

Common Stereotypes of Tourists in Dubrovnik

Božović, Cvijeto

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2018

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **RIT Croatia / RIT Croatia**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:229:163057>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2022-11-27**

RIT

Repository / Repozitorij:

[RIT Croatia Digital repository - Rochester Institute of Technology](#)

Croatia



Common Stereotypes of Tourists in Dubrovnik

Cvijeto Bozovic

RIT Croatia

Mentor: Vanda Bazdan

Dubrovnik, May 2018

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to find out what are the stereotypes of the most common tourists in Dubrovnik; British, Americans, Germans, Spaniards and French people. Questionnaire was distributed among the people working in hotels in Dubrovnik. All the hotels were categorized between 3 and 5 stars. Questionnaires were given to the employees who distributed them among them and they were later collected. The results showed that British people are considered to be conventional, Americans are described as democratic, while Germans are perceived as hardworking people. Guests from Spain are described as loud, while French people are seen as liberal. Stereotypes can be dangerous in hospitality industry, since they are bordering with generalization and they can often lead to discrimination. The employer should educate their employees on stereotypes and train them to overcome their perception of guests in order to avoid negative consequences that can be the result of stereotyping.

Keywords: stereotypes, guest, tourists, Dubrovnik, hospitality, hotels

Introduction

Stereotypes

Word “stereotype” was introduced for the first time in 1922 by Walter Lippmann (Hogan, 2010). He used this word to describe the belief of a person or a group of people who perceive people belonging to a different social group in a certain way. Generally accepted definition of stereotypes is that these represent a set of characteristic and behaviors connected to group of people based on their nationality, sex, religion, sexual orientation, race and many more. Many people think that stereotypes and generalization are the same. But, that is only partially true.

While every stereotype is at the same time generalization, not all generalizations are stereotypes (Nittle, 2017). If people believe that a specific racial group is good at math, this is both a stereotype and a generalization. On the other hand, if an individual thinks that a member of a certain nation is a great cook and based on this thinks that all members of that group are great cooks, this is only a generalization because it is based on the conclusion of an individual. Stereotypes as such don't have a real purpose. They are a “tool” used by human brain to simplify social world (Saul McLeod, 2015). Stereotypes are produced by cognitive structures and they are considered to be unconscious (Dovidio, 2002).

Stereotypes can be explained as a strict and, in most of the cases, exaggerated and simplified beliefs that can be applied to a social category or an individual (Krueger, 1996). Stereotypes are often the foundation for creating prejudice which can turn into discrimination of a certain social group. They are considered to be undesirable because of their role in creating of social oppression based on someone's characteristics, but they are also necessary in some situations. For example, if a person finds himself in a situation where they don't know anyone,

then he uses stereotypes to know what to expect from others and what others expect from him (Johnson, 1995).

Stereotypes are the foundation for creating prejudice and discrimination of a certain social group and it is not always the majority that creates stereotypes and prejudice (Dovidio, 2002).. A study was conducted by the National Conference for Community and Justice in the United States. The name of the study was “Taking America’s Pulse”. The goal of this study was to see what other ethnic groups think of Asians. Even though white people are dominant by the number, they were not the ones who had the worst opinion of Asians. Latin American and African Americans (both 42%) had negative stereotypes of Asians, while 27% of dominant (by the number) white population had negative stereotypes (Kim, 2000).

Stereotypes are complicated (McCarthy, 2016). It is not all black and white as it may seem. There are paradoxes linked to the stereotypes. The first paradox are good and bad stereotypes. Although stereotypes are considered to be negative, there are positive stereotypes as well. An example of a positive stereotype would be that all Germans are hardworking. Those positive and negative stereotypes make the difference between model minority and foreigner. Another paradox is connected to the perception of those who have stereotypes and those who are being stereotyped. An example of this paradox are Asian Americans. It is considered that African Americans are being abused and discriminated the most in the United States. But actually Asian Americans report approximately the same amount of racial abuses as Afro Americans, but in the eyes of members of other ethnic groups Asian Americans are not as much abused (Lee, 2000)

National and Ethnic Stereotypes

As already mentioned, there are many kinds of stereotypes. Some of them are national and ethnic stereotypes (Nittle, 2017). National stereotypes are general perception of people that come from the same country. An example would be a stereotype that all people from Poland are Catholic – ultranationalists – football hooligans that hate Jews (Leszczynski, 2012), or another example; all people from Ireland are angry hard drinking potato eaters. Ethnic stereotypes are based on the ethnicity of certain group of people. For example, Slavs are perceived as lazy people who prefer crime over a decent job , all Afro-Americans are addicted to fried chicken and watermelon, or another example are Jews who are often perceived as money-grabbing thieves who control the world banks (Pine, 2013). These ethnic stereotypes can become the source of ethnic prejudices which can be deadly for the business in hospitality industry.

