

## **ABSTRACT**

BOSLEY, HOLLY ELIZABETH. Volunteers' Perceptions of Impacts of the Azalea Festival: Do Findings on Resident Perceptions of Tourism Impacts Apply? (Under the direction of Gene L. Brothers and Larry D. Gustke.)

The purpose of this research was to investigate whether findings from the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts applied to festival volunteers as a specific subset of residents. Volunteers at festivals and special events play a particularly important role in the context of tourism because of their potential to perform effective internal marketing of the event or organization. Understanding motivations for volunteer involvement will improve recruitment and retention efforts.

It was hypothesized that results from research on resident perceptions of tourism impacts would be applicable to a sample of festival volunteers. The following independent variables were analyzed with respect to volunteer perceptions of the impacts of the festival: distance from the tourist zone, length of residence, birthplace, and level of knowledge of the tourism industry. Data were collected from a sample of North Carolina Azalea Festival volunteers through an e-mail survey sent to committee chairs in addition to an on-site survey distributed at the annual post-festival Workers' Party.

Analyses, in the form of t-tests and a Pearson correlation, showed that volunteers' perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival were not consistent with the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts. Research on festivals and events has focused on economic impact and visitor motivations; further investigation of the role of the host community, including volunteer involvement, is needed.

**VOLUNTEERS' PERCEPTIONS OF IMPACTS OF THE AZALEA FESTIVAL: DO  
FINDINGS ON RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS OF  
TOURISM IMPACTS APPLY?**

by  
**HOLLY ELIZABETH BOSLEY**

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
North Carolina State University  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Science

**PARKS, RECREATION AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT**

Raleigh  
2004

**APPROVED BY:**

---

---

Co-Chair of Advisory Committee – Co-Chair of Advisory Committee

## **BIOGRAPHY**

Holly E. Bosley moved to Raleigh, North Carolina a year after receiving her Bachelor of Arts degree in Spanish and International Studies from Denison University in Granville, Ohio. While working toward her master's degree at North Carolina State University, the author was fortunate to work on a variety of exciting projects for the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management. During this time she developed research interests in festivals and special events, socio-cultural elements of tourism impacts, and rural tourism development. She will enroll in the doctoral program at North Carolina State University in the fall of 2004 with the intention of one day becoming a university professor.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The process of completing a master's thesis is never an individual effort. This project could only have taken place through the contributions of a number of people.

First, I wish to thank my committee co-chairmen, Drs. Gene L. Brothers and Larry D. Gustke, for their unwavering support throughout the research process. They provided the ideal balance between structure and flexibility so that I could conduct a project that was both relevant to the field and commensurate with my research interests. I would also like to thank Dr. Candace Goode for serving on my committee and for lending me her consistent support throughout my tenure as a master's student.

Many thanks for the additional assistance I received from the faculty and staff of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management. In particular, I wish to extend my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Beth Wilson for tirelessly offering her encouragement, wisdom, and experience.

I am thankful for the network of friends that I have found within the graduate student body of the College of Natural Resources, who have shared their kindness and support at every crossroads.

Finally, I am eternally grateful to my parents. By their example I have come to understand the meaning of unconditional love and generosity. These lessons are more important than anything that can be learned from a textbook or in a classroom.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
 <b>Chapter 1</b>	
INTRODUCTION .....	1
STUDY OBJECTIVE .....	2
GENERAL HYPOTHESIS .....	3
ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS .....	3
 <b>Chapter 2</b>	
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	4
INTRODUCTION .....	4
VOLUNTEERISM .....	4
Introduction .....	4
Motivation .....	5
Satisfaction .....	9
Training .....	10
RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS OF TOURISM IMPACTS .....	11
Introduction .....	11
General Importance of Resident Perceptions of Tourism Impacts .....	12
Internal Marketing Through Resident Education .....	12
Knowledge of the Tourism Industry .....	13
Doxey’s Irridex as a Model of Resident Reactions .....	14
Distance from the Tourist Zone .....	15
Birthplace .....	17
Length of Residence and “Learning to Live With Tourism” .....	17
Community Attachment and Tourism Impacts .....	19
FESTIVALS AND SPECIAL EVENTS .....	21
Introduction .....	21
Functions of Festivals and Special Events .....	21
Festival Tourism .....	21
Typologies of Festivals and Events .....	22
SUMMARY .....	23
HYPOTHESES .....	23
 <b>Chapter 3</b>	
METHODOLOGY .....	25
INTRODUCTION .....	25
STUDY POPULATION .....	25
SAMPLING FRAMES FOR PRETEST AND STUDY .....	25
INTRODUCTION TO DATA COLLECTION .....	25

