

University of New Orleans

ScholarWorks@UNO

University of New Orleans Theses and
Dissertations

Dissertations and Theses


Spring 5-18-2012

A Comparison of Profiles and Expenditures between Volunteer and Leisure Tourists for the New Orleans Metropolitan Statistical Area

Ksenia Kirillova

University of New Orleans, kkirillo@uno.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td>

 Part of the [Tourism and Travel Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kirillova, Ksenia, "A Comparison of Profiles and Expenditures between Volunteer and Leisure Tourists for the New Orleans Metropolitan Statistical Area" (2012). *University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations*. 1452.

<https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/1452>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by ScholarWorks@UNO with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

A Comparison of Profiles and Expenditures between Volunteer and Leisure Tourists
for the New Orleans Metropolitan Statistical Area

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Hospitality and Tourism Management

by

Ksenia Kirillova

B.S. University of New Orleans, 2010

May, 2012

© 2012, Ksenia Kirillova

Dedication

To Amir

Acknowledgment

It is a pleasure to express my gratitude to the research committee members - Dr. Bordelon, Dr. Kim Williams, and Dr. John Williams - for their innovative and sometimes provocative suggestions on how to improve this research. I would like to give my special appreciation to the chair of my committee, Dr. David Pearlman who believed in me even when I had lost faith in myself and who taught me not only research but also the “life” skills necessary to succeed. The data collection for this research would not have been possible without the help of Heather McCutcheon from Rebuilding Together New Orleans, and I would like to extend my sincere thank you to her. I also would like to thank Dr. Harsha Chacko and Marianne Hawkings for assisting me with obtaining the data sample used in this research. All my work on this thesis would have been more difficult without the support and encouragement of my husband Kenneth Oglesby who spent many nights proofreading my work.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vii
Abstract	viii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Significance of the Study	2
Definitions	4
Delimitations	5
Chapter 2. Literature Review	7
Tourism	7
Economic Impact of Tourism.....	8
Studying Direct Economic Impact.	11
Leisure Tourism	13
Phenomenon of Volunteer Tourism	13
Chapter 3. Methods.....	23
Sample.....	23
Methodology	25
Voluntourist survey section I: Trip characteristics.....	26
Voluntourist survey section II: Trip expenditures.....	27
Validity and reliability of the scale.....	28
Voluntourist survey section III: Demographic information.....	29
Data Collection.....	30
Data Analysis	31
Chapter 4. Results and Discussion.....	33
Demographic Profiles and Trip Characteristics	33
Leisure tourists.	33
Volunteer tourists.	37
Comparison of Expenditures	42
Chapter 5. Conclusion.....	46
Limitations	46
Future research	48
References.....	50

Appendices.....	58
Appendix A Volunteer Tourist Survey.....	58
Appendix B Internal Review Board Approval Letter	61
Vita.....	63

List of Tables

Table 1 Methods of Studying Direct Economic Impact	12
Table 2 Leisure Tourist Expenditures.....	17
Table 3 Volunteer Tourists Sampling Frame.....	24
Table 4 Leisure Tourists. Frequencies of Demographic Characteristics	34
Table 5 Leisure Tourists. Frequencies of Places of Origin.....	36
Table 6 Volunteer Tourists. Frequencies of Demographic Characteristics	38
Table 7 Volunteer Tourists. Frequencies of Repeat Visits	39
Table 8 Volunteer Tourists. Frequencies of Places of Origin.....	40
Table 9 Comparison of Mean Expenditures between Volunteer and Leisure Tourists	43

Abstract

This research compared the expenditure patterns, profiles, and trip characteristics of volunteer and leisure tourists in New Orleans. Survey research methods were used to obtain a sample of voluntourists that was compared to a leisure tourist sample obtained from secondary data. Visitors' expenditures across six types of spending, demographics, and travel information were collected. Data analysis included eight t-tests that revealed that voluntourists' spending was lower in five out of six categories, total daily expenditures, and total trip spending. Voluntourists spent more on local transportation but preferred cheaper accommodations and dining, seldom gambled, shopped little at the destination, and rarely visited tourist attractions. Frequency analysis used to profile tourists discovered that voluntourists traveled greater distances to the destination than leisure tourists and came from northern states. While most leisure tourists were aged between 35-64 years, married, and neither students nor retired, most voluntourists were younger, single, and still in college.

Keywords: volunteer tourism, voluntourism, leisure tourism, economic impact, direct expenditures, demographics, profiles, New Orleans

Chapter 1

Introduction

Volunteer tourism, or voluntourism, gained momentum in the 1990s as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) sought ways to supplement their long-term volunteers with short-term international assistance (Lyons, Wearing, & Benson, 2009). Over the last two decades, voluntourism has transformed from a purely humanitarian activity to a more commercialized (i.e. participants often have to pay fees to volunteer) part of the tourism industry. For example, socially and environmentally conscious gap-year students engage in a variety of unpaid work at vacation destinations. Gap year students are defined as young people who spend a year after high school volunteering at destinations around the world before entering college. Today, the most popular volunteer projects lie within the fields of community poverty relief and environmental preservation in developing countries in South America (Keese, 2011). The report by Tourism Research and Marketing (TRAM) of the Association for Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS) estimated that the volunteer tourism market had grown to a total of 1.6 million voluntourists a year (Tourism Research and Marketing, 2008).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research was three-fold: (1) to compare and contrast demographic profiles of volunteer tourists with those of leisure tourists in New Orleans, (2) to compare and contrast trip characteristics of volunteer tourists with those of leisure tourists, and (3) to compare and contrast expenditures of volunteer tourists with those of leisure tourists. While many

researchers acknowledge the possible negative economic impacts of volunteer tourism (Guttentag, 2009; McGehee & Andereck, 2008; Sherraden, Lough, & McBride, 2008; Van Engen, 2000), a study to assess expenditures has yet to be published. Moreover, the majority of research in this area approached the topic from a qualitative perspective. This quantitative research will begin to fill the gap in academic and practical knowledge. In addition, the results of this study can be used as a point of reference, or a benchmark, for future studies on spending differences between volunteer and leisure travelers.

Significance of the Study

As with other types of tourism, volunteer tourism may result in positive and negative experiences for the volunteer and the host community (Keese, 2011). According to Guttentag (2009), a lack of local involvement may result in misunderstandings between volunteer tourists and host communities. For example, Guttentag (2009) recalls a *Guardian* article describing a situation in which a group of Ecuadorian residents returned home from work and found their homes freshly painted. Volunteers did not ask for the homeowners' permission before painting the houses. Additionally, depending on the volunteers' skill levels, subpar work might be produced (Guttentag, 2009). Volunteer tourism also may contribute to the rationalization of poverty and initiate cultural changes within a host community via the demonstration effect (Guttentag, 2009). The demonstration effect may ultimately result in cultural change within a host community when local people exposed to more affluent outside visitors attempt to imitate tourists' consumption patterns and behaviors (Guttentag, 2009). An influx of volunteer tourists may result in decreased employment opportunities for local citizens and contribute to economic dependency (Guttentag, 2009; Pearce, 1980).

Voluntourism in New Orleans became mainstream after hurricane Katrina in 2005. With many residents displaced, the city desperately needed workers to rebuild houses, clean streets, and provide other essential services. In 2009, New Orleans hosted 67,500 volunteer tourists (Hospitality Research Center [HRC], 2010). By 2010, New Orleans was the largest center of voluntourism in the United States, while maintaining its status as one of the most popular leisure tourist destinations in the world (NPR, 2011).

Communities have limited resources to allocate to tourism promotion and infrastructure development (Miller, van Megen, and Buys, 2010). For this reason, countries and cities must make wise resource allocation decisions (Stynes, 1997). For instance, business tourism requires sophisticated infrastructure, such as convention centers and upscale hotels, which may bring more revenue. Conversely, some types of leisure tourism, such as ecotourism, may require minimal development and may be less profitable. During development, destination planners must understand which types of tourism generate the greatest economic benefits to a destination, so more resources can be allocated to those particular forms of tourism. Economic impact and expenditure assessment studies have estimated that economic benefits can help tourism developers make better choices (Stynes, 1997). In addition, destination planners must consider the negative side effects of various forms of tourism. For example, volunteer tourism may promote economic dependency and hinder the existing employment market (Guttentag, 2009). With these possible negative economic impacts of volunteer tourism, it is essential to understand whether development of this form of tourism helps or hinders a local economy. Therefore, communities should possess enough information to perform cost/benefit analyses to make effective resource allocation decisions (Stynes, 1997). While the current study did not directly

address economic dependency and employment issues, it provided a foundation for future studies to focus on these problems.

Understanding expenditure patterns of volunteer tourists at a destination is critical for that destination's long-term strategic planning and its ability to maximize positive economic impact. To assess the direct economic impacts of volunteer tourism, the expenditures were estimated and compared to a related form of tourism, leisure tourism. As such, the difference in the economic impact of voluntourists compared to the more studied leisure tourists will aid practitioners in resource allocation and tourism policy development. If voluntourism does not provide a sufficient return on investment, communities may choose to develop another form of tourism.

Definitions

For the purposes of the study, several definitions must be introduced. There has been a debate in the field of tourism research about what characteristics constitute a *tourist* (Masberg, 1998). A tourist is traditionally viewed from the perspectives of distance traveled to a destination, purpose of the trip, and length of stay (Masberg, 1998). For example, a *tourist* can refer to any person who travels one hundred miles or more (U.S. Travel Data Center, 1997, as cited in Masberg, 1998) or a person who stays at a destination that is outside his or her "usual environment for a period not exceeding twelve months" (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2012, p. 5). Conversely, the U.S. Travel Association considers a person a tourist if he or she travels at least fifty miles to a destination (U.S. Travel Association, 2010). Furthermore, the World Tourism Organization (WTO) advises the use of the term *visitor* to refer to travelers "taking a trip to a main destination outside his/her usual environment, for less than a year, for any main purpose (business, leisure or other personal purpose) other than to be employed by a resident entity in the

country or place visited” (WTO, 2008, p. 10). At the same time, a visitor is classified as a tourist only if the visit includes an overnight stay; otherwise, a person is considered an excursionist (WTO, 2008). The WTO does not provide recommendations on the use of the distance traveled criterion to define a tourist. As is evident from this discussion, there is no consistency in defining a tourist; thus, tourism planners and researchers must explain how they define tourists in their studies (Masberg, 1998).

As with the definition of a tourist presented above, there is no consistency in defining a voluntourist. Wearing (2001) defines voluntourists as tourists “who, for various reasons, volunteer in an organized way to undertake holidays that might involve aiding or alleviating the material poverty of some groups in society, the restoration of certain environments or research into aspects of society or environment” (p. 1). A volunteer tourist is also defined as a person who, “utilizing discretionary time and income, travels out of the sphere of regular activity to assist others in need” (McGehee & Santos, 2005, p. 760). As one can see, researchers do not apply the same criteria (purpose of the trip, distance traveled, and length of stay) to define volunteer tourists as they do to define tourists, which leads to one recommendation within the “Future research” section of this thesis.

Delimitations

Since no agreed upon definition of a tourist exists, for the purposes of this research only, a leisure tourist was defined as a person who traveled one hundred miles or more to a destination that is outside his or her usual environment for no longer than twelve consecutive months for the purposes of leisure. Using the same criteria (purpose of the trip, distance traveled, and length of stay), a volunteer tourists was defined as a person who traveled one hundred miles or more to a

destination that was outside of his or her usual environment for a period not exceeding twelve consecutive months to participate in any non-paid work project while at that destination.