Change of Stereotypes Throughout the Decades

Stereotypes are not immune to the time. With modern technology, internet and better quality of education people have access to higher amount of information which helps them to understand the world around them better, or at least different. A study (Madon, 2000) was conducted on general opinion on African Americans. Participants in this study were members of other ethnic groups in the United States. The study examined the opinions of different participants in three different time periods. They made an 18 year long gap between every retake. The first one was made in 1933, the second one was made in 1951 and the third one was in 1969. The study shows that 75% of participants perceived African Americans as lazy, in 1951 that percentage went down to 31% and in 1969 to 26%. Also, in 1933 African Americans were perceived as stupid by 22%, in 1951 by 10% and finally in 1969 by 4% participants. These results clearly show the change of how and what people think of a certain social group. But even though the change is clearly visible, those stereotypes still exist. With people getting easier

access to the information the percentages of bad stereotypes in this case went down, but stereotypes haven't disappeared yet and they will probably never disappear.

Stereotypes in Tourism

Stereotypes are everywhere and it is impossible to avoid them. Tourism is not spared of it either, it is just the opposite (Bender, 2013). Stereotypes in tourism go both ways. Tourists have stereotypes of people whose country they are visiting and local people have stereotypes of people who are visiting their land. Both tourists and their hosts use stereotypes as a tool to know what to expect from others. An example would be that there is a stereotype that French people are great cooks, so most of tourists expect great food when visiting France. People are not the only one being stereotyped, but their countries also. For example, most of tourists perceive Brazil as poor country with a high criminal rate, while actually Brazil isn't as poor as it is perceived and only some places or neighborhoods are dangerous.

But stereotypes are not just in people's heads, they are also in tourist guidebooks. These stereotypes can change people's perception of the destination. A study was made on tourist guidebooks about Switzerland (Bender, 2013). This study was made on guidebooks for the French, German, Spanish, Italian and American market since they are their top visitors. The study shows that these guidebooks claim that most of Swiss people speak all three official languages (German, French, Italian), but that is not true. Most of Swiss people speak only one of those languages. An example of stereotypes affecting the perception of the destination was found in the French guidebook which described Swiss nightlife as boring because most of bars and nightclubs are closing earlier than they do in France. The closing time is more similar to the

German bars and clubs which are often perceived as boring. This shows how simple things as working hours of a night club can shape a stereotype of the whole nation as boring.

Stereotypes can have a huge affect on tourism (McKercher, 2013). They can help to shape a touristic destination which can be both useful and dangerous. A positive example would be in adjustment of an offer if most of the guests of a certain destination are coming from France, and French people are perceived as huge fans of good food and quality wine, it would be good to enrich the offer of with high quality restaurants and wine bars. An opposite example would be the myth that Asian people are not willing to try the local cuisine and that they insist on their (Chinese, Korean...) food and restaurants (Selstad, 2012), which is not the truth. They like to try local food and they don't want to be recommended with Asian restaurants, since they eat Asian food all of their lives. Understanding what customers consider to be valuable in a service transaction is vital to the interaction between guests and employees (Ruiseco, 2018)

Dubrovnik as a Tourist Destination

City of Dubrovnik is located on the coast of the Croatian side of Adriatic Sea (TZ Dubrovnik, 2018). Dubrovnik has population of just above 40 000. It is the most popular tourist destination in Croatia and it is also known as a Pearl of the Adriatic. Dubrovnik is best known for its Old Town which attracts many people from around the world. Old Town is under UNESCO's protection since 1979 as a cultural heritage (UNESCO, n.d.). The Old Town is surrounded with the stone walls which are 1940 meters long. What attracts tourist is the history, culture, sun and sea, coast line, islands, Mediterranean cuisine, movies and series that have been filmed here. Mount of Srd offers a perfect view of the old town, but also a view of the whole

city. Dubrovnik Summer Festival is being held every summer since 1950 and it is the biggest cultural event in the region. It takes place around Dubrovnik, but also outside the city. Dubrovnik offers a lot of different hotels of mid and high category, along with private accommodation. There are 45 hotels and 12 of them are five star hotels (TZ Dubrovnik, 2018). The most visitors come from the United Kingdom, followed by Americans, French and Germans. Number of foreign visitors and overnight staying is increasing for the past several years.