## TABLE OF CONTENTS – CONTINUED

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT .....	26
Development of E-Mail Pretest Survey Instrument and Potential Limitations .....	26
Pretest Distribution and Outcomes .....	26
Final On-Site Instrument Used in Data Collection .....	28
Section I: Perceptions of Azalea Festival Impacts on the Host Community .....	28
Section II: Level of Attachment to the Greater Wilmington Community .....	29
Section III: Additional Socio-Demographic Variables .....	30
METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION .....	31
LIMITATIONS .....	31
SUMMARY .....	33
<b>Chapter 4</b>	
RESULTS .....	34
INTRODUCTION .....	34
SAMPLE OF AZALEA FESTIVAL VOLUNTEERS .....	34
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND RESULTS .....	35
Introduction .....	35
Hypothesis 1 .....	37
Hypothesis 2 .....	38
Hypothesis 3 .....	39
Hypothesis 4 .....	42
SUMMARY .....	47
<b>Chapter 5</b>	
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	48
INTRODUCTION .....	48
HYPOTHESIS 1: DISTANCE FROM TOURIST ZONE .....	49
HYPOTHESIS 2: LENGTH OF RESIDENCE .....	51
HYPOTHESIS 3: BIRTHPLACE .....	52
HYPOTHESIS 4: KNOWLEDGE OF TOURISM INDUSTRY .....	53
METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS .....	55
Sample Size .....	55
Representativeness of the Sample .....	55
CONCLUSION .....	56
REFERENCES .....	57
APPENDICES	
A: E-Mail Pretest .....	60
B: On-Site Survey Instrument .....	65
C: Follow-Up E-Mail .....	71

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Methods of Data Collection from 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers .....	26
Table 3.2	Perceived Impact Categories and Individual Impact Statements Included on Final Instrument Distributed to 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers .....	29
Table 4.1	2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceived Impact Category Means by Driving Distance Group .....	37
Table 4.2	Comparison of 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceptions of Impacts by Distance from the Tourist Zone .....	38
Table 4.3	Correlation Between 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Length of Residence and Perceptions of Impacts .....	39
Table 4.4	2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceived Impact Category Means by Place of Birth .....	40
Table 4.5	Comparison of 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceptions of Social Costs by Place of Birth .....	41
Table 4.6	2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceived Impacts of Social Cost Items by Place of Birth .....	41
Table 4.7	Comparison of 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceptions of Social Cost Items by Place of Birth .....	42
Table 4.8	2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Response Frequencies for Levels of Knowledge of Wilmington's Tourism Industry .....	43
Table 4.9	2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceived Impact Category Means by Level of Knowledge of Tourism Industry .....	43
Table 4.10	Distribution of Perceptions of Community Cohesiveness by Knowledge Level Group for 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers .....	44
Table 4.11	Distribution of Perceptions of Economic Benefits by Knowledge Level Group for 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers .....	44
Table 4.12	Distribution of Perceptions of Social Incentives by Knowledge Level Group for 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers .....	45
Table 4.13	Distribution of Perceptions of Social Costs by Knowledge Level Group for 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers .....	46

# Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

Volunteers play an integral role in the provision of tourism products and services. Festivals and special events, often used as catalysts for community-based tourism development, rely heavily on support from volunteers. Therefore, festival managers cannot afford to ignore the vital contributions of volunteers and must work to provide satisfying volunteer experiences to improve recruitment and retention efforts.