Further, this research paper focused on voluntourists whose primary purpose of travel was to volunteer (pure voluntourists). Therefore, vacation-minded tourists who undertake volunteer activities while on business or leisure trips were not considered in this sample. It is possible that different types of volunteer tourists exhibit distinctly different spending patterns and thus have different economic impacts. Regardless of the fact that primary purpose was stated as voluntourism, it was possible that other activities occurred during the visit. In addition, the current study compared pure voluntourists to pure leisure tourists (with leisure as their primary purpose). Research indicates that, in New Orleans, in 2010, out of 1.85 million business visitors, 47.9% extended their vacations for 2.1 days for leisure purposes (NOMCVB, 2011). The present study did not consider these leisure visitors. Consequently, to present a clear picture, this research concentrated on pure forms of volunteer and leisure tourists and omitted the possible overlaps between the two groups. While a convenience sampling technique was applied to recruit volunteer tourists in the current study, a random sample of leisure tourists was used in the analysis. For the above reasons, generalizability of the findings is limited.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

As stated earlier, the purpose of this research was to acquire knowledge of a little known tourism phenomenon, volunteer tourism, by profiling volunteer tourists and comparing their direct economic impact with that of leisure travelers. To better understand this phenomenon and appropriate assessment methods, this literature review consists of five sections: (1) an overview of tourism characteristics, (2) a discussion of the economic impact of tourism in general, (3) a review of the common approaches to studying direct economic impacts, (4) an overview of leisure tourist profiling, and (5) a summary of the existing research in the field of volunteer tourism. The fifth section also focuses on the methodology used in existing research. Finally, at the conclusion of the literature review, the three research questions are presented.

Tourism

There are many reasons why communities worldwide choose to engage in tourism development. In a general sense, tourism provides many benefits to host communities (e.g., an increase in residents' quality of life, the attraction of potential residents, and the establishment of new businesses). However, the primary reason for tourism development is to receive economic benefits in the forms of increased employment, taxes, and income that result in direct and indirect effects on the local economy. Hence, as practice indicates, tourism has been used as an economic development tool (Gokovali, 2010).

In another sense, tourism is more than an industry; it is “more like a ‘sector’ that impacts a wide range of industries” (Davidson, 2005, p.31). Like any other complex social and economic phenomenon, this sector is comprised of various components. Tourism may take the form of business travel, leisure travel, or visiting friends and relatives, and it can be further classified as international or domestic and inbound or outbound travel (Weaver & Lawton, 2006). Moreover, leisure tourism can be categorized as urban or rural travel and nature-based (eco-tourism) or culture-based (heritage tourism) travel. In addition, there exist historical, ethnic, agricultural, industrial, educational, and other forms of leisure tourism (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2012). Leisure travel can also be viewed from the perspectives of traditional mass tourism or alternative tourism (Keese, 2011). The goal of traditional mass tourism is to maximize the comfort of tourists, while alternative tourism emphasizes ecological sustainability, cultural preservation, and positive returns for host communities (Keese, 2011). For these reasons, volunteer tourism is regarded by many as a form of alternative travel (Coghlan & Gooch, 2011; Guttentag, 2011; Keese, 2011), and, as with other type of tourism, it affects the economy of a host community.

Economic Impact of Tourism

Although tourism is generally associated with economic growth and prosperity, it can positively and negatively impact the host economy. According to 2010 data, travel and tourism services were forecasted to contribute \$5.992 trillion to the world’s GDP, which would constitute 9.1% of the total GDP (WTTC, 2011). Because tourists are major consumers of services at a destination, tourism significantly contributes to local, regional, and national economies. Tourism also generates additional output and increases employment, both of which contribute to overall economic growth. According to some researchers, as employment rates increase, tourism

facilitates an equal distribution within the host community (Marcouiller, Kim, & Deller, 2004). Overall tourists' expenditures have a positive effect on balance of payments, which is especially crucial for developing destinations because this impact triggers economic growth. Tourism development and overall economic growth also encourage outside investments, which can lead to technological and educational advancement (Gokovali, 2010).

Aside from the direct economic effect, the indirect impact of various multipliers increases the magnitude of visitor spending. In this case, a multiplier refers to a link between tourism and other sectors of the economy as the tourist's dollar "works its way through the trading relationships (or linkages) established between various sectors" (Saayman & Saayman, 2006, p. 72). As tourists' money travels throughout the host economy, it generates additional output, which benefits industries that are not directly related to tourism. For instance, tourists who in restaurants cause restaurant owners pay farmers, fishermen, and construction workers for goods and services. As tourists' demands and expenditures increase, restaurants will require more goods and services; therefore, this high demand stimulates long-term income for these industries (Paajanen, 2006).

Conversely, tourism can result in negative impacts in a host economy. Because visitors spend more money on vacation than they would at home, their elevated expenditures could cause high inflation rates (Bahar & Kozak, 2008). Additionally, with tourism development, land becomes a highly desirable commodity (Weaver & Lawton, 2006). Therefore, land prices increase and residents may be forced to leave an area and move to less tourism-developed localities. Furthermore, because inbound tourism is considered an import of a host community, there is the danger of developing economic dependency on this outside source. If a destination does not contain a qualified work force, outsiders must be brought in to work in supervisory

positions, which offer little benefit to the local economy (Pearce, 1980). Even though such an approach should not be used where the workforce can be trained, it is unfortunately a common way to develop tourism at a destination (Gokovali, 2010). As a community's industries become less diverse and more dependent on tourism, the economy as a whole may be affected negatively by seasonality and the overall states of national and world economies. Finally, the additional profit that is generated from tourism may leak out of a destination and hinder the positive effects of multipliers (Bahar & Kozak, 2008).

The overall economic impact occurs on three levels: direct, indirect, and induced economic effects. The direct economic impact arises from money that tourists spend and is directly received by hospitality and tourism enterprises at a destination (Paajanen, 1998). Visitors use their money to buy accommodations, food, beverages, souvenirs, entertainment, transportation, and other products and services. Local businesses turn this money into revenue and transfer it to employees via wages. In other words, expenditures on different types of tourist products and services that are provided by local businesses are equal to income that is received by businesses who serve tourists plus employees' wages plus taxes paid on tourism related wages (Paajanen, 1998).

In addition to the direct effect, the indirect effect refers to those transactions that occur because of tourism-stimulated activity between tourism-related businesses and local suppliers. Even though tourists are not present at this level, the activity is tourism-generated. Suppliers pay their employees, who in turn buy goods at local markets and stores. Therefore, the money brought in by a visitor is re-spent within the local economy, which increases the magnitude of the initial (direct) economic impact. Purchases by tourism-related businesses from their local suppliers are equal to income that is received by local suppliers plus employees' wages that are

indirectly attributed to tourism plus taxes paid on those wages (Paajanen, 1998).

Finally, the third type of effect, the induced effect, refers to the overall economic growth that is attributed to tourism. Specifically, it is “the contribution of the direct and indirect effects to the income levels of the residents” (Paajanen, 1998, p. 126). In addition to improving the purchasing power of residents, the marginal income earned from tourism increases tax revenue, which can be spent on building better infrastructure such as schools, roads, and airports. In turn, new infrastructure attracts more enterprises and investors and further stimulates the local economy. Hence, induced economic impact is the amount of tourist spending that benefits local enterprises (Paajanen, 1998).

In conclusion, it is important to note that, as with any other type of tourism, voluntourism influences the local economy in positive and negative ways (Guttentag, 2009, 2011). For example, voluntourism is capable of generating additional income for residents, local tax revenues, and jobs (Sherraden et al., 2008). However, volunteer tourism may contribute to the development of economic dependency, high inflation, and increases in land prices (Guttentag, 2009, 2011). Therefore, development of volunteer tourism should be carefully managed to maximize positive and minimize negative effects to the local economy (Guttentag, 2011).

Studying Direct Economic Impact.

There is a variety of methods used to study the economic impact of tourism. Bahar and Kozak (2008) identified nine methods to investigate the direct economic effect of tourism based on tourist spending data. Table 1 presents the descriptions of these methods. As this table indicates, all of the listed techniques have limitations; nevertheless, the regional research method is the most widely used method to date (Bahar & Kozak, 2008).

Table 1

Methods of Studying Direct Economic Impact

Method	Description
Observing Tourist Spending	This category of spending involves collecting data on two levels, tourists as consumers and businesses as vendors. The tourists' expenditures are observed at the destination and the data on tourists expenditures are collected from tax offices and national or regional Departments of Commerce. After sales figures from businesses are obtained, the total income acquired from tourists' spending is computed. While this method is simple in its logic, it is tedious and data-demanding in its execution.
Regional Research Method	This method uses a survey to estimate tourists' spending patterns. For instance, the questionnaire asks how much a tourist spends on accommodations, food and beverages, retail shopping, etc., at a destination. Then, the average expenditure is calculated and multiplied by the total number of visitors during any given period. The resulting figure represents the total tourist expenditures in an area. Like any survey method, this technique is generalized by estimation and, therefore, requires a large and representative sample size; otherwise, the estimates obtained using this method will not be accurate.
Method of Consumer Research	This method predicts tourist spending by conducting research on tourism within communities. First, total consumer spending is calculated, and then tourists' expenditures are subtracted from the total figure.
Method of Bank Accounts	This method involves the calculation of the foreign exchange when foreign tourists exchange currency at specialized offices and banks. It is assumed that all exchanged money is spent within a destination; therefore, total tourists' expenditures can be easily computed. While this method seems to be the least time-consuming and data-demanding, it can only be properly executed in countries and regions where foreign currency exchange is strictly controlled.
Excess Income Method	This method estimates tourists' spending by calculating residents' expenditures first. Following this calculation, residents' spending is subtracted from the total retail sales in the area. Data on total retail sales are obtained through secondary data (e.g., tax income, companies' reports). The resulting figure represents visitors' spending within that area. Because calculating residents' spending is not less difficult than computing visitors' expenditures, this method is not widely used.
Seasonal Difference Method	This method refers to the month when businesses report the lowest sales, which is considered a low season month. The sales of the following month in the year are subtracted from the sales for the previous, lowest season month. The result is the tourists' expenditures for that month. The same procedure is applied to all consecutive months to create an annual figure. This method assumes that there are absolutely no visitors during the slow month, which is rarely the case. Therefore, the method of seasonal difference usually yields unreliable results.
Satellite Account Method	This method analyzes both the supply and demand sides of tourism. Additionally, this method attempts to standardize industry data collection to allow researchers to use data to produce quality economic impact assessments. The World Tourism Organization, World Travel and Tourism Council, and many countries use this approach. However, because many organizations and countries have yet to embrace this new methodology, this potentially uniform method is not widely used.
Spending Rate Method	This method uses primary and secondary data in its calculations. First, lodging businesses' income is assessed via secondary data. Then, tourists' expenditures are determined via a survey. Next, the hotels' income is rated to the tourists' spending, and the obtained rate is multiplied by the accommodation expenses. As one can see, this process is data-demanding and time-consuming.
Cost Factor Method	This method is based on obtaining the number of overnight stays at a destination and calculating average daily food costs. The amount of spending is calculated by multiplying the overnight stays and the cost of food. This method poses questions about the reliability of food cost, which can vary greatly between different types of food service firms. Because the method heavily relies on this figure, the results may not reflect the facts.

Source: (Bahar & Kozak, 2008)

Leisure Tourism

The U.S. Travel Association estimates that 1.99 billion person-trips were taken in 2011, and leisure travel accounted for 77% of them (Leisure Market Research Handbook, 2012). The leisure market is composed of travelers who visit a destination for non-business purposes: they can be on vacation, visiting friends and families, or just on a weekend getaway (Shoemaker, Lewis, and Yesawich, 2007). Among the recent trends in leisure tourism are increasing demand for culinary and wine destinations and adventure travel (Leisure Market Research Handbook, 2012).