Methodology

Purpose

The main goal of this research paper was to find out what are the most common stereotypes of tourists in Dubrovnik. Objective of this paper was to examine how hospitality employees in Dubrovnik perceive most common guests based on their nationality. Guests from the UK, USA, Germany, Spain and France are most common guests in Dubrovnik according to Tourist Board of Dubrovnik (TZ Dubrovnik, 2018), and based on that information a survey was constructed.

The data used for this research was based on 100 participants who voluntarily filled out the questionnaire at their work place during March and April of 2018. Questionnaires were distributed in seven different hotels rated from three to five stars, all of them located in Dubrovnik. The only demand for the participants was that they are employed in one of these hotels, irrespective to their position, age, gender and other factors.

Out of 100 questionnaires distributed, 88 of them are valid, while other twelve were invalid. Out of 88 participants, 56 were male (63,6%) and 32 were female (34,6%) (Table 1). The age span ranged from “18 or less” to “58 or more”, with most of participants, 40 (45,5%),

belonging to the age group “19-27” (Table 2). Most of the participants, 34 of them or 38,6% finished High school. They are followed by 33 participants who have college degree (Table 3). Most of the participant or 34 of them (38.6%) are working 2-5 years at their current company (Table 4), while 36 employees (40.9%) are also working 2-5 years in hospitality (Table 5). Majority of participants are working in a 4 star hotels, 33 out of 88 which makes 37.5% out of the total number of participants (Table 6). Also, huge majority of participants (52 out of 88, or 59.1%) were working in mid-sized hotels with 51-200 rooms (Table 7)

Instrument

Questionnaire used in this research was recycled from the research „Ethnic and National Stereotypes: The Princeton Trilogy“ that was conducted in the US (Madon, 2000). Questionnaire was constructed out of 53 adjectives which were describing certain nation. The participants supposed to show how much they were in agreement with these descriptions on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). There were also additional seven demographic questions, which makes 60 questions in total. It took approximately 5 minutes to complete this questionnaire. Each of the five ethnic groups which are listed as the most common tourists. Out of 20 questionnaires considering stereotypes of British people, 17 was valid, 15 out of 20 for the Germans, 16 out of 20 for the Americans and 20 out of 20 for the Spanish and French tourists. Total of 88 out of 100 questionnaires were valid.

Distribution

To collect data for this research paper, questionnaires were distributed by the “Drop-off” method. That means that questionnaires were given to the employees of different hotels who distributed those questionnaires to their colleagues, and they were later collected.

Results

Common Stereotypes

It was expected that there would be a lot of strong answers (“strongly agree” or “strongly disagree”), but that was not the case. There was not many strongly held stereotypes, just a few for each nation.

Participants described British people as conventional ($M=5.41$, $SD=1.54$), alert ($M=5.12$, $SD=1.45$), ostentatious ($M=4.88$, $SD=1.36$), proud ($M=4.82$, $SD=1.51$) and they tend to complain ($M=4.76$, $SD=1.44$). Also, participants disagree that British people are rude ($M=3.41$, $SD=1.29$) or Ignorant ($M=3.35$, $SD=1.58$) (Table 8).

Germans are considered to be extremely hardworking ($M=6.31$, $SD=0.74$), efficient ($M=5.87$, $SD=0.83$), intelligent ($M=5.60$, $SD=0.74$), patriotic ($M=5.60$, $SD=1.30$) and materialistic ($M=5.60$, $SD=1.06$), while they don't think that Germans are ignorant ($M=2.40$, $SD=1.12$) or emotional ($M=2.27$, $SD=1.28$) (Table 9).

Tourists from the US are perceived as democratic ($M=5.88$, $SD=1.15$), proud ($M=5.75$, $SD=0.78$), liberal ($M=5.69$, $SD=0.87$), outspoken ($M=5.69$, $SD=0.87$) and straightforward ($M=5.69$, $SD=1.14$). On the other hand they are not considered to be intelligent ($M=2.75$, $SD=1.13$) or conventional ($M=2.62$, $SD=1.15$) (Table 10).

Spanish people were described as loud ($M=5.15$, $SD=1.42$), materialistic ($M=5.15$, $SD=1.23$), alert ($M=5.15$, $SD=1.57$), efficient ($M=5.05$, $SD=1.97$) and stubborn ($M=5.00$, $SD=1.17$). Participants didn't see them as emotional ($M=3.45$, $SD=1.61$) or individualistic ($M=3.35$, $SD=1.31$) (Table 11).

French tourists are perceived as liberal ($M=5.65$, $SD=1.60$), stubborn ($M=5.45$, $SD=1.28$), proud ($M=5.45$, $SD=1.28$), superficial ($M=5.40$, $SD=0.88$) and materialistic ($M=5.35$, $SD=1.14$). On the other hand, they are considered not to be sportsmanlike ($M=3.20$, $SD=1.24$) or emotional ($M=3.10$, $SD=1.45$) (Table 12).

