and his mother. Similarly, Lebogang (a male Motswana from Moreomaoto) stays alone, as opposed to with a girlfriend, wife, or mother and hence assumes the responsibility for cooking, not only for himself but his eldest child as well. Despite these examples of men assuming cooking responsibility, the overwhelming, continued presence and dominance of women in the home helps to reinforce them as the ones who should be there and who are meant to be cooking.

Nonetheless, the deduction that women cook because men are somewhere else is surprising because like men, women often perform labour which is outside of home. Women are also active in the fields (with weeding and sewing crops), cattle posts (cleaning them and milking cows), and many work in paid employment, like that provided by Meno A Kwena. Therefore, for men 'working somewhere else' is a useful discourse for not engaging in cooking which simultaneously frames women as the one’s who should. However, as much as women are the normalised population who cooks, men can be found cooking in the home, because it is believed, even though they do not carry out the act of cooking regularly, that they are capable.

**Men can cook, so they will, if it is paid**

*AA: Traditionally the women will do the cooking and the sweeping and the men will do the hard labour, the hard part of it. [He will] take an axe out of the wood and plough. I'll cook, clean and bath the kids.*

By using words such as 'hard', 'difficult', and 'heavy' to describe men’s work women participants, like Gorata, negate women’s work (such as cooking), and relegate it outside of the realm of skilled labour. Unlike with cattle care or ploughing where women’s bodies were framed as inherently lacking the necessary skill (strength) to do the work, men are believed to be able to cook. Men are framed as capable cooks 'if they need to be', as was the case with Ofentse and Lebogang mentioned previously, but that they can cook should they 'feel like it' and should they choose to. Therefore, unlike women who are expected to cook because of their association with the home men cooking tends to be voluntary or imposed. This framing of cooking as something anyone can do detaches the act from the historical skill and knowledge women have acquired and passed on to one another through cooking. Nonetheless, the ability to construct cooking as devoid of skill is also what has aided men in encroaching on tourism jobs previously reserved only for women, like cooking. This is an important point because most interviewees expressed that life today is significantly more expensive than in the past.

A combination of a reduction in natural provisions for survival (through cattle death, less space, legislation against hunting, reduced rainfall, and sporadic river flows) and new modern ‘created’ demands for commercial goods (such as toiletries and clothes) which were either not needed, nor were they as expensive, in the past work together to influence people’s belief that life is more expensive today. With these restrictions it is unsurprising that ‘not enough money’ is a central discourse in people’s narratives of their lives and that they identify a need for more jobs to curtail these anxieties. Thabo (the librarian working in Moreomaoto) believes this is one of the reasons men are moving into activities, such as waiting, previously reserved only for women: "initially from the past we realise that those jobs were for women but nowadays because of 'we want money, we want to work' men are doing those jobs…"

Thabo makes a poignant observation that the desire as well as pull of money and work are what motivate men "doing those jobs", jobs they would not do at home. Therefore, men are doing tasks at Meno A Kwena that they do not do at home because doing work which brings in financial resources supersedes
the importance of what work is being done. The Chief makes the seriousness of this apparent when he says if someone is offered a job as a chef and turns it down because they are a man they must not come back to the village.

Therefore, while men are not currently represented in other female defined jobs (See Figure 2), such as cleaning, this may change in future, as alluded to by Ditiro (a man living in Moreomaoto who is not affiliated with the camp): "Cooking used to be women’s work but now it’s also men’s work and in future they might be cleaning too." While cooking in tourism does bring in higher financial returns than working as a housekeeper, it does not fully explain why there is currently male movement into one and not the other.