Tourism researchers have conducted studies to determine what potential market segments might be identified and then targeted with a customized marketing campaign (Handler, 2009). Thus, profiling leisure tourists is usually performed during a destination's market analysis and segmentation stage (Huang & Xiao, 2000). There are numerous approaches to segmenting the leisure travel market – by motivation (Hsieh & Chang, 2004), by lifestyle (Scott & Parfitt, 2004), by benefit sought (Jang, Morrison, & O'Leary, 2001; Kim, Park, Gazzoli, & Sheng, 2011; Lee, Morrison, & O'Leary, 2005), and by other variables. However, segmenting leisure tourists by socio-demographic (i.e. age, gender, education, occupation) and geographic (place of origin) factors remain the most common (Handler, 2009; Kotler, Bowen, and Makens, 2006; Middleton & Clark, 2007).

Many tourist destinations in the world conduct studies to profile their tourists by demographic characteristics in order to customize their marketing efforts to a particular target segment; therefore, most leisure tourist profile studies are destination specific (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2012). For example, Handler (2009) explored profiles of Taiwanese leisure travelers to Japan. The researcher found that the majority of these tourists were in their 20s, males, and had

university degrees (Handler, 2009). Huang and Xiao (2000) examined demographic and geographic characteristics of leisure tourists to the Changchun province of China and found that more men than women traveled to Changchun and that most leisure tourists had university degrees. The research also found that most travelers were factory workers, technical personnel, or students. Additionally, the study revealed that “the longer the distance between the tourists’ origins and destinations, the lower the tourist arrivals” (Huang & Xiao, 2000, p. 211).

In the U.S. and many other countries, leisure tourist profile studies are conducted at both national and local levels (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2012). In the U.S., such research is conducted at the national level by the Office of Travel and Tourism Industries at the U.S. Department of Commerce (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2012). For example, the 2010 study of international leisure tourists in the U.S. found that men were slightly more likely to travel to the U.S. than women, the average tourist age was 38 for female and 42 for male tourists, and their median household income was US\$77,200 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2010). International leisure tourists’ top activities at a destination included shopping (91%), dining (85%), and sightseeing (53%). This study also found that a typical international leisure tourist traveled with an average party-size of 1.9 and stayed 14.8 nights at a destination (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2010).

The domestic travel market is generally studied by universities, travel associations, and private tourism research firms (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2012). A study of the U.S. travel market in 2009 by D.K. Schifflet and Associates (2010) revealed that Generation X (aged between 35 and 54 years today) represented the largest segment of the leisure tourist market (38%), followed by tourists between the ages 18 and 34 (34%), and those 55 and older (29%). Overall, the average domestic tourist in the U.S. is 45 years old (D.K. Schifflet and Associates, 2010). According to the same study, most leisure tourists (32%) had households with incomes below \$55,000 or

above \$100,000 (31%), while 20% of leisure tourists came from households with incomes ranging from \$50,000 to \$74,999. Fifty-seven percent of leisure tourists' households had no children under eighteen. A typical leisure tourist in the U.S. traveled with an average party-size of 2.34, stayed 1.57 nights at a destination, and did not bring children under eighteen on the trip (74%) (D.K. Schifflet and Associates, 2010). Leisure tourists preferred to spend their money at dining establishments, retail stores, and entertainment facilities (D.K. Schifflet and Associates, 2010). In addition, the study found that an average distance traveled to a destination was 502 miles, which is greater than a typical driving distance (D.K. Schifflet and Associates, 2010).

At the local level, similar research is ordered by local tourism governing bodies such as convention and visitors' bureaus and other entities (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2012). For example, the New Orleans Metropolitan Convention and Visitors Bureau (NOMCVB) compiles annual visitor profile reports prepared by the Hospitality Research Center (HRC) at the University of New Orleans (UNO). Scholars at various universities also research demographic and geographical characteristics of leisure tourists at destinations. Hsu, Kang, and Wolfe (2002), examined demographic profiles of leisure tourists in Kansas and found that over half of these tourists were married (59.8%) and had no children under eighteen living at home (62.6%). Moreover, 21.4% of leisure travelers were aged between 25 and 34 years, and 22.4% were between 45 and 54 years old. The researchers also discovered that most leisure tourists had at least some college education (56.3%) and many had advanced degrees (16.4%) (Hsu, Kang, & Wolfe, 2002).

While at a destination, leisure tourists spend money on local transportation, lodging accommodations, dining, sightseeing, shopping, and many other activities to fully experience a destination. These direct expenditures stimulate a local economy and provide further economic benefits to a host community as described in the previous sections (Bahar & Kozak, 2008).

According to the U.S. Travel Association (2010), in 2010, domestic tourists spent \$655.2 billion while traveling. Particularly, 14% of the total expenditures were spent on auto transportation, 12.3% - on public transportation, 6.5% - on lodging, 4.3% - at food service operations, 3.3% - in general retail, and .02% - on entertainment. In Louisiana, leisure travelers spent \$9,024.3 million while traveling, of which 25% was spent in food and beverage facilities, 22% - on transportation, 20% - on gambling, 17% - on lodging, 8% - on general retail, and 5% - on entertainment and recreation (TNS, 2010). More related to the current study, Table 2 depicts expenditures of domestic leisure tourists nationwide and in Louisiana across several categories. Consumer price indices of 1.03 and 1.05 published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics were applied to convert 2010 and 2009 nominal dollars respectively into 2011 real dollars (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012).

Table 2

Leisure Tourist Expenditures

Expenditure Category	U.S.		Louisiana	
	2010 (per-person per-day nominal dollars)	2011 (per-person per-day real dollars)	2009 (per-person per-day nominal dollars)	2011 (per-person per-day real dollars)
Transportation	\$50.17	\$51.68	\$36.30	\$38.11
Lodging	\$44.75	\$46.10	\$28.05	\$29.45
Food/Beverages	\$32.25	\$33.21	\$41.25	\$43.31
Gambling	\$9.00	\$9.27	\$33.00	\$34.65
Retail Shopping	\$22.32	\$22.99	\$13.20	\$13.86
Entertainment	\$13.97	\$14.39	\$8.25	\$8.66
Other	\$6.14	\$6.32	\$4.95	\$5.20
Total per-person per-day	\$178.60	\$183.96	\$165.00	\$173.25
Total trip	\$500.10	\$515.10	\$512.00	\$537.60

Source: TNS (2010, 2011)

These figures confirm that leisure travel in the U. S. has a tremendous impact not only on the national economy but also on the local economies throughout the country (Leisure Market Research Handbook, 2012).

As research to date indicates, leisure travel constitutes the majority of tourism in the U.S. and, according to the U.S. Travel Association, accounts for 67% of total tourist spending (Leisure Market Research Handbook, 2012). Yesawich (2010) predicts that, led by more affluent households, demand for leisure travel will grow moderately in the years ahead. Since leisure tourism will continue to significantly contribute to national and local economies, it should be thoroughly studied and carefully managed.

Phenomenon of Volunteer Tourism

While the phenomenon of volunteering has interested researchers prior to the emergence of voluntourism, academics did not start researching this topic until the early 2000s (Benson, 2011). Consequently, voluntourism is still an under-researched area in tourism studies (Smith &

Holmes, 2009). In the beginning, research mainly considered volunteer tourism as an alternative to mass tourism with many negative effects on local communities. Moreover, some researchers grouped voluntourism together with such forms of tourism as ecotourism, rural tourism, and backpacking because most volunteer projects took place in the rural areas of developing countries (Honey, 1999). For instance, Ooi and Laing (2010) investigated the overlap between backpacker tourists' and volunteer tourists' motivations and found that both segments shared similar motivations. On the other hand, some researchers have argued that volunteer tourism is an emerging form of neo-colonialism, in which wealthier parts of the world try to dominate poorer regions (Butcher & Smith, 2010; Sherraden et al., 2008).

Even after volunteer tourism became more commercialized, most academics still had an optimistic, and somewhat uncritical, approach to the phenomenon (Wearing, 2001; Uriely, Reichel, & Ron, 2003). However, at this point, even the value of short-term volunteer Christian missions had already been questioned. For example, Van Engen (2000) posed the following questions:

Are we going through the motions of helping the poor so we can congratulate ourselves?
Or are we seeking to understand the lives of third world people – to recognize and support their strength and to try to appreciate the problem they face and our role in them? (p. 22).

Studies conducted during the early 2000s aimed to assess voluntourists' motivations to participate in unpaid projects and determine the benefits they receive during the process (Gray & Campbell, 2007; Simpson, 2004). While it is important to understand volunteers' motivations in tourism, host communities represent the people who are supposed to receive the most benefit from volunteer work. Research to assess the impact of volunteer tourism in these communities

consists primarily of qualitative studies (McGehee & Andereck, 2008; McIntosh & Zahra, 2007; Sin, 2009). For example, McGeehe and Andereck (2008) conducted a qualitative study of local people's attitudes toward volunteer tourists in Tijuana, Mexico, and McDowell County, West Virginia, USA. The researchers coined the term "pettin' the critters" to describe volunteer tourists' attitudes toward the host communities (McGeehe & Andereck, 2008, p. 12). In another instance, McIntosh and Zahra (2007) interviewed members of an indigenous Maori community and found that the community perceived their relationship with volunteer tourists to be a mutually beneficial one. Although scholars turned their interests to host communities, research on volunteer tourists and their motivations is still more prevalent in current academic literature (Benson & Seibert, 2009; Brown & Lehto, 2005; Brumbaugh, 2010; Campbell, 2009; Coghlan & Pearce, 2010; Jarvis & Blank, 2011; Lee & Woosnam, 2010; Leonard & Onyx, 2009; Lo & Lee, 2011; Sin, 2009). A study by Tourism and Marketing Research (TRAM) (2008) of the Association for Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS) found that women were more likely to participate in voluntourism than men and that 70% of the voluntouists were students between ages 20 and 25 years old.

Academics use different theories to research volunteer projects' participants. For example, Blackman and Benson (2010) investigated the role of psychological contracts (mutual beliefs and informal obligations) in terms of the relationship between volunteers and placement organizations and concluded that a focus upon this relationship was important in volunteer tourism marketing. Tomazos and Butler (2010) advanced research on volunteer tourism participants by comparing voluntourists to the heroes of medieval and classical myths. Coghlan and Gooch (2011) explored the practices of volunteer tourism in the context of the educational theory of transformative learning. This theory involves a ten-step process that leads to a radical

change in consciousness that “dramatically and irreversibly alters how participants see their place in the world” (Coghlan & Gooch, 2011, p.713). The researchers found that not all of the ten steps were applied in designing a volunteer tourism experience, and therefore volunteer tourism experience is not always life changing for the participants (Coghlan & Gooch, 2011).

In spite of an extensive body of knowledge on volunteer tourists’ primary motivations, there has been a disagreement on the true motivation to volunteer during travel. While earlier studies have suggested that the motivation to volunteer is purely altruistic (Blackman & Benson, 2010; Singh & Singh, 2004; Wearing, 2001), researchers have acknowledged that the actual motivation is a combination of altruistic and egoistic values (Mowforth & Munt, 2008; Mustonen, 2007). Coghlan and Fennell (2009) analyzed forty-three academic papers on the subject and concluded that “while volunteer tourists may behave in an altruistic manner, personal benefits derived from the experience by and large dominate the experience” (p. 377). Scholars have also turned their interest to the organizations that place volunteer tourists (Benson & Henderson, 2011; Coghlan 2007; Raymond, 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Tomazos & Butler, 2009) and the roles of the organizations’ facilitating staffs (Coghlan, 2008). For instance, Raymond and Hall (2008) suggested that the “development of cross-cultural understanding should be perceived as a goal of volunteer tourism rather than a natural result of sending volunteers overseas” (p. 530); thus, a placement organization should play a crucial role in facilitating this understanding.