Effect of gender on stereotypes

A significant difference was detected in opinions of men and women when it comes to evaluation of British tourists (Table 13) with men displaying stronger attitudes in terms of stereotypes of British people being more arrogant ($M=4.92$, $SD=1.56$) than women ($M=3.00$, $SD=0.71$). Men see them also more democratic ($M=4.67$, $SD=0.79$) than women ($M=3.40$, $SD=0.59$). Men think that British people are more stubborn ($M=5.17$, $SD=1.34$) than women ($M=3.4$, $SD=1.14$). Men also think that British tourists are more curious ($M=5.00$, $SD=1.35$) than women ($M=3.40$, $SD=1.13$). Male participants also think that British people are more Hard headed ($M=4.67$, $SD=0.89$) than women do ($M=3.40$, $SD=1.52$) (Table 14).

Some significant differences were noticed in opinions of men and women about Germans (Table 15). Men think that Germans are more hardworking ($M=6.44$, $SD=0.73$) than women do ($M=5.64$, $SD=0.52$). Women see Germans as more sportsmanlike ($M=4.83$, $SD=1.72$) than men do ($M=3.22$, $SD=1.09$). Also, women think that Germans are more politically active ($M=5.33$, $SD=1.21$) than men do ($M=4.11$, $SD=0.93$) (Table 16).

There was only one significant difference between the genders in their way of seeing the Americans (Table 17). Men think that Americans are rude ($M=4.91$, $SD=1.30$) than women do ($M=3.00$, $SD=1.73$) (Table 18).

The most significant differences between opinions of different genders were about French tourists (Table 19). Women think that French people are more ambitious ($M=5.13$, $SD=1.13$) than men do ($M=5.00$, $SD=0.89$). Men see French people as more progressive ($M=5.36$, $SD=0.51$) compared to women ($M=4.50$, $SD=1.51$). Men think that French people are more aggressive ($M=4.82$, $SD=1.47$) than women do ($M=3.63$, $SD=1.06$). Men also think that French tourists are more practical ($M=4.55$, $SD=0.69$) than women do ($M=4.13$, $SD=0.64$). Women think that the French are more individualistic ($M=5.38$, $SD=0.74$) than men do ($M=4.73$, $SD=1.35$). Men see French people as more ostentatious ($M=5.55$, $SD=0.69$) than women do ($M=4.50$, $SD=0.93$). Also, men think that the French are more competitive ($M=4.82$, $SD=0.75$) than women think ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.71$). Men see French people as more hard headed ($M=5.18$, $SD=0.75$) compared to women opinion ($M=5.00$, $SD=1.41$). Also, men think that the French are more independent ($M=4.64$, $SD=0.67$) than women ($M=4.25$, $SD=1.04$). Men see them as more greedy ($M=4.73$, $SD=1.01$) compared to women ($M=4.00$, $SD=1.41$). Also, men think that the French are more proud ($M=5.73$, $SD=1.10$) than women think ($M=5.50$, $SD=0.93$) (Table 20).

There was no significant differences in opinions about Spanish tourists.

Discussion

This research proved that employees of Dubrovnik hotels have stereotypes of people visiting the city based on their nationalities. Questionnaire results showed that hotel employees think that guests from United Kingdom are conventional and that Americans are democratic. Germans are seen as extremely hardworking people, Spaniards were described as loud nation, while French tourists are perceived as liberal people. It is in human nature to have stereotypes of

people belonging to different groups, but those stereotypes are often bordering with prejudice which can affect employee's professional relationship with a guest. Prejudices are a common problem in tourism in general and it can affect the business. Hotel management should prepare their employees with a training or education in order for them to avoid stereotyping their guests. These trainings and educations should help the employees to reduce the amount of automatic stereotypes that they have about certain nations. Results showed that men hold more stereotypes in general and that they have more negative stereotypes than women.