Volunteer satisfaction is dependent upon both motivations for involvement and perceptions of the organization or event. These motivations and perceptions are diverse, and volunteer managers must be aware of the heterogeneity of their volunteer pool, because volunteers are an effective internal marketing device for an organization and/or event.

Despite the importance of volunteer involvement in hosting a festival, there is limited research on this topic. Moreover, few studies have been completed on the social or community impacts related to hosting a festival. Gursoy, Kim, and Uysal (2004) stated that, “most of the studies that examined festivals and special events have focused on either the economic impact of festivals and special events ... or the reasons and motivations of people to attend festivals and special events” (p. 172). Understanding volunteers’ perceptions about the impacts of the festival to which they are contributing will be a valuable tool for managers because the attitudes of volunteers toward the festival can influence the festival both positively and negatively.

If volunteers do not perceive the festival to contribute positively to their quality of life, then their concerns should be acknowledged and changes – both to the festival itself and to the volunteer experience – should be implemented accordingly. Therefore, the aim of the present study is to join together three bodies of knowledge – volunteerism, resident perceptions of tourism impacts, and festivals and events– in order to test whether volunteer perceptions of a festival are congruent with research findings on general resident perceptions of tourism impacts.

The study was conducted within the context of the North Carolina Azalea Festival (referred to hereafter as the Azalea Festival), a multi-day festival that occurs annually in Wilmington, North Carolina. A survey was designed to collect information from a sample of volunteers regarding their perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival, level of attachment to the greater Wilmington community, and a number of socio-demographic variables previously identified in the literature as related to resident perceptions of tourism impacts.

The practical outcome of the study is to identify socio-demographic variables that can be easily identified by a volunteer manager and used to assess volunteers' perceptions of the impacts of a festival on the host community.

## **STUDY OBJECTIVE**

The objective of the study is to investigate whether the findings from the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts apply to festival volunteers as a specific subset of residents.

## **GENERAL HYPOTHESIS**

It is hypothesized that results from research on resident perceptions of tourism impacts will be applicable to a sample of Azalea Festival volunteers. The following independent variables will be analyzed with respect to volunteer perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival: distance from the tourist zone, length of residence, birthplace, and level of knowledge of the tourism industry.

## **ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS**

This thesis is organized into five chapters. Chapter One addresses the question of the necessity of a study on festival volunteers as a subset of the general resident population. Also contained in the first chapter is the objective of the study. Chapter Two is a review of the relevant literature from three distinct bodies of research: volunteerism, resident perceptions of tourism impacts, and festivals and special events. The methodology of the study is explained in Chapter Three, including sampling, instrument development, data collection, and limitations. Chapter Four consists of a descriptive summary of the sample, a review of the data analysis conducted to address the testable hypotheses, and relevant statistical findings. Finally, Chapter Five provides a discussion of the practical applicability of the results, methodological considerations, and suggestions for future research.

## **Chapter 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter consists of a review of the relevant literature from three distinct areas: volunteerism, resident perceptions of tourism impacts, and festivals and special events.

#### **VOLUNTEERISM**

##### **Introduction**

This first section will examine the literature on volunteerism through the lens of park and recreation studies. While volunteer research does take place in other fields (e.g., public administration), it was determined that park and recreation studies would provide the most relevant findings, since the volunteer settings in these studies relate most closely with the festival or special event context that is of interest in the present study. Volunteers at festivals and special events play an especially important role in the context of tourism because they are a category of residents in the community with the potential to carry out effective internal marketing of the event or organization.