While Sherraden et al. (2008) and Guttentag (2009) were not the first to address the possible negative consequences of volunteer tourism, they were pioneers in pointing out possible negative economic impacts. The authors acknowledged the possibility of long-term local worker displacement and economic dependency on volunteer workers. Of note, both studies provided

only an overview and theoretical foundation of the issues but lacked data collection and analysis.

Today, academia is not the only sector concerned with the negative impacts of volunteer tourism. Other concerned stakeholders include volunteer tourists, NGOs, and affected communities, who are becoming more skeptical about the outcomes of voluntourism. Some stakeholders have begun to realize that short-term volunteering does not benefit the host community to the extent that was previously thought (Love, 2011; Stephenhagen, 2011; Stupart, 2011; Wearing, 2011). Moreover, social policy administrators and educators have begun to consider the possible monetary costs and benefits of volunteer tourism to a destination. For example, the Institute for Social Change, an educational resource for sharing the best practices to eliminate social problems, conducted a webinar on possible negative effects of volunteer tourism on a host community (Bovee, 2011). Additionally, in his blog, Stupart (2011) cautioned potential voluntourists about the negative impacts they may have on host communities and explained why they should not participate in volunteer tourism. As one can see, the possible negative social and economic impacts of voluntourism are considered; however, scholarly research to address these issues has yet to be conducted.

With some exceptions (Bailey & Russel, 2010; Ooi & Laing, 2010), when it comes to empirical research, volunteer tourism investigators favor a qualitative approach. Specifically, researchers conduct field observations, interviews, and focus groups (Broad, 2003; Gray & Campbell, 2007; Holmes, Smith, Lockstone-Binney, & Baum, 2010; Lepp, 2009; McGehee & Andereck, 2009; Palacios, 2010; Sin, 2009; Sin, 2010). One reason for the scarcity of quantitative research is the difficulty in tracking data (Smith & Holmes, 2009). Nations and smaller destinations track tourist arrivals and expenditures; however, they rarely distinguish

between the purpose of the visit beyond business and leisure. Moreover, many developed countries collect and analyze data on volunteerism. For instance, in the U.S., the Corporation of National and Community Service, in partnership with the U.S. Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, collects data as part of the Current Population Survey; volunteer rates are reported at the national, regional, and state levels (VolunteeringInAmerica, 2011). Despite the efforts to track and assess the value of volunteering, in general, governments do not apply the same strategies to analyze voluntourism (Lockstone-Binney, Holmes, Smith, and Baum, 2010).

While research to date has discussed the economic perspective of volunteer tourism, no empirical attempt to assess the economic impact on a host community has been made. Consequently, this study makes the first attempt to quantify the contribution of voluntourism to a host economy and compare it with that of leisure tourism. Based on the literature review and the concepts outlined above, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

- Q1.** How are demographics of volunteer tourists similar or different from those of leisure tourists in New Orleans?
- Q2.** How are trip characteristics of volunteer tourists similar or different from those of leisure tourists in New Orleans?
- Q3.** How are expenditures of volunteer tourists similar or different from those of leisure tourists in New Orleans?

Chapter 3

Methods

This chapter includes a discussion of the sample, study methodology, data collection, and data analysis. The first section contains the description of the sample for the study, and the second section, methodology, provides the description of the designed survey. In the third section, data collection procedures are outlined. Finally, in the last section, the procedures for data analysis are presented.

Sample

The sample consisted of both primary and secondary data. For this quantitative study, two independent samples were obtained: leisure tourists and volunteer tourists in the New Orleans area. The New Orleans Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) is defined as the geographical locale that includes Orleans, Jefferson, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. John, and St. Tammany Parishes. (A parish in Louisiana is the equivalent to a county in other states.) It should also be restated that leisure tourists are travelers who visit the area for purposes other than business, meetings, conventions, or engaging in unpaid volunteer programs. Volunteer tourists refer to those visitors who travel to New Orleans with a stated primary purpose of volunteering.

The primary data were utilized for the volunteer tourist sample, while secondary data were used for the leisure tourist sample. A random subsample of 127 leisure tourists was drawn from a database of completed surveys (6,170 observations), which were collected randomly by

the Hospitality Research Center at the University of New Orleans in the second half of 2010. A frequency analysis was run, and z-scores were calculated to identify potential outliers. After incomplete observations and outliers were deleted, the subsample contained 100 observations.

The volunteer tourist sample was obtained with the help of non-governmental organizations that place volunteer tourists in the New Orleans MSA. The VolunteerNewOrleans.com website contains a list of various organizations grouped by the nature of volunteer activity (e.g., construction, animals, community, arts and culture, sports and recreation, and other) (Volunteer New Orleans, 2011). Table 3 depicts the organizations that were contacted and the volunteer types. The locations of the majority of sites varied depending on the program and the day. While some organizations had a wide variety of volunteering sites, voluntourists in the New Orleans area generally work at residential construction sites, and, for this reason, all of the volunteer tourists in this sample were recruited from such sites. The criteria for inclusion were non-residence in the New Orleans MSA, being aged eighteen or above, and volunteering as the primary purpose of the visit. Participants intercepted for the survey were not randomly selected, and therefore the volunteer tourists sample was a convenience sample.

Table 3

Volunteer Tourists Sampling Frame

Organization name	Types of sites and activities
Catholic Charities of New Orleans	Construction sites, domestic violence, child and family services, food and nutrition, healthcare, and Hispanic community services
Beacon of Hope Resource Center	Construction sites (light rebuilding), tree planting, and neighborhood cleaning sites
Project Homecoming	Construction sites
Rebuilding Together New Orleans (AmeriCorps)	Construction sites

One hundred and twelve questionnaires were collected from volunteer tourists. A frequency analysis and calculated z -score did not identify any outliers. Nevertheless, only 100 questionnaires were used in the analysis because several respondents indicated leisure as their primary reason to visit New Orleans or gave a New Orleans MSA zip code. The researcher recorded the responses as questionnaires were collected. For example, if ten completed surveys were collected on a particular day, they were immediately reviewed for inclusion criteria and, if the criteria were met, entered into a data file. This technique allowed the researcher to be aware of how many more completed surveys were needed to yield two balanced samples. Given the nature of this research, time constraints, and financial resources, the final sample consisted of 100 voluntourists and 100 leisure tourists. Such a sample size is sufficient for conducting statistical inferences at .05 level of significance in exploratory research (Borg & Gall, 1989; Bickman & Rog, 2008).

Methodology

This exploratory study adopted a quantitative approach using the regional research method outlined in Table 1. The regional research method requires utilization of a survey to estimate volunteer tourists' spending patterns. This researcher used a questionnaire based on Walpole and Goodwin (2000), Cela, Lankford, and Knowles-Lankford (2009), and the University of New Orleans HRC studies (2005) to assess the demographic characteristics and spending patterns of volunteer tourists. The volunteer tourist questionnaire consisted of three sections: trip characteristics, trip expenditures, and demographics. Approval for the present study was obtained from the University of New Orleans Institutional Review Board (IRB) (see Appendix B).

Volunteer survey section I: Trip characteristics.

The trip characteristics section consisted of one open-ended and four close-ended questions (see Appendix A) and was designed to collect basic information about the respondents (e.g., home location, primary purpose of the visit, and how many people were in the immediate group). Specifically, the first question asked for the zip code of a respondent's primary home address to distinguish between residents and non-residents. While an effort to give surveys only to visitors was made, this question was designed to establish a clear criterion as to who was considered a tourist. For example, visitors who indicated that they lived in areas with zip codes starting with 700, 701, or 704 were excluded. In addition, this question was used to evaluate the distance visitors traveled. The second question sought to eliminate respondents whose primary purpose was other than voluntourism or leisure. It is important to recognize that vacation-minded volunteers might perceive themselves as voluntourists even though their primary purpose was leisure or business. Therefore, the identified primary purpose of the visit was crucial in classifying respondents and comparing their trip expenditures. The next question delineated first time versus repeat visitors and was used to determine which group (volunteer or leisure) had the greatest number of repeat visitors, which is a part of profiling tourists. The fourth question asked for the total number of days respondents planned to stay in New Orleans. Again, this question aided the researcher in profiling both types of visitors. The fifth question requested information about the size of the immediate group, including children under eighteen years old. Again, this question was used to help profile tourists. Finally, a sub-question, to estimate the number of children in a group, was asked to determine which type of visitors was more likely to bring children on a trip.

Volunteer survey section II: Trip expenditures.

The trip expenditures part of the questionnaire was designed to assess visitors' spending patterns. The major categories of expenditures were identified using Walpole and Goodwin (2000), Crompton, Lee, and Shuster (2001), and HRC (2005). These researchers acknowledged expenditures on accommodations, food and beverages, retail shopping, and souvenirs. While Walpole and Goodwin (2000) separated spending on transportation into tours, charter buses, boats, and ferries, Crompton et al. (2001) combined these types of expenditures into two groups, private automobile expenses and rental car expenses. Based on these studies, the current questionnaire contained six categories of tourist spending, which were grouped within an open-ended question six (see Appendix A). The first category, Local Transportation, included gasoline expenditures while at the destination, bus tickets, streetcar tickets, etc. The second category, Lodging, requested information about spending at hotels, motels, condos, and hostels. The third category, Food/Beverages, covered tourist expenditures in restaurants, bars, cafeterias, etc. The fourth category addressed gambling activity. The fifth category, Retail Shopping, estimated visitor spending on souvenirs, groceries, and clothing. The sixth category, Tours/Admission Fees, assessed spending on tours, museums, concert tickets, cover charges at night clubs, and late night shows. The seventh category, Any Other Expenses, was intended to cover other expenditures that were not identified in the previous categories. During the survey process, only one respondent used this category to indicate the tip amount left at food and beverage establishments. Since tips were considered a part of Food/Beverages expenses, the amount was added to that category and Any Other Expenses category was excluded from further analysis. While respondents were asked to report how much they spent in all six categories of expenditures, it should be noted that the amounts may not be exact. In economic impact studies,

people often base their responses on memory recollection or estimation of what they believe their expenditure will be while still on the trip; consequently, “the economic impact studies can only be ‘guestimates’” (Crompton et al., 2001, p. 84).

Validity and reliability of the scale.

Reliability and content validity of the survey instrument were evaluated. Reliability, or internal consistency, measures the tendency toward consistency in repeated measurements while “content validity depends on the extent to which an empirical measurement reflects a specific domain of content” (Carmines & Zeller, 1979, p. 20). The internal consistency of the current instrument was assessed by conducting a pilot survey and calculating the Cronbach’s alpha. Generally, a value above .6 is considered acceptable for a research instrument to be reliable (Mueller, 2004).

Pilot studies are generally utilized to test research methodology and explore the potential research implications (Bickman & Rog, 2008). The pilot study for this research was undertaken before the data collection process to ensure reliability and content validity of the designed questionnaire. The researcher facilitated a focus group with eight consenting participants from the service industry who identified themselves as being well-traveled. The focus group consisted of five males and three females aged between 25 and 55 years. Seven participants were single, and one respondent was married. None of the eight participants of the focus group had children under eighteen living at home.

The responses were recorded, and a Cronbach’s alpha of .69 was calculated. During the focus group, participants indicated that some categories of expenditures were not clearly explained and caused confusion. The participants were not clear on whether a streetcar was considered a tour or a means of local transportation. Further, it was not understood whether

expenses at concession stands were a part of tours and admission or food and beverage expenditures. Suggestions from a focus group on the questions' explanations were taken into consideration and incorporated into a refined questionnaire. The reliability of the scale was then retested on thirty participants yielding a greater alpha of .71. The Cronbach's alpha based on the complete sample was .72, which assures the reliability of a given instrument.