Limitations and Further Research

This research has some limitations which should be taken into consideration. Questionnaire was distributed in only several hotels in Dubrovnik and the study was conducted on a sample of 100 people. Out of 100 questionnaires distributed 88 of them were valid. Also, the research was made on only five different nationalities which is not enough. Further research should be conducted on a bigger sample. The research should be done in more tourist destinations in Croatia. Results could be compared based on the age or time spent working in hospitality of the participants. Also, the research could be made on how guests feel about these stereotypes of their nations

References List

- Dovidio, J. F. (2002). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
- Dubrovnik Tourist Board. (2018). Retrieved from http://www.tzdubrovnik.hr/sp/ku/lang/en/index_ku.html
- Hogan, P. C. (2011). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences*.
- John F. Dovidio, S. L. (2002). Implicit and Explicit Prejudice and Interracial Interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* , 62-68.
- Johnson, A. G. (1995). *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology*.
- Kim, N. (2000). "Taking America's Pulse".
- Krueger, J. (1996). Personal Beliefs and Cultural Stereotypes About Racial Characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* .
- Lee. (2000). *Los Angeles Times* .
- Leszczynski, A. (2013). Polish stereotypes: hard-drinking Catholic zealots? Nie! *The Guardian* .
- Madon. (2000). Ethnic and National Stereotypes.
- Madon, S. Ethnic and National Stereotypes. In *The Princeton Trilogy - Revisited and Revised*.
- McCarthy, J. (2017). What's the Secret to Combating Ageist Stereotypes? It's Complicated. *PSYCHOLOGY BENEFITS SOCIETY* .
- McKercher. (2008). Stereotypical factors in tourism. *researchgate.net* .
- McLeod, S. (2015). Stereotypes. *SimplyPsychology* .
- Nittle, N. K. (2017). What Is the Meaning of Stereotype?
- Pine, D. (2013). Jews and money: The stereotype, the history. *The Jewish News of Northern California* .
- Ruiseco, N. (2008). *HOW STEREOTYPING AFFECTS CUSTOMER SERVICE*.
- Selstad. (2015). Stereotypes And The Tourists.
- UNESCO. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/95>

Tables

Table 1. *Frequencies for gender*

		Frequency	Percent	Gender Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	M	56	63.6	63.6	63.6
	F	32	36.4	36.4	100.0
	Total	88	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 *Frequencies for age*

		Age		Valid	Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
Valid	Less than 18	2	2.3	2.3	2.3
	19-27	40	45.5	45.5	47.7
	28-37	13	14.8	14.8	62.5
	38-47	13	14.8	14.8	77.3
	48-57	12	13.6	13.6	90.9
	58 or more	8	9.1	9.1	100.0
	Total	88	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 *Frequencies for education*

		Education			
				Valid	Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
Valid	Elementary school	2	2.3	2.3	2.3
	High school	34	38.6	38.6	40.9
	Post-secondary non- tertiary education	19	21.6	21.6	62.5
	College or more	33	37.5	37.5	100.0
	Total	88	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 *Frequencies for time spent at the current company*

		TimeSpentAtTheCurrentCompany			
				Valid	Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Percent	Percent
Valid	Less than 2 years	28	31.8	31.8	31.8
	2-5	34	38.6	38.6	70.5
	6-9	5	5.7	5.7	76.1
	10-13	17	19.3	19.3	95.5
	More than 13	4	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	88	100.0	100.0	

Table 5 *Frequencies for time spent working in hospitality*

TimeSpentWorkingInHospitality					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 2 years	4	4.5	4.5	4.5
	2-5	36	40.9	40.9	45.5
	6-9	9	10.2	10.2	55.7
	10-13	24	27.3	27.3	83.0
	More than 13	15	17.0	17.0	100.0
	Total	88	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 *Frequencies for hotel star rating*

HotelStarRating					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3*	25	28.4	28.4	28.4
	4*	33	37.5	37.5	65.9
	5*	30	34.1	34.1	100.0
	Total	88	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 *Frequencies for the number of rooms in the hotel*

		HotelNumberOfRooms			Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	50 or less	16	18.2	18.2	18.2
	51-200	52	59.1	59.1	77.3
	201 or more	20	22.7	22.7	100.0
	Total	88	100.0	100.0	

Table 8

UK stereotypes

Most common stereotypes of UK tourists

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Conventional	17	2	7	5.41	1.543
Alert	17	3	7	5.12	1.453
Ostentatious	17	2	7	4.88	1.364
Proud	17	2	7	4.82	1.510
Complaining	17	3	7	4.76	1.437
Rude	17	2	6	3.41	1.278
Ignorant	17	1	7	3.35	1.579

Table 9 Germany

Most common stereotypes of German tourists

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Hardworking	15	5	7	6.13	.743
Efficient	15	5	7	5.87	.834
Intelligent	15	4	7	5.60	.737
Patriotic	15	2	7	5.60	1.298
Materialistic	15	4	7	5.60	1.056
Ignorant	15	1	4	2.40	1.121
Emotional	15	1	5	2.27	1.280