Another reason may be tied to gendered hiring practices themselves (Acker, 2006, Weinert, 2008). Although David (the owner of Meno A Kwena) believes that the gendered division of labour at the camp is as a result of Moreomaoto’s ‘traditional’ beliefs’ he could not clearly articulate why there appears to be an increasing immersion of men in catering jobs (both in waiting and cooking) despite going against Moreomaoto’s gender norms. He did, however, admit that women falling pregnant are a deterrent for him as it costs him money. Contracts do not include any paternal benefits they do include maternity leave (paid 75% for 1st month, 50% for 2nd month, and 35% for 3rd month). This reluctance alters hiring practices and in turn the organisation of labour at the camp itself. His only concession for why hiring women is favourable is because "they work harder". That said, the entrenched view, while not unique to Meno A Kwena or Botswana, that hiring women is a negative because they will fall pregnant and have children further positions women as lacking the capacity needed to be effective at their jobs.

However, even this does not fully explain why men are not then also found within housekeeping jobs because the same hiring logic would be used. Another, more hidden discourse as to why men are increasingly found cooking could be the framing of cooking at camp as different to cooking at home, a discursive shift not yet found with housekeeping.

At camp cooking is different and therefore skilled

While women are found to be suitable to cook at camp 'because it is the same as what they do at home', men cook at the camp precisely because cooking can be framed as something different to and separate from the home- That may also explain why despite having these jobs in tourism it has not translated into men carrying out the activity at home too.

Cooking is not the same at camp as it is in the village because at Meno A Kwena a variety of western foods are prepared for guests to enjoy including everything from steaks, to crepe suzettes, cakes, and pasta. At home, in Moreomaoto, Batswana are not making such food; rather they are cooking and eating staples such as 'papa' a type of maize meal, together with soups and vegetables (such as sorghum) and fruits (like watermelon) which have been bought from local stores or grown in their own fields.

Interestingly where men are moving into activities involving food because the activities, generally, are seen as being different from those at home most respondents do not view cleaning at home and at the camp as being different, the only exception being Isabella (female expat working at the camp) who called it a 'different world'. However, as much as neither cooking nor cleaning at the camp resembles the act of cooking and cleaning at home men are found moving into cooking at the camp because they themselves enjoy the work, because it is well paid, and importantly because it is discursively framed as something different to cooking at home. Further, because cooking is spoken of something men can do even in the home, the transition of them into cooking at camp is not problematised because despite
it being something they do not do at home, like women, they are discursively framed as having the innate capabilities and capacities to do the activity should they wish to.

**Discussion and conclusion**

Therefore, the contours which are shaping who cooks within these respective gender orders have underlying similarities. The discourses used to justify women’s action of cooking are the same in both spaces. Women cook because they always have and because it is associated with the home. This discourse does not highlight the skill and historical knowledge present in women’s cooking but has, through repetitive action, come to normalise women as the ones who cook. Interestingly, however, men’s act of cooking is not problematized either, despite them not cooking repetitively. The acceptance of men as cooks has been achieved through different means, by constructing them as inherently capable. No one questions men’s ability to cook. Men can and do cook. However, where women are *expected* to cook men *choose* to cook.

This difference in discourse means that men have more flexibility than women when seeking out jobs in tourism. Men are viewed as willing and able to adapt and learn new skills whereas women only do what they have always done. These discourses are found within both gender orders meaning that the likelihood of Meno A Kwen’a gender order substantially subverting the contours of Moreomaoto’s gender order is unlikely. That is, while men may be present in a space and doing an activity with which they are not traditionally associated, the discourses used to justify their presence do not disrupt the underlying discourse that men are skilled and therefore able to undertake a task which is new to them. Therefore, the discourses which are used to justify who cooks illustrate how gendered divisions of labour can shift and change over time and in different spaces but also how they are able to simultaneously maintain existing ideas about masculinity and femininity. However, as long as women’s activities (including cooking) and labour is viewed as one and the same as what they do at home, irrespective of the different tools and skills they use in these spaces, then women will not diversify their employment opportunities in tourism in the same way men have.

**Note**

Translated interviews underwent a quality check during the transcription process with Setswana speakers hired to double check the quality of the translations while they were transcribing the interviews. All other interviews were transcribed by me verbatim. Only minor ‘ums’ and ‘ahs’ were removed. Grammatical errors were left unless the mistake hampered comprehension and in those instances the change is indicated.
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