Because an acceptable reliability (Cronbach's alpha $>.6$) does not necessarily imply that the instrument is valid, content validity of the questionnaire must be assessed (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). First, a focus group was conducted to assess the clarity of the survey. Based on the participants' input, several changes were made in the scale. For example, it was not clear to participants what constituted local transportation and food and beverage expenditures; therefore, more examples were provided in the questionnaire. After the adjustments were made, the revised survey was presented to focus group participants who indicated that no further changes were needed. Then, an academic panel applied its expertise to assess the questionnaire's content validity, and an industry professional panel was utilized to evaluate the survey's face validity. The academic panel determined that the survey questions indeed reflected the specific content domains, while the industry panel found the survey's content and layout clear and easy to interpret.

Volunteer survey section III: Demographic information.

The demographic section of the questionnaire included five closed-ended and two open-ended questions on age, sex, marital status, number of underage children, household income, level of education, and occupation, which aided in creating profiles of volunteer and leisure tourists (see Appendix A). Additionally, this information was used to reveal possible spending patterns associated with certain demographic characteristics.

Data Collection

The leisure tourist sample was obtained from the secondary data collected in the second half of 2010 by the Hospitality Research Center as a part of the New Orleans Area Visitor Profile Study (HRC, 2011). The surveys were e-mailed to the people who made information requests with the New Orleans Metropolitan Convention and Visitors Bureau (NOMCVB) and New Orleans Tourism and Marketing Corporation (NOTMC). These included inquiries via the websites, e-mail, phone, and regular mail. In addition, the data included intercept survey data collected during 2010 festivals and other events. After all the data were aggregated, 7,940 questionnaires were recorded (HRC, 2011). These responses were sorted by the purpose of the visit, and 127 leisure tourists' responses were randomly selected for inclusion within the current research and further manipulations as described in the following sections. It should be noted that this secondary data sample did not contain information about respondents' sex, education background, and occupation beyond student and retired.

Data collection for the volunteer tourist sample was conducted during the period of September 2011 through January 2012 on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. The researcher contacted volunteer coordinators at voluntourist placement organizations in the New Orleans area and received permission from their supervisors to conduct the survey. The researcher went to construction sites and asked consenting voluntourists to complete the questionnaires. The questionnaires were administered during lunch breaks (from noon to 1 p.m.) so that the work process at the site was not interrupted. Although the survey was self-administered, a brief introduction and instructions were provided at the beginning of the survey. Respondents were invited to keep a complimentary University of New Orleans logo pen as a gift for their time.

Data Analysis

The raw data of volunteer and leisure tourists were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 19.0 (*SPSS 2010*). Because spending data of leisure tourists were collected one year prior to collecting the data on voluntourists, the leisure tourist expenditure data were adjusted for inflation. A consumer price index of 1.03 published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in January 2012 on its website www.bls.gov was used to convert 2010 nominal dollars into 2011 real dollars (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). Then, per-person per-day expenditures were calculated and forwarded for further analysis.

Voluntourist survey responses were coded, per-person per-day expenditures were calculated, and the results were entered into a raw data file. After the data were cleaned, frequencies were run to identify possible outliers and assess the normality of the data. It became apparent that the order of columns in the leisure tourist subsample had to be rearranged to match the volunteer tourist sample. Further, the data appeared to be moderately positively skewed (skewness=.704). While normality is required to perform *t*-tests, moderate departure from this assumption does not cause misleading results in large ($n>30$) balanced samples (Montgomery, 2009). Further, Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was not significant for the Local Transportation category ($p=.2$). Levene's test was significant for Lodging ($p=.000$), Food/Beverages ($p=.000$), Gambling ($p=.000$), Retail Shopping ($p=.000$), and Tours/Admission Fees ($p=.000$). In addition, per-person per-day total expenditures ($p=.000$), and overall spending ($p=.006$) were significant at the alpha level of .05. For this reason, a traditional *t*-test was appropriate for Transportation only, while *t*-tests with the Welch-Satterthwaite adjustment for unequal variances were run for all other categories. The following shows the data analysis methods used to answer the two research questions.

Research Question 1. How are demographics of volunteer tourists similar or different from those of leisure tourists in New Orleans?

Frequency analysis was used to yield demographic profiles of volunteer and leisure travelers associated with both types of tourists.

Research Question 2. How are trip characteristics of volunteer tourists similar or different from those of leisure tourists?

Frequency analysis and descriptive statistics were used to reveal trip characteristics of both types of tourists. Two *t*-tests were utilized to determine which group stayed in New Orleans longer and traveled in larger groups. An alpha level of .05 was applied to minimize a Type I error (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Research Question 3. How are expenditures of volunteer tourists similar or different from those of leisure tourists in New Orleans?

T-tests were performed across all six categories (Local Transportation, Lodging, Food/Beverages, Gambling, Retail Shopping, and Tours/Admission Fees) to determine whether there were significant differences in per-person per-day expenditures between volunteer and leisure tourists in each category. Two additional *t*-tests were also run to see if there was a significant difference in total daily expenditures and overall trip spending between volunteer and leisure tourists. Each *t*-test had two independent samples comprised of volunteer and leisure tourists. The alpha level of .05 was used to minimize a Type I error (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Chapter 4

Results and Discussion

The purpose of this research was (1) to compare and contrast demographic profiles of volunteer tourists with those of leisure tourists in New Orleans, (2) to compare and contrast trip characteristics of volunteer tourists with those of leisure tourists, and (3) to compare and contrast expenditures of volunteer tourists with those of leisure tourists. The survey in this study enabled the collection of data that permitted the researcher to examine demographic profiles and trip characteristics of volunteer and leisure tourists. In addition, the data allowed the researcher to perform *t*-tests to determine whether expenditure patterns of these market segments of tourists were significantly different across the six categories – Local Transportation, Lodging, Food/Beverages, Gambling, Retail Shopping, and Tours/Admission Fees. The results and discussion are presented in this chapter.

Demographic Profiles and Trip Characteristics

Leisure tourists.

As mentioned, 100 leisure tourist questionnaires obtained from the Hospitality Research Center (HRC) at the University of New Orleans were utilized for the frequency analysis and descriptive statistics. Table 4 presents frequencies and percent distributions of demographic characteristics of leisure tourists in the sample.

Table 4

Leisure Tourists. Frequencies of Demographic Characteristics (n=100)

Item	Category	n	%
Age	18-24	4	4.0
	25-34	17	17.0
	35-49	30	30.0
	50-64	43	43.0
	≥65	6	6.0
	Total	100	100.0
Marital status	Married/Live with domestic partner	75	75.0
	Single	17	17.0
	Divorced/Widowed	8	8.0
	Total	100	100.0
Children	0	75	75.0
	≥1	25	25.0
	Total	100	100.0
Income	≤\$25,000	4	4.0
	\$25,001-\$49,999	18	18.0
	\$50,000-\$74,999	21	21.0
	\$75,000-\$99,999	15	15.0
	\$100,000-\$149,999	18	18.0
	≥\$150,000	6	6.0
	Missing	18	18.0
	Total	100	100.0
Occupation	Student	3	3.0
	Retired	16	16.0
	Other Occupations	81	81.0
	Total	100	100.0

As is evident in Table 4, the majority of leisure tourists were between 35 and 64 years of age (75%), married (75%), neither students nor retired (81%), and had no children under eighteen in their households (75%). The age of the leisure tourists in this sample supports the findings of the U.S. Department of Commerce (2010) that an average age of international leisure travelers was 38 for females and 42 for males. Such results also support the findings of D.K. Schifflet and Associates (2010) who found that Generation X (aged today between 35 and 54 years) represents the largest segment of leisure travel. However, leisure tourists to New Orleans, as found in this study, appear to have been slightly older (the 50-64 year old range had the

highest frequency) than typical international and domestic leisure tourists in the country. Further, the profile of leisure tourists in New Orleans is similar to the one of leisure tourists in Kansas explored by Hsu, Kang, and Wolfe (2002) where the majority of leisure tourists were married and had no children under eighteen living at home. In the current study, the leisure tourist income levels varied across all the specified ranges with the highest frequency ($n=21$) occurring among these with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999. The household income indicated by leisure tourists in this sample is below the median household income of international leisure tourists to the U.S. (US\$77,200) as reported by the U.S. Department of Commerce (2010). However, the findings show that a proportion of leisure tourists with household incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999 is similar to that of domestic leisure tourists in the U.S. as reported by D.K. Schifflet and Associates (2010). The leisure tourists' sample used in the HRC study did not contain data on respondents' sex or occupation other than student and retired.

In the current research, 53% of leisure tourists in the sample were repeat visitors, while 47% of participants traveled to New Orleans for the first time. Furthermore, 86 respondents (86%) did not bring children under eighteen years of age on the trip, 8 people (8%) brought one child, 2 people (2%) brought two children, 2 more people (2%) brought three children, 1 person (1%) brought four children, and 1 participant (1%) chose not to answer. Such results support the findings of D. K. Schifflet and Associates (2010) who found that the majority of leisure tourists in the country do not bring children on the trip. On average, leisure tourists traveled with a party of 3.22 people ($SD=4.1$) and spent 3.97 nights ($SD=2.11$) in the New Orleans MSA. The average travel party-size is higher than the national average for domestic and international leisure travelers (D. K. Schifflet and Associates, 2010; U. S. Department of Commerce, 2010). Yet, the average length of stay is greater than the national average for domestic leisure tourists but lower

than the national average for international leisure tourists (D. K. Schifflet and Associates, 2010; U. S. Department of Commerce, 2010). Table 5 shows the places of origin of leisure tourists to the New Orleans area.

Table 5

Leisure Tourists. Frequencies of Places of Origin (n=100)

State	n	%
Texas	8	8.0
California	7	7.0
Alabama	6	6.0
Louisiana	5	5.0
New Jersey	4	4.0
Maryland	4	4.0
Oklahoma	4	4.0
Mississippi	3	3.0
Missouri	3	3.0
Nebraska	3	3.0
New York	3	3.0
South Carolina	3	3.0
Tennessee	3	3.0
Wisconsin	3	3.0
Arizona	2	2.0
Colorado	2	2.0
Florida	2	2.0
Illinois	2	2.0
Kansas	2	2.0
Michigan	2	2.0
Ohio	2	2.0
Pennsylvania	2	2.0
Virginia	2	2.0
Washington	2	2.0
West Virginia	2	2.0
Connecticut	1	1.0
Delaware	1	1.0
Georgia	1	1.0
Iowa	1	1.0
Minnesota	1	1.0
North Carolina	1	1.0
Rhode Island	1	1.0
Washington, DC	1	1.0
Missing	11	11.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 5 shows that regional markets (Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi) had the highest frequency ($n=22$) of visitors of all the U.S. geographical regions. No other geographical patterns were identified. The found pattern supports Huang and Xiao's (2000) finding that the greater the distances between the tourists' origins and the destination, the fewer tourist arrivals from that origin.

Volunteer tourists.

One hundred volunteer tourist questionnaires were used to run descriptive statistics and perform frequency analysis. Table 6 depicts the frequencies and percent distributions of the demographic characteristics of the volunteer tourist sample.