Table 10 US

Most common US tourist stereotypes

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Democratic	16	3	7	5.88	1.147
Proud	16	5	7	5.75	.775
Liberal	16	4	7	5.69	.873
Outspoken	16	4	7	5.69	.873
Straightforward	16	3	7	5.69	1.138
Intelligent	16	1	5	2.75	1.125
Conventional	16	1	5	2.62	1.147

a. Nationality = USA

Table 11 Spain

Most common Spanish tourists stereotypes

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Loud	20	2	7	5.15	1.424
Materialistic	20	3	7	5.15	1.226
Alert	20	1	7	5.15	1.565
Efficient	20	1	7	5.05	1.986
Stubborn	20	3	7	5.00	1.170
Emotional	20	1	7	3.45	1.605
Individualistic	20	1	6	3.35	1.309

a. Nationality = Spain

Table 12 France

Most common French tourists stereotypes

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Liberal	20	1	7	5.65	1.599
Stubborn	20	2	7	5.45	1.276
Proud	20	2	7	5.45	1.276
Superficial	20	4	7	5.40	.883
Materialistic	20	3	7	5.35	1.137
Sportsmanlike	20	1	5	3.20	1.240
Emotional	20	1	6	3.10	1.447

a. Nationality = France

Table 13 Significant differences – UK

ANOVA^a

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Arrogant	Between Groups	12.966	1	12.966	6.726	.020
	Within Groups	28.917	15	1.928		
	Total	41.882	16			
Democratic	Between Groups	5.663	1	5.663	10.798	.005
	Within Groups	7.867	15	.524		
	Total	13.529	16			
Stubborn	Between Groups	11.016	1	11.016	6.645	.021
	Within Groups	24.867	15	1.658		
	Total	35.882	16			
Curious	Between Groups	9.035	1	9.035	5.378	.035
	Within Groups	25.200	15	1.680		
	Total	34.235	16			
HardHeaded	Between Groups	5.663	1	5.663	4.754	.046
	Within Groups	17.867	15	1.191		
	Total	23.529	16			

a. Nationality =
Great Britain

Table 14

M/F differences UK

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Arrogant	M	12	4.92	1.564	.452	3.92	5.91	1	7
	F	5	3.00	.707	.316	2.12	3.88	2	4
	Total	17	4.35	1.618	.392	3.52	5.18	1	7
Democratic	M	12	4.67	.778	.225	4.17	5.16	3	6
	F	5	3.40	.548	.245	2.72	4.08	3	4
	Total	17	4.29	.920	.223	3.82	4.77	3	6
Stubborn	M	12	5.17	1.337	.386	4.32	6.02	2	7
	F	5	3.40	1.140	.510	1.98	4.82	2	5
	Total	17	4.65	1.498	.363	3.88	5.42	2	7
Curious	M	12	5.00	1.348	.389	4.14	5.86	3	7
	F	5	3.40	1.140	.510	1.98	4.82	2	5
	Total	17	4.53	1.463	.355	3.78	5.28	2	7
HardHeaded	M	12	4.67	.888	.256	4.10	5.23	3	6
	F	5	3.40	1.517	.678	1.52	5.28	1	5
	Total	17	4.29	1.213	.294	3.67	4.92	1	6

Table 15 Significant differences Germany

ANOVA^a

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Hardworking	Between Groups	2.178	1	2.178	5.096	.042
	Within Groups	5.556	13	.427		
	Total	7.733	14			
Sportsmanlike	Between Groups	9.344	1	9.344	4.981	.044
	Within Groups	24.389	13	1.876		
	Total	33.733	14			
PoliticallyActive	Between Groups	5.378	1	5.378	4.916	.045
	Within Groups	14.222	13	1.094		
	Total	19.600	14			

Table 16

M/F differences Germany

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Hardworking	M	9	6.44	.726	.242	5.89	7.00	5	7
	F	6	5.67	.516	.211	5.12	6.21	5	6
	Total	15	6.13	.743	.192	5.72	6.54	5	7
Sportsmanlike	M	9	3.22	1.093	.364	2.38	4.06	2	5
	F	6	4.83	1.722	.703	3.03	6.64	2	7
	Total	15	3.87	1.552	.401	3.01	4.73	2	7
PoliticallyActive	M	9	4.11	.928	.309	3.40	4.82	3	6
	F	6	5.33	1.211	.494	4.06	6.60	4	7
	Total	15	4.60	1.183	.306	3.94	5.26	3	7

a. Nationality = Germany

Table 17 Significant differences USA

ANOVA^a

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Rude	Between Groups	12.528	1	12.528	6.067	.027
	Within Groups	28.909	14	2.065		
	Total	41.437	15			

Table 18

M/F differences US

		95% Confidence Interval							
		for Mean							
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Rude	M	11	4.91	1.300	.392	4.04	5.78	2	7
	F	5	3.00	1.732	.775	.85	5.15	2	6
	Total	16	4.31	1.662	.416	3.43	5.20	2	7