Individuals, communities, and organizations profit from volunteerism. Individuals are given the opportunity to contribute to the development of social capital (Arai, 2000). Volunteer opportunities also provide a context for co-production, through which governments partner with the citizens they serve to provide public services and programs (Backman, Wicks, & Silverberg, 1997). Public agencies depend on volunteers so that they can continue to provide the services that communities have

come to expect, and some organizations simply could not function without their volunteer base (Silverberg, Ellis, Backman, & Backman, 1999; Auld & Cuskelly, 2001). Organizational benefits of volunteer involvement include the revitalization of stagnant organizations and the facilitation of grass-roots support for organizations, which leads to an improved public image (Auld & Cuskelly, 2001).

Recent trends in volunteer behavior, including a decline in volunteer numbers (together with a rise in demand for volunteers) and increasing complexity of volunteer motivations, point to the necessity of volunteer studies (Auld & Cuskelly, 2001). Understanding motivations for volunteer involvement will assist recreation and leisure service agencies in competing against other volunteer-dependent agencies so that recruitment and retention efforts are directed toward satisfying the needs of potential and current volunteers (Caldwell & Andereck, 1994).

In response to the acknowledgement of the growing importance of volunteers in today's society, researchers have investigated volunteerism with a focus on motivation, satisfaction, and training. The following subsections will review the research findings on these three categories.

### **Motivation**

According to Silverberg et al. (1999), it is “the responsibility of managers to understand the motives of workers in order to effectively recruit individuals to jobs to which they are suited and to empower workers to function effectively as individuals and as members of cooperative teams” (p. 30). Research efforts have been concentrated on the development of volunteer typologies, which have practical utility in that volunteer managers can apply them to their specific volunteer pools to better understand the variety of motivations among their volunteers.

Henderson (1981) looked at the fulfillment of achievement, affiliation, and power needs as three types of motivators for volunteer participation. Using this type of framework to examine a group of volunteers is helpful because it serves as a reminder that volunteers are not part of a homogenous group, but that they have unique goals and needs. She found that female volunteers are motivated by a desire to establish and/or strengthen their relationships with others (affiliation needs), while males are motivated primarily by a desire to take pride in an accomplishment (achievement needs). In general, Henderson concluded that volunteers are motivated by their expectations, namely, what they hope to gain from the volunteer experience. Specifically, the feeling that volunteering was a leisure experience was found to be a motivator for continued volunteer involvement.

Caldwell and Andereck (1994) identified three categories of incentives that motivate people to volunteer: purposive, solidary, and material benefits. Purposive benefits allow volunteers to feel as though they are making a contribution to society, solidary benefits are derived from social interactions and interpersonal relationships forged through volunteering, and material benefits are tangible rewards that result from volunteer involvement. Caldwell and Andereck found purposive benefits to be the strongest motive for joining a voluntary association as well as for continuing membership in such an organization. Solidary benefits were the second most important motive, while material benefits were the least important motive for initiating and continuing volunteer efforts. Based on these findings, the authors suggested that volunteer associations should emphasize the purposive benefits associated with volunteer involvement (i.e., the idea that volunteering provides an opportunity to contribute to society) in their recruitment and retention efforts.

Farrell, Johnston, and Twynam (1998) confirmed the findings of Caldwell and Andereck (1994) through the development of a similar classification of volunteer motivations. Within their sample of volunteers at an elite sporting event, they also found the purposive factor to be the most influential motivator for volunteers.

Using the theory of co-production, defined as “citizen involvement in the production of governmental services” (Silverberg et al., 1999, p. 34), it was suggested that motivation to volunteer is not purely altruistic, and that “co-production motives are present among individuals who provide voluntary services that also serve to directly or indirectly benefit themselves and family members” (p. 31). The three co-production motives included in the typology developed by Silverberg et al. were: “The Department and Community Need Me; Knowledge of Governmental Operations; [and] Benefits to People I Know” (p. 33). These three motives were added to a list of six motives that had already been developed in relation to functional motivation: “Values; Understanding; Social; Career; Protective; Enhancement” (Clary et al., 1997, as cited in Silverberg et al., p. 31). The resultant nine-item motivation typology serves as a reminder that volunteers are looking to contribute in various ways to the betterment of their own lives and to the community at large.