Table 6

Volunteer Tourists. Frequencies of Demographic Characteristics (n=100)

Item	Category	n	%
Sex	Male	35	35.0
	Female	65	65.0
	Total	100	100.0
Age	18-24	53	53.0
	25-34	17	17.0
	35-49	11	11.0
	50-64	10	10.0
	≥65	9	9.0
	Total	100	100.0
Marital status	Married/Live with domestic partner	23	23.0
	Single	70	70.0
	Divorced/Widowed	7	7.0
	Total	100	100.0
Children	0	86	86.0
	1	2	2.0
	2	7	7.0
	3	3	3.0
	4	2	2.0
	Total	100	100.0
Education	High School	33	33.0
	Associate	7	7.0
	Bachelor	38	38.0
	Master	18	18.0
	Doctoral/MD/JD	4	4.0
	Total	100	100.0
Income	≤\$25,000	16	16.0
	\$25,001-\$49,999	10	10.0
	\$50,000-\$74,999	27	27.0
	\$75,000-\$99,999	15	15.0
	\$100,000-\$149,999	11	11.0
	≥\$150,000	21	21.0
	Total	100	100.0
Occupation	Student	51	51.0
	Education	10	10.0
	Professional Services	9	9.0
	Retired	5	5.0
	Law	5	5.0
	Healthcare	4	4.0
	Information Technology	3	3.0
	Construction	3	3.0
	Homemaker	3	3.0
	Engineering	3	3.0
	Retail	2	2.0
	Unemployed	1	1.0
	Business Owner	1	1.0
	Total	100	100.0

As Table 6 shows that the majority of volunteer tourists in the sample were females (65%), aged between 18 and 24 (53%), single (70%), and childless (86%). They had bachelor's degrees (38%) or high school diplomas (33%). Furthermore, many voluntourists in the sample were students (51%) or educators (10%). Such a demographic profile supports the findings of TRAM (2008) that females tend to participate in voluntourism more than males and that young people who are students dominate the market. Twenty-seven percent of volunteer tourists in the sample had household incomes ranging from \$50,000 to \$74,999, while 21% reported household incomes greater than \$150,000. It should be noted that only 3% of the respondents were professional construction workers, while the occupation of 97% of the surveyed were not related to any construction services. This finding supports Guttentag's (2009, 2011) speculation that volunteer tourists may deliver subpar work at construction sites because they lack relevant skills.

Fifty-six percent of leisure tourists in the sample were repeat visitors, while 44% of the participants visited New Orleans for the first time. Table 7 presents the frequency of repeat visits of volunteer tourists to New Orleans.

Table 7

Volunteer Tourists. Frequencies of Repeat Visits (n=100)

Previous Visits	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
0	44	44.0
1	7	7.0
2	18	18.0
≥3	31	31.0
Total	100	100.0

Ninety-five percent of the respondents did not bring children under eighteen on the trip, while 5% brought two children. On average, volunteer tourists traveled with a party of 15.93 people (SD=13.23) and spent 6.54 nights (SD=1.04) in the New Orleans MSA. Table 8 presents the frequencies of volunteer tourists' places of origin.

Table 8

Volunteer Tourists. Frequencies of Places of Origin (n=100)

State/Country/Region	n	%
Massachusetts	16	16.0
Washington	14	14.0
Connecticut	11	11.0
Michigan	10	10.0
New York	8	8.0
Indiana	7	7.0
Illinois	6	6.0
New Hampshire	4	4.0
Louisiana	4	4.0
Idaho	3	3.0
Maine	2	2.0
North Carolina	2	2.0
New Jersey	2	2.0
Rhode Island	2	2.0
California	1	1.0
Kentucky	1	1.0
Minnesota	1	1.0
New Mexico	1	1.0
Oregon	1	1.0
South Carolina	1	1.0
Virginia	1	1.0
Canada	1	1.0
Central America	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

It should be noted that while states such as Washington and Michigan had high frequencies of volunteer tourists, the states that are collectively called New England (Massachusetts, Maine, Connecticut, New Hampshire and Rhode Island) had the highest frequency ($n=35$) of all the U.S. geographical regions. No other geographical patterns were identified.

Unlike the majority of leisure tourists who were not students or retired, most volunteer tourists were young and still pursuing their degrees in college. This finding could be explained by the fact that many colleges and universities in the country require their students to complete service-learning hours (National Service-Learning Clearinghouse, 2008). It is possible that many academic programs offer students the opportunity to fulfill service-learning requirements at tourist destinations, which may explain the found demographic profile of voluntourists in New Orleans. Nevertheless, as depicted in Table 6, many volunteer tourists (40%) were professionals with careers in education, healthcare, engineering, information technology, law, and other fields. Volunteer tourists in this research were not only students seeking to donate their vacation time to an outside community, but also professionals who found time in their schedules to travel to the destination and volunteer.

As found in this research, unlike the majority of leisure travelers in New Orleans who were married or lived with domestic partners, volunteer tourists were single. The majorities of both leisure tourists and volunteer tourists in the sample did not have children living in their households. This phenomenon could be explained by the fact that 43% of leisure tourists were 50-64 years old and may have had adult children living separately. Volunteer tourists, on the other hand, were younger, single, and may not have had their own families yet. While no data on educational background of leisure tourists were available, volunteer tourists in this sample appeared to be educated (many received bachelor's degrees) or currently enrolled in college. Most leisure and volunteer tourists in this study came from households with incomes ranging from \$50,000 to \$74,999; however, more volunteer tourists than leisure tourists ($n=6$ vs. $n= 21$) had households with incomes at or above \$150,000.

Both volunteer and leisure travelers had comparable frequencies of repeat visits.

Volunteer tourists tended to take significantly longer trips ($t(144.5)=-10.95, p=.000$) and travel in significantly larger groups than leisure tourists ($t(117.82)=-9.18, p=.000$). Finally, leisure tourists in this study came from regional markets: both from within the state and from neighboring states. Volunteer tourists in the sample, in contrast, were likely to travel greater distances and originate in northern parts of the country.

Comparison of Expenditures

Six independent sample *t*-tests were performed to compare the means of expenditures across the six categories – Local Transportation, Lodging, Food/Beverages, Gambling, Retail Shopping, Tours/Admission Fees – between volunteer and leisure tourists. Two additional *t*-tests were run to compare the means of total daily expenditures and total trip expenditures. All tests adopted the alpha level of .05 for significance (Borg & Gall, 1989). Table 9 presents the results.

Table 9

Comparison of Mean Expenditures between Leisure and Volunteer Tourists (N=200)

	Type		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Two-tailed <i>p</i> -value	
	Leisure	Volunteer				
Local Transportation	Mean SD	\$6.95 (\$13.44)	\$14.08 (\$19.74)	-2.99	198	.003
Lodging	Mean SD	\$47.33 (\$41.74)	\$33.34 (\$28.12)	2.78	173.52	.006
Food and Beverages	Mean SD	\$83.73 (\$64.72)	\$23.26 (\$14.20)	9.03	112.92	.000
Gambling	Mean SD	\$12.94 (\$46.72)	\$0.65 (\$6.25)	2.64	102.62	.01
Retail Shopping	Mean SD	\$31.49 (\$36.54)	\$10.33 (\$17.89)	5.20	143.90	.000
Tours/Admission Fees	Mean SD	\$21.66 (\$30.21)	\$2.13 (\$5.02)	6.38	104.45	.000
Total Per-person Per-day Expenditures	Mean SD	\$204.10 (\$125.36)	\$83.79 (\$59.05)	8.68	140.87	.000
Total Trip Expenditures	Mean SD	\$739.38 (\$528.78)	\$554.76 (\$403.39)	2.78	185.08	.006

Tables 2 and 9 show that leisure tourists in the New Orleans MSA spent more per-person per-day while at the destination on lodging, food and beverages, retail shopping, and entertainment than did leisure tourists in Louisiana and in the U.S. New Orleans leisure tourists also had greater total per-person per-trip and total trip expenditures. Nevertheless, an average leisure tourist in New Orleans spent less on gambling than an average Louisiana leisure visitor but more than an average domestic leisure tourist in the U.S. Since nationwide and statewide research did not collect local transportation expenditure data, the comparison on this category of expenditures was not possible.

As Table 9 indicates, volunteer tourists in the sample spent significantly more on local transportation ($M=6.95$, $SD=13.44$) than did leisure tourists ($M=14.08$, $SD=19.74$), $t(198)=2.99$, $p=.003$. However, voluntourists spent significantly less in all other categories of expenditures (see Table 9). As a result, volunteer tourists' per-person per-day expenditures were also significantly less ($M=83.79$, $SD=59.05$) than leisure tourists' ($M=204.1$, $SD=125.36$), $t(140.87)=8.68$, $p=.000$. Even though volunteer tourists spent more nights in New Orleans than leisure tourists did, their total trip expenditures were still significantly lower ($M=554.76$, $SD=403.39$) than those of leisure tourists ($M=739.38$, $SD=528.78$), $t(185.08)=2.78$, $p=.006$.

Table 8 shows that volunteer tourists in this study spent significantly less in the New Orleans area in five out of six categories. As the results of this study show, voluntourists in this study stayed in inexpensive hotels or motels, hostels, and camps (often far from downtown), while leisure tourists were more likely to stay in more expensive hotels or motels. Moreover, it appeared that volunteer travelers in this study selected inexpensive food options over restaurant experiences and almost never gambled. They did little shopping at the destination and rarely visited tourist attractions; therefore, they did not experience this destination the way leisure tourists did. Interestingly, voluntourists in the sample had significantly higher expenditures in the local transportation category than did leisure tourists. During the survey process, many respondents indicated that they rented vans or hired taxis to transport them from hotels (usually outside the New Orleans city limits) to the work sites and back to accommodations. Based on the low transportation and high lodging expenditures (see Table 9), it may be inferred that leisure travelers, in contrast, often do not need to use local transportation to get to tourist attractions since they tend to stay in the downtown area and can walk to tourist attractions or drive in their vehicles.

According to Stynes (1997), increased spending at a destination translates into increased economic impact on the local economy. In this research, a voluntourist spent significantly less at the destination than did a leisure tourist on a daily basis across five categories – Lodging, Food/Beverages, Gambling, Retail Shopping, and Tours/Admission Fees. Based on the differences in tourists' expenditures found in this study, it appears that the local economy benefited less from voluntourists than it did from leisure tourists.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

This study presented the first quantitative attempt to analyze the economic contribution of voluntourism on a host economy. This research aimed to develop a profile of volunteer tourists in New Orleans to compare them to leisure tourists. In practice, this study proposed a methodology to compare direct spending of voluntourists to that of leisure tourists. Understanding how the impact of one form of tourism differs from another will aid practitioners in allocating scarce financial resources and in developing tourism policy. According to this preliminary research, voluntourists spend less, and therefore more research is needed at destinations adopting this target market; otherwise, destinations may not be using their limited resources to their full potentials.

Limitations

The limitations of this research included a focus on only one dimension of the economic value of volunteers: financial contributions as measured by spending within the local economy. This study did not consider such potentially important economic impacts as the decrease of employment opportunities for local workers or the long-term promotion of economic dependency. This study did not take into account non-economic positive and negative impacts of voluntourism. For example, despite their minimal economic contributions, volunteer tourists may be an important source of labor during disaster recovery. Voluntourism could also create positive publicity for both the voluntourists and a host community. This PR may be invaluable to

recovering destinations. In addition, voluntourism can serve as a competitive advantage as corporations choose destinations for their meetings based on the availability of community service opportunities. Therefore, one cannot make a definite conclusion about the value of volunteer tourists based on the results of this study without considering additional factors.

Several limitations arise from the design of the voluntourist survey instrument. First, the question addressing repeat visits did not specify whether the answer was supposed to include the current visit. Therefore, the findings generated from this question should be used with caution: the actual number of repeat visits may be smaller or greater than the number found in this study. Second, the examples of the categories of expenditures (see Appendix A, Question 6) did not contain all possible options; instead, the word *etc.* was used to emphasize that the list of examples was not exhaustive. As a result, it is possible that some respondents could have interpreted the categories in a manner that is different from the one intended. They were prompted to use their best judgment to associate some types of spending that were not listed as the examples provided in each of the six categories. This limitation should be considered when analyzing the results of the study because the categories of expenditures might not have been uniformly interpreted by respondents.

Finally, the obtained voluntourist sample was derived from a limited list of volunteer programs in New Orleans found on the VolunteerNewOrleans.com website and may not represent the entire array of diverse volunteer tourists. People who participate in different projects may have very distinct spending patterns.