Table 19 Significant differences – France

ANOVA^a

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Ambitious	Between Groups	8.925	2	4.463	4.496	.027
	Within Groups	16.875	17	.993		
	Total	25.800	19			
Progressive	Between Groups	12.005	2	6.002	5.502	.014
	Within Groups	18.545	17	1.091		
	Total	30.550	19			
Aggressive	Between Groups	17.039	2	8.519	4.908	.021
	Within Groups	29.511	17	1.736		
	Total	46.550	19			
Practical	Between Groups	6.148	2	3.074	6.874	.006
	Within Groups	7.602	17	.447		
	Total	13.750	19			
Individualistic	Between Groups	10.493	2	5.247	4.044	.037
	Within Groups	22.057	17	1.297		
	Total	32.550	19			
Ostentatious	Between Groups	5.073	2	2.536	4.019	.037
	Within Groups	10.727	17	.631		
	Total	15.800	19			
Competitive	Between Groups	7.064	2	3.532	6.572	.008
	Within Groups	9.136	17	.537		
	Total	16.200	19			

HardHeaded	Between Groups	9.314	2	4.657	4.032	.037
	Within Groups	19.636	17	1.155		
	Total	28.950	19			
Independent	Between Groups	6.755	2	3.377	4.766	.023
	Within Groups	12.045	17	.709		
	Total	18.800	19			
Greedy	Between Groups	13.568	2	6.784	4.769	.023
	Within Groups	24.182	17	1.422		
	Total	37.750	19			
Proud	Between Groups	12.768	2	6.384	5.969	.011
	Within Groups	18.182	17	1.070		
	Total	30.950	19			

Table 20

M/F differences France

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Ambitious	M	11	5.00	.894	.270	4.40	5.60	3	6
	F	8	5.13	1.126	.398	4.18	6.07	3	6
	4	1	2.00	2	2
	Total	20	4.90	1.165	.261	4.35	5.45	2	6
Progressive	M	11	5.36	.505	.152	5.02	5.70	5	6
	F	8	4.50	1.512	.535	3.24	5.76	2	6
	4	1	2.00	2	2
	Total	20	4.85	1.268	.284	4.26	5.44	2	6
Aggressive	M	11	4.82	1.471	.444	3.83	5.81	2	6
	F	8	3.63	1.061	.375	2.74	4.51	2	5
	4	1	1.00	1	1
	Total	20	4.15	1.565	.350	3.42	4.88	1	6
Practical	M	11	4.55	.688	.207	4.08	5.01	4	6
	F	8	4.13	.641	.227	3.59	4.66	3	5
	4	1	2.00	2	2
	Total	20	4.25	.851	.190	3.85	4.65	2	6
Individualistic	M	11	4.73	1.348	.407	3.82	5.63	2	7
	F	8	5.38	.744	.263	4.75	6.00	4	6
	4	1	2.00	2	2
	Total	20	4.85	1.309	.293	4.24	5.46	2	7
Ostentatious	M	11	5.55	.688	.207	5.08	6.01	5	7
	F	8	4.50	.926	.327	3.73	5.27	3	5
	4	1	5.00	5	5

	Total	20	5.10	.912	.204	4.67	5.53	3	7
Competitive	M	11	4.82	.751	.226	4.31	5.32	3	6
	F	8	3.75	.707	.250	3.16	4.34	3	5
	4	1	3.00	3	3
	Total	20	4.30	.923	.206	3.87	4.73	3	6
HardHeaded	M	11	5.18	.751	.226	4.68	5.69	4	7
	F	8	5.00	1.414	.500	3.82	6.18	2	6
	4	1	2.00	2	2
	Total	20	4.95	1.234	.276	4.37	5.53	2	7
Independent	M	11	4.64	.674	.203	4.18	5.09	4	6
	F	8	4.25	1.035	.366	3.38	5.12	3	6
	4	1	7.00	7	7
	Total	20	4.60	.995	.222	4.13	5.07	3	7
Greedy	M	11	4.73	1.009	.304	4.05	5.41	3	6
	F	8	4.00	1.414	.500	2.82	5.18	2	5
	4	1	1.00	1	1
	Total	20	4.25	1.410	.315	3.59	4.91	1	6
Proud	M	11	5.73	1.104	.333	4.99	6.47	3	7
	F	8	5.50	.926	.327	4.73	6.27	4	7
	4	1	2.00	2	2
	Total	20	5.45	1.276	.285	4.85	6.05	2	7

Appendix

Poštovani,

Moje ime je Cvijeto Božović i student sam četvrte godine visokoškolske institucije RIT Croatia u Dubrovniku, koja provodi program dodiplomskog studija menadžmenta u uslužnim djelatnostima fakulteta Rochester Institute of Technology iz Rochestera, u državi New York (SAD).