Arai (2000) approached the analysis of volunteer typologies from a political perspective, operating under the premise that volunteering allows citizens to contribute “to the formation of social capital” (p. 328). Social capital is defined as “the features of social life – networks, norms, and trust – that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives” (p. 333).

Based on comprehensive interviews with “Board Volunteers” (volunteer board members) and “Service Volunteers” (non-board members), Arai (2000) identified

seven general themes about the benefits and frustrations experienced by volunteers, which were then used to formulate a typology. The three benefits-based themes were that volunteering:

- provides an opportunity to make a contribution (although Board Volunteers viewed their efforts as a contribution to the community, while Service Volunteers described their contributions as benefiting the organization),
- facilitates the development of knowledge (Board Volunteers) and skills (Service Volunteers), and
- allows for the formation of relationships (pp. 336-338).

Arai also delineated four general themes of frustrations expressed by volunteers (pp. 338-340):

- The nature of the process (i.e., “the slow pace of social change,” p. 338)
- Lack of supports (especially monetary support, which results in a major focus on fundraising, rather than activities that directly support the mission of the organization)
- Personal lack of knowledge (which could be resolved through training)
- Lack of influence (i.e., a feeling that decisions are being made for the community at a higher level)

An analysis of these seven themes resulted in a volunteer typology consisting of three categories of volunteers—Citizen, Techno, and Labour volunteers—with differing benefits and frustrations. In general terms, Citizen volunteers are motivated by their desire to contribute to the community and gain a greater understanding of community issues; Techno volunteers wish to contribute to the organization via their specific skills and abilities; and Labour volunteers, who “are directly involved in

implementing the activities and services of the organization” (Arai, 2000; p. 345), are not as connected to the organizational mission or the way in which the mission corresponds to community issues.

Typologies such as those previously discussed are useful for volunteer managers in their recruitment and retention efforts, since understanding volunteers’ motivations for involvement will affect their resultant satisfaction with their experience.

### **Satisfaction**

Volunteer motivations are typically internal, leaving volunteer managers relatively powerless to control retention based solely on the ability to fulfill motivations. Volunteer satisfaction, on the other hand, can be affected externally through a variety of measures, to be delineated in the following paragraphs.

With an understanding of the benefits that volunteers bring to organizations and communities, Auld and Cuskelly (2001) stressed the importance of studying willingness to initiate and propensity to continue volunteer efforts. The authors found that there are certain measures an organization can take to provide satisfying volunteer experiences, such as offering one-time opportunities for those individuals who are wary of a long-term volunteer commitment, as well as providing adequate training so that volunteers feel that their contribution is meaningful. Satisfied volunteers serve as a solid foundation for a self-sustaining volunteer base, since they are more likely to encourage their friends and family members to volunteer as well. Thus, satisfied volunteers not only portray a positive image of the organization to the general public, but they also have the potential to sway the opinions of

potential future volunteers – an important tool in today’s society, which is facing the predicament of requiring more volunteers, but attracting fewer.

Farrell et al. (1998) had similar recommendations with respect to aspects of the volunteer experience over which volunteer managers have some direct control. The authors identified three areas to consider in relation to volunteer satisfaction: the volunteer experience itself, the organization of the event, and the event’s facilities. Farrell et al. contended that satisfaction “is founded upon a link between motivations and actual experience” (p. 290), suggesting that there are certain elements of the volunteer experience over which managers have some control. When the volunteer experience was well organized and the physical facilities of the event were properly maintained, volunteers reported higher levels of satisfaction. Therefore, while managers may not be able to directly influence volunteers’ motivations for initiating and continuing their involvement with an organization, they do have control over the facilities and the organization of the event, both of which contribute to overall volunteer satisfaction.

## **Training**

Proper volunteer training is imperative because it provides volunteers with the background and skills that allow them to feel that they are making a valuable contribution to the organization and/or the community (Arai, 2000; Auld & Cuskelly, 2001).

Goldblatt (1997) discussed the role that volunteer managers play in recruiting, coordinating, and rewarding special event volunteers. He stressed the necessity of volunteer training, either through an orientation or a comprehensive handbook.

Regular recognition of volunteer contributions is also fundamental to successful management, as it can serve to improve loyalty among volunteers.

In addition to general volunteer training, Getz and Frisby (1988) suggested that it is beneficial to provide management training for volunteer organizers and managers. Consistent with Goldblatt's (1997) suggestions, Getz and Frisby also recommended providing incentives or rewards to volunteers as a form of recognition of their invaluable contributions.

Understanding volunteer motivations and providing training will ideally contribute to a satisfying volunteer experience. Satisfied volunteers play an essential role in promoting a festival or special event to residents and visitors alike.

## **RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS OF TOURISM IMPACTS**

### **Introduction**

As stated above, volunteers comprise a significant subset of the general resident population because of their capacity to act as an internal marketing device for the organizations and events with which they are involved. Festival and special event volunteers' perceptions of tourism impacts are especially important; they serve as front-line representatives of the community due to their increased contact with tourists. This review of the literature on general resident perceptions of tourism impacts will contribute to the present study's goal of understanding volunteers' perceptions of the impacts of festivals so as to improve recruitment and retention.

The following subsections will first explain the overall importance of the study of resident perceptions of tourism impacts, and will then provide a review of research findings on specific sociodemographic and attitudinal variables that have been

associated with resident perceptions: knowledge of the tourism industry, distance from the tourist zone, birthplace, length of residence, and community attachment.

### **General Importance of Resident Perceptions of Tourism Impacts**

The assessment of general resident perceptions of tourism contributes to sustainable tourism development efforts for two primary reasons. First, tourism development must not compromise the overall quality of life of the host community for the sake of economic gain. Secondly, when residents perceive a decline in their quality of life and attribute this decline to tourism development in their community, their negative attitudes toward tourism and tourists can detract from efforts at attracting visitors (Williams & Lawson, 2001, p. 270).

Belisle and Hoy (1980) noted the importance of assessing resident perceptions of tourism impacts, quoting Zehnder's (1976) summary that:

... of all the factors which determine pleasure and enjoyment in travel, there is none more important than the way travelers are treated by the local residents of tourist areas. Their attitudes toward tourists are extremely important; for most of us avoid places where we are not readily accepted (p. 212, as cited in Belisle & Hoy, 1980, p. 85).

Even if there are measures in place to monitor *actual* tourism impacts, Zehnder's remark reminds tourism professionals that how residents *perceive* tourism impacts should also be a major consideration. Resident perceptions of tourism play a central marketing role because resident attitudes will reflect positively or negatively on the community as a tourist destination.

### **Internal Marketing Through Resident Education**

Internal marketing programs are suggested in the literature as one way to monitor resident perceptions of tourism impacts. Snaith and Haley (1999)

recommended that tourism professionals identify those members of the community who do not perceive any benefit from tourism development, and then develop improved methods of educating the public with regard to tourism efforts so that all residents – not just those who benefit personally – might better understand the community benefits of tourism development.

Similarly, Madrigal (1995) stressed that an internal marketing plan must take into consideration the needs of the entire community, not those of residents who benefit from tourism development. The aim of such a marketing plan should be to inform all residents of development plans, rather than to “convert” residents with negative perceptions of tourism.

Perdue, Long, and Allen (1990) also concluded that, “public relations programs aimed at improving tourism’s image with local residents...are a viable means of increasing local support for tourism, particularly among those who will not necessarily or directly benefit from such development” (p. 597).

Supporting these recommendations is Ross’ (1992) finding that residents who perceive more negative personal impacts are more likely to report lower levels of community enjoyment. This conclusion relates to Williams and