Future research

Volunteer tourism is becoming increasingly popular. Visitors look for ways to enjoy a new place and its culture while contributing to a host community. It is evident that voluntourism is not just a trend; rather, it is an evolving form of tourism. In 2008, the market for volunteer tourism in Western Europe (which is dominated by the U. K.) grew by approximately 5%-10% from the previous five years (2003-2008) and, in 2006, was worth an estimated US\$150 million (Mintel, 2008, as cited in Morgan, 2009). If not restricted, this sector could continue to grow; therefore, methods for estimating the value of this type of tourism are desperately needed so that wise target market selection occurs, and decisions can be information-based.

A similar comparative study should be conducted using interval data and a larger, randomly generated sample to determine whether there are significant differences in household and discretionary income between volunteer and leisure tourists. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2010), out of the 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia, Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, Washington, DC, and Wyoming, have median household incomes higher than the national average of \$50,046. Sixty-six percent of volunteer tourists in the current study came from the states with median household income higher than the national average, while only 34% of leisure tourists came from such states. A larger random sample and discretionary income data are needed to explore the differences in household and discretionary income between the two groups of travelers.

As noted in the introduction, no practical definition of a voluntourist in the terms of purpose of the trip, distance traveled, and length of stay currently exists. Further research should

address this theoretical gap in order to achieve uniformity of results in future studies. Such consistency will allow researchers to compare voluntourists to many other tourist types and across a greater array of tourist characteristics.

This study attempted to present a methodology to compare direct expenditures of volunteer tourists to those of leisure tourists. However, further research is necessary to find ways of assessing possible economic dependencies that may arise from the presence of free outside labor. Further research is also needed to investigate the effects of voluntourists' labor on the host community's employment rate. Finally, additional research is required on the volunteer tourist; for example, profiling different types of volunteer tourists may be useful in the future.

Volunteer tourism can create positive publicity for both volunteers and a host community; thus, future research should also address the importance of public relations resulting from voluntourism. Today, many corporations and professional associations often choose destinations for their meetings and conventions based on the availability of community service opportunities (Stark, 2011). For example, after hurricane Katrina, New Orleans became a magnet for corporate voluntourism (Stark, 2011). These organizations used the opportunity to volunteer at a tourist destination to fulfill a part of their corporate social responsibility initiatives. Consequently, a tourist destination may consider its voluntourism programs a competitive advantage that allows the destination to attract more Meeting, Incentive, Convention, and Exhibition (MICE) business. More research should be conducted in this field to assess the importance of voluntourism as a competitive advantage for a MICE market. As one can see, this emerging form of tourism presents plenty of topics for researchers to advance the understanding of this phenomenon.

References

- Bahar, O., & Kozak, M. (2008). *Tourism economics: Concepts and practices*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Bailey, A., & Russel, K. (2010). Predictors of interpersonal growth in volunteer tourism: A latent curve approach. *Leisure Sciences*, 32, 352-368. doi:10.1080/01490400.2010.488598
- Benson, A. (2011). *Volunteer tourism: Theoretical frameworks and practical implications*. London: Routledge.
- Benson, A., & Henderson, S. (2011). A strategic analysis of volunteer tourism organisations. *Service Industries Journal*, 31(3), 405-424. doi:10.1080/02642060902822091
- Benson, A., & Seibert, N. (2009). Volunteer tourism: Motivations of German participants in South Africa. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 12(3/4), 295-314. doi:10.1080/11745398.2009.9686826
- Bickman, L., & Rog, D. (2008). *The Sage handbook of applied social research methods* (2 ed.). Sage publications.
- Blackman, D. A., & Benson, A. M. (2010). The role of the psychological contract in managing research volunteer tourism. *Journal of Travel and Marketing*, 27, 221-235. doi:10.1080/105484010003744669
- Borg, W., & Gall, M. (1989). *Educational Research*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Bovee, M. (2011). *Voluntourism: The good and the bad*. Retrieved from <http://notenoughgood.com/2011/08/voluntourism-the-good-and-the-bad/>
- Broad, S. (2003). Living the Thai life -- a case study of volunteer tourism at the Gibbon Rehabilitation Project, Thailand. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 28 (3), 63-72
- Brown, S., & Lehto, X. (2005). Traveling with a purpose: understanding the motives and benefits of volunteer vacationers. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 8(6), 479-496. doi:10.1080/13686500508668232
- Brumbaugh, A. (2010). The impact of diversity seeking and volunteer orientation on desire for alternative spring break programs. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 27, 474-490. doi:10.1080/10548408.2010.499060
- Butcher, J., & Smith, P. (2010). 'Making a difference': volunteer tourism and development. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 35 (1), 27-36.
- Campbell, A. (2009). The Importance of Being Valued: Solo 'grey nomads' as volunteers at the National Folk Festival. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 12(3/4), 277-294. doi:10.1080/11745398.2009.9686825
- Carmines, E., & Zeller, R. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Cela, A., Lankford, S., & Knowles-Lankford, J. (2009). Visitor spending and economic impacts of heritage tourism: A case study of the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 4(3), 245-256. doi:10.1080/17438730802139269
- Coghlan, A. (2007). Towards an integrated image-based typology of volunteer tourism organisations. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(3), 267-287. doi:10.2167/jost628.0
- Coghlan, A. (2008). Exploring the role of expedition staff in volunteer tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10 (2), 183-191.
- Coghlan, A., & Fennel, D. (2009). Myth or substance: An examination of altruism as the basis of volunteer tourism. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 12(3/4), 377-402.
- Coghlan, A., & Gooch, M. (2011). Applying a transformative learning framework to volunteer tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19 (6), 713-728.
- Coghlan, A., & Pearce, P. (2010). Tracking affective components of satisfaction. *Tourism & Hospitality Research*, 10, 42-58. doi:10.1057/thr.2009.18
- Crompton, J., Lee, S., & Shuster, T. (2001). A guide for undertaking economic impact studies: The Springfest example. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40, 79-87. doi:10.1177/004728750104000110
- Davidson, T. (2005). What are travel and tourism: Are they really a tourism? In W. Theobald, *Global Tourism* (pp. 25-31). Elsevier.
- D. K. Schifflet and Associates. (2010). *Michigan: 2009 visitor profile*.
- Goeldner, C., & Ritchie, B. (2012). *Tourism: principles, practices, philosophies* (12 ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gokovali, U. (2010). Contribution of tourism to economic growth in Turkey. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 21, 139-153. doi:10.1080/13032917.2010.9687095
- Gray, N., & Campbell, L. (2007). A de commodified experience? Exploring aesthetic, economic and ethical values for volunteer ecotourism in Costa Rica. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(5), 463-482. doi:10.2167/jost725.0
- Guttentag, D. (2009). The possible negative impacts of volunteer tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 11(6), 537-551. doi:10.1002/jtr.727
- Guttentag, D. (2011). Volunteer tourism: as good as it seems? *Tourism Recreation Research*, 36 (1), 69-74.
- Handler, I. (2009). Profiling Taiwanese leisure travelers to Japan using a market segmentation approach. *Keio SFC Journal*, 9 (1), 53-63.
- Holmes, K., Smith, K., Lockstone-Binney, L., & Baum, T. (2010). Developing the dimensions of tourism volunteering. *Leisure Sciences*, 32(3), 255-269. doi:10.1080/01490401003712689

- Honey, M. (1999). *Ecotourism and sustainable development: Who owns paradise?* Washington, DC: Island Press.
- HRC. (2005). *2004 New Orleans Area Visitor Profile: Annual report*. University of New Orleans, Hospitality Research Center, New Orleans.
- HRC. (2010). *2009 New Orleans Area Visitor Profile: Annual report*. University of New Orleans, Hospitality Research Center, New Orleans.
- HRC. (2011). *2010 New Orleans Area Visitor Profile: Annual report*. University of New Orleans, Hospitality Research Center, New Orleans.
- Hsieh, A., & Chang, J. (2004). Shopping and tourist night markets in Taiwan. *Tourism Management* , 27, 138-145.
- Hsu, C., Kang, S., & Wolfe, K. (2002). Psychographic and demographic profiles of niche market leisure travelers. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* , 26 (1), 3-22.
- Huang, A., & Xiao, H. (2000). Leisure-based tourist behavior: A case study of Changchun. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* , 12/3, 210-214.
- Jang, S., Morrison, A., & O'Leary, J. (2001). Benefit segmentation of Japanese travelers to the USA and Canada: Selecting target markets based on the profitability and risk of individual market segments. *Tourism Management* , 23, 367-378.
- Jarvis, N., & Blank, C. (2011). The importance of tourism motivations among sport event volunteers at the 2007 World Artistic Gymnastics Championships, Stuttgart, Germany. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 16(2), 129-147. doi:10.1080/14775085.2011.568089
- Keese, J. (2011). The geography of volunteer tourism: Place matters. *Tourism Geographies*, 13(2), 257-279. doi:10.1080/14616688.2011.567293
- Kim, W., Park, Y., Gazzoli, G., & Sheng, E. (2011). Benefit segmentation of international travelers to Macau, China. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism* , 12 (1), 28-57.
- Kotler, P., & Bowen, J. M. (2006). *Marketing for hospitality and tourism*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson.
- Leisure Market Research Handbook. (2012). Leisure market research handbook. In *The 2012-2013 leisure market research handbook* (pp. 187-189). Atlanta, Georgia: Richard K. Miller & Associates.
- Lee, G., Morrison, A., & O'Leary, J. (2006). The economic value portfolio matrix: A target market selection tool for destination marketing organizations. *Tourism Management* , 27 (4), 576-588.

- Lee, Y., & Woosnam, K. (2010). Voluntourist transformation and the theory of integrative cross-cultural adaptation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(4), 1181-1189.
doi:10.1016/j.annals.2010.04.012
- Leonard, R., & Onyx, J. (2009). Volunteer tourism: The interests and motivations of grey nomads. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 12(3/4), 315-332.
- Lepp, A. (2009). Leisure and obligation: An investigation of volunteer tourists' experience at Kenya's Taita Discovery Center. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 41 (2), 253-260.
- Lo, A., & Lee, C. (2011). Motivations and perceived value of volunteer tourists from Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 32 (2), 326-334.
- Lockstone-Binney, L., Holmes, K., Smith, K., & Baum, T. (2010). Volunteers and volunteering in leisure: social science perspective. *Leisure Studies* , 29 (4), 435-455.
- Love, M. (2011, July 22). *The contradictions of voluntourism*. Retrieved from Tenacious Transparency: <http://tenacious Transparency.wordpress.com/2011/07/22/the-contradictions-of-voluntourism/>
- Lyons, K., Wearing, S., & Benson, A. (2009). Introduction to the special issue on volunteer tourism. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 12(3/4), 269-271.
- Marcouiller, D., Kim, K., & Deller, S. (2004). Natural amenities, tourism and income distribution. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(4), 1031-1050.
doi:10.1016/j.annals.2004.04.003
- Masberg, B. (1998). Defining the tourist: Is it possible? A view from the Convention and Visitors Bureau. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37, 67-70.
- McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. (2009). Volunteer tourism and the "voluntoured": The case of Tijuana, Mexico. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17, 39-51.
doi:10.1080/09669580802159693
- McGehee, N., & Andereck, K. (2008). 'Pettin' the critters': Exploring the complex relationship between volunteers and the voluntoured in McDowell County, West Virginia, USA, and Tijuana Mexico. In K. Lyons, & S. Wearing (Eds.), *Journeys of Discovery in Volunteer Tourism* (pp. 12-25). Oxfordshire, UK: CABI.
- McGehee, N., & Santos, C. (2005). Social change, discourse and volunteer tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* , 760-779.
- McIntosh, A., & Zahra, A. (2007). A cultural encounter through volunteer tourism: Towards the ideals of sustainable tourism? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(5), 541-556.
doi:10.2167/jost701.0
- Middleton, V., & Clarke, J. (2007). *Marketing in travel and tourism*. Oxford: Elsevier.

- Miller, E., van Meegen, K., & Buys, L. (2010). Impacts and opportunities: Residents's views of sustainable development of tourism in regional Queensland, Australia. *Journal of Tourism Challenges & Trends*, 3 (1), 9-28.
- Mintel. (2008). *Travel and Tourism Analyst 'Volunteer Tourism - International'*.
- Montgomery, D. (2009). *Design and analysis of experiments* (7 ed.). Wiley.
- Morgan, J. (2009). Volunteer tourism: What are the benefits for international development? Retrieved from VolunTourist.org: <http://www.voluntourism.org/news-studyandresearch62.htm>
- Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2008). *Tourism and Sustainability: Development, globalization, and new tourism in the third world* (3 ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Mueller, C. (2004). Validity. In M. Lewis-Beck (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of social science research methods* (Vol. 3). Sage.
- Mustonen, P. (2007). Volunteer tourism: Altruism of mere tourism? *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 18, 97-115. doi:10.1080/13032917.2007.9687038
- Naional Service-Learning Clearinghouse. (2009). *History of service-learning in higher education*. Retrieved from servicelearning.org: <http://www.servicelearning.org/history-service-larning-higher-education>
- NOMCVB. (2011). *New Orleans achieves major tourism milestone: 8.3 million visitors in 2010*. New Orleans: NOMCVB.
- NPR. (2011, March 24). New Orleans remains a volunteer hub for college students five years after storm. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=125120464>
- Ooi, N., & Laing, J. (2010). Backpacker tourism: Sustainable and purposeful? Investigating the overlap between backpacker tourism and volunteer tourism motivations. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(2), 191-206. doi:10.1080/09669580903395030
- Paajanen, M. (1998). Assessing local income and employment effects of tourism: Experience using the Nordic model of tourism. In T. Baum, & R. Mudambi, *Economic and management methods for tourism and hospitality research* (pp. 123-144). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Palacios, C. (2010). Volunteer tourism, development and education in a postcolonial world: Conceiving global connection beyond aid. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(7), 861-878. doi:10.1080/09669581003782739
- Pearce, J. (1980). A volunteer worker placement model for business. *Annals of tourism research*, 2(3), 443-454. doi:10.1016/0160-7383(80)90034-1

- Raymond, E. (2011). Volunteer tourism: Looking forward. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 36 (1), 77-79.
- Raymond, E., & Hall, C. (2008). The developmet of cross-cultural (mis)understanding through volunteer tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(5), 530-543. doi:10.2167/jost796.0
- Saayman, M., & Saayman, A. (2006). Estimating the economic contribution of visitor spending in the Kruger National Park to the regional economy. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14, 67-81. doi:10.1080/09669580608668592
- Scott, N., & Parfitt, N. (2004). Lifestyle segmentation in tourism and leisure: Imposing order or finding it? *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism* , 5 (2-4), 121-139. doi: 10.1300/J162v05n02_07
- Sherraden, M. S., Lough, B., & McBride, A. (2008). Effects of international volunteering and service: Individual and institutional predictors. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 19(4), 395-421. doi:10.1007/s11266-008-9072-x
- Shoemaker, S., Lewis, R., & Yesawich, P. (2007). *Marketing leadership in hospitality and tourism: Strategies and tactics for competitive advantage* (4 ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Simpson, K. (2004). 'Doing development': The gap year, volunteer-tourists and a popular practice of development. *Journal of International Development*, 16(5), 681-692. doi:10.1002/jid.1120
- Sin, H. (2009). Volunteer tourism - "Involve me and I will learn?". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 480-501. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2009.03.001
- Sin, H. (2010). Who are we responsible to? Locals' tales of volunteer tourism. *Geoforum*, 41, 983-992.
- Singh, S., & Singh, T. (2004). Volunteer tourism: New pilgrimage to the Himalayas. In T. Singh, *New horizons in tourism: Strange experiences and strange practices* (pp. 181-194). Wallingford, UK: CABI.
- Smith, K., & Holmes, K. (2009). Researching volunteering in tourism: Going beyond. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 12(3/4), 403-420. doi:10.1080/11745398.2009.9686831
- Stark, T. (2011). Volunteering. Retrieved from HotelExecutive.com: <http://www.acomonline.org/News/Volunteering.pdf>
- Stephenhagen, J. (2011, July 16). The give and take of 'voluntourism'. Retrieved from *The Vancouver Sun*: <http://www.vancouversun.com/travel/give+take+voluntourism/5112773/story.html>
- Stupart, A. (2011, August 22). Why you shouldn't particiate in voluntourism. Retrieved from Matador Network: <http://matadornetwork.com/change/why-you-shouldnt-participate-in-voluntourism/>

- Stynes, D. (1997). Economic impacts of tourism. Retrieved from Michigan State University: <https://www.msu.edu/course/prr/840/econimpact/pdf/ecimpvol1.pdf>
- TNS. (2011). *2010 average spending. TravelsAmerica*
- TNS. (2010). *Calendar year 2009 Louisiana TravelsAmerica*. Retrieved from Louisiana Office of Tourism: <http://www.crt.state.la.us/tourism/research/documents/2010-11/cy2009travelsamericalouisianareport.pdf>
- Tomazos, K., & Butler, R. (2009). Volunteer tourism: The new ecotourism? *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 20, 196-211.
- Tomazos, K., & Butler, R. (2010). The volunteer tourist as "hero". *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(4), 363-380. doi:10.1080/13683500903038863
- TRAM. (2008). *Volunteer tourism: A global analysis*. Retrieved from ATLAS: http://www.atlas-webshop.org/epages/61492534.sf/en_GB/?ObjectPath=/Shops/61492534/Products/ATL_00073
- Uriely, N., Reichel, A., & Ron, A. (2003). Volunteering in tourism: Additional thinking. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 28(3), 57-62.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2012). Inflation calculator: Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics: http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). Median Household Income. Retrieved from American FactFinder: http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_10_1YR_GCT1901.US04PR&prodType=table
- U.S. Department of Commerce. (2010). *2010 Sector Profile: Leisure*. Retrieved from Office of Travel and Tourism Industries: http://tinet.ita.doc.gov/outreachpages/download_data_table/2010-leisure-profile.pdf
- U.S. Travel Association. (2010). The economic impact of travel on Louisiana parishes: 2009. Washington, DC.
- U.S. Travel Data Center. (1997). Survey of state travel offices 1992-1993. Washington, DC: Travel Industry Association of America.
- Van Engen, J. A. (2000). The cost of short-term missions. *The Other Side*, 20-23.
- Volunteer New Orleans. (2011). Retrieved from Volunteer Resources: <http://volunteerneworleans.com/VolunteerResources.php>
- VolunteeringInAmerica. (2011). Research. Retrieved from VolunteeringInAmerica: http://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/about/research_faqs.cfm
- Walpole, M., & Goodwin, H. (2000). Local economic impacts of dragon tourism in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 559-576. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00088-2

- Wearing, S. (2001). *Volunteer tourism: Experiences that make a difference*. New York: CABI.
- Wearing, S. (2011, June 16). Volunteer tourism: Interview with Stephen Wearing. Retrieved from Your Travel Choice: <http://www.yourtravelchoice.org/2011/06/volunteer-tourism-interview-with-dr-stephen-wearing/>
- Weaver, D., & Lawton, L. (2006). *Tourism Management* (3 ed.). Milton, Queensland, Australia: John Wiley & Sons Australia.
- WTO. (2008). *International Recommendations for Tourism Statistics 2008*. Retrieved from WTO: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/Seriesm/SeriesM_83rev1e.pdf
- WTTC. (2011). Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2011. Retrieved from World Travel & Tourism Council: http://www.wttc.org/bin/pdf/original_pdf_file/world_regional_2011-pdf.pdf
- Yesawich, P. (2010). *Profile of a leisure traveler*. Retrieved from HotelNewsNow.com: <http://www.hotelnewsnow.com/Articles.aspx/3471/Profile-of-a-leisure-traveler>

Appendix A

VOLUNTEER TOURIST SURVEY

The purpose of this study is estimate direct spending of volunteer tourists in New Orleans. The questionnaire is anonymous, and the results will be used to better understand the impact of volunteers on our community. To answer, please circle or fill in the appropriate space.

1. What is the zip code at your primary home address? _____

2. What is the *primary* purpose of your visit to New Orleans?
 to volunteer for leisure for business

3. Is this your first visit to New Orleans?
 yes no → how many times in your lifetime _____

4. How many nights are you planning for this visit? _____

5. How many people (including yourself) are in your travel party? (This is the number of people for/with whom you share expenses on this trip, e.g. your family or close friends) _____ Of those, how many are children under 18? _____

6. For the following questions, please include only your own individual expenses and not those of your entire party. By the time you leave New Orleans, how much money will you have spent TOTAL for your ENTIRE TRIP in each of the categories (please write zero if none is spent):

TYPE OF EXPENDITURE	Expense amount
A. Local transportation (gas, bus, taxi, streetcar, etc.)	\$ _____
B. Lodging (hotel, motel, hostel, condos, etc.)	\$ _____
C. Food & Beverages (restaurants, concessions, bars, etc.)	\$ _____
D. Gambling	\$ _____
E. Retail Shopping (souvenirs, groceries, clothes, etc.)	\$ _____
F. Tours/Admissions fees (museums, concerts, site seeing, boat tours, etc.)	\$ _____
G. Any other expenses	\$ _____
Please identify _____	

The following questions are for classification purposes only:

1. **Gender:** Male Female

2. **Age:**
18-24 25-34 35-49 50-64 ≥65

3. **Marital status:**

Married or live with domestic partner Single Divorced or widowed

4. **Do you have children under age of 18?** No Yes → how many _____

5. **Household Income:**

≤\$25,000 \$25,001-\$49,999 \$50,000-\$74,999
\$75,000-\$99,999 \$100,000-\$149,999 ≥\$150,000

6. **The highest earned degree:**

High school Associate Bachelor Master Doctoral/MD/JD

7. **Occupation (i.e. your job, student, homemaker, retired, unemployed etc.):** _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!

If you have any question or concerns, please contact:

**Ksenia Kirillova, Graduate Student
Dr. Bridget Bordelon and Dr. David Pearlman
(504)280-6906 / (504)280-6962**



**THE UNIVERSITY of
NEW ORLEANS**



Appendix B

**University Committee for the Protection
of Human Subjects in Research
University of New Orleans**

Campus Correspondence

Principal Investigator: Bridget Bordelon
Co-Investigator: Ksenia Kirillova
Date: May 5, 2011
Protocol Title: “A Comparison of Expenditures between Volunteer and
Leisure Tourists in the New Orleans Area”
IRB#: 02May11

The IRB has deemed that the research and procedures described in this protocol application are exempt from federal regulations under 45 CFR 46.101 category 2, due to the fact that the information obtained is not recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

Exempt protocols do not have an expiration date; however, if there are any changes made to this protocol that may cause it to be no longer exempt from CFR 46, the IRB requires another standard application from the investigator(s) which should provide the same information that is in this application with changes that may have changed the exempt status.

If an adverse, unforeseen event occurs (e.g., physical, social, or emotional harm), you are required to inform the IRB as soon as possible after the event.

Best wishes on your project.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Laird, Ph.D., Chair
UNO Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research

Vita

Ksenia Kirillova was born and raised in Krasnoyarsk, Russia. Before coming to the United States as an exchange worker at the age of 20, she was pursuing a degree in Public Relations at the Siberian Federal University. At the University of New Orleans, Ksenia received her Bachelor and then Master degrees in hospitality and tourism management while working as a waitress in several well-respected restaurants. A curious traveler, she has been always interested in how tourism development influences local communities and how tourism negative impacts can be mitigated. Ksenia plans to study these and other tourism-related issues during her Ph.D. studies at Purdue University.