Trenutno pišem diplomski rad, a tema mog rada je “Stereotipi o turistima u Dubrovniku”.

Budući da ste vi zaposlenik u uslužnim djelatnostima u Dubrovniku, ovim Vas pozivam da svojim odgovorima sudjelujete u mom istraživanju koje provodim za potrebe mog diplomskog rada. Ispunjavanje upitnika u pravitku trajat će otprilike 5 minuta.

Sudjelovanje u ovom upitniku je u potpunosti dobrovoljno, a vaši podaci anonimni i povjerljivi, te ne postoji nikakav rizik ispunjavanja istog. Kako biste u potpunosti osigurali da Vaši podaci ostanu povjerljivi, molim Vas da na upitnik ne upisujete niti Vaše ime, niti ime kompanije/ustanove/poduzeća za koje radite.

Ukoliko odlučite sudjelovati, molim Vas da odgovorite na sva pitanja što je moguće iskrenije i preciznije.

Zahvaljujem Vam na Vašem vremenu i sudjelovanju u ovom istraživanju.

Ukoliko biste željeli bilo kakve dodatne informacije o ovom istraživanju ili mom diplomskom radu, slobodno mi se obratite na moj osobni telefon ili mail (098 922 6224/cx2884@g.rit.edu) ili direktno mom mentoru, profesorici Vandi Bazdan (vanda.bazdan@croatia.rit.edu).

S poštovanjem,

Cvijeto Božović

Ovaj upitnik je anoniman i oduzet će otprilike 4-5 minuta Vašeg vremena. Kako bi osigurali da sve informacije ostanu povjerljive, molim Vas da ne upisujete svoje ime. Ako odlučite sudjelovati u ovom upitniku, molim Vas da odgovorite na sva pitanja iskreno te da vratite upitnik osobi koja Vam ga je predala. Hvala!

Molim Vas, ocijenite svoje slaganje sa sljedećim opisima gostiju iz **Velike Britanije** na ljestvici od 1 do 7, gdje 1 označava 'uopće se ne slažem', a 7 'Potpuno se slažem'.

Marljivi	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Inteligentni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Materijalisti	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Ambiciozni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Progresivni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Oprezni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Učinkoviti	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Agresivni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Izravni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Praktični	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Sportski tipovi	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Individualci	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Tradicionalni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Hvalisavi	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Lijeni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Ekstremni nacionalisti	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Neuki	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Nagli	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Arogantni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Nepristojni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Demokratski nastrojani	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Ljubitelji glazbe	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Skloni koketiranju	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Kompetitivni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Glasni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Otvoreni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Tvrđoglavi	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Znatiželjni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Pustolovni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Hvalisavi	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Cool	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Tvrđoglavi	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Neovisni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Svojevoljni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Buntovni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Pristrani	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Površni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem

Emocionalni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Skloni žalbama	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Okrutni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Pohlepni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Domoljubi	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Politički aktivni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Ponosni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Rasisti	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Hvalisavi	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Razmaženi	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Liberalni	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem
Vođe	Uopće se ne slažem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Potpuno se slažem

Zaokružite Vaše odgovore na slijedeća demografska pitanja:

1) Spol

a) M	b) Ž
------	------

2) Dob

a) 18 ili manje	b) 19-27	c) 28-37	d) 38-47	e) 48 - 57	f) 58 ili više
-----------------	----------	----------	----------	------------	----------------

3) Stupanj obrazovanja

a) Nezavršena osnovna škola	b) Osnovna škola	c) Srednja škola	d) Viša škola	e) Fakultet i više
-----------------------------	------------------	------------------	---------------	--------------------

4) Koliko godina radite za tvrtku u kojoj ste trenutno zaposleni?

a) Manje od 2 godine	b) 2-5	c) 6-9	d) 10-13	e) Više od 13
----------------------	--------	--------	----------	---------------

5) Koliko godina radite u ugostiteljstvu?

a) Manje od 2 godine	b) 2-5	c) 6-9	d) 10-13	e) Više od 13
----------------------	--------	--------	----------	---------------

6) Kojoj kategoriji (broj zvijezdica) pripada hotel u kojem ste zaposleni?

a) 3*	b) 4*	c) 5*
-------	-------	-------

7) Kojoj kategoriji pripada hotel u kojem ste zaposleni po broju soba?

a) 50 ili manje	51-200	201 ili više
-----------------	--------	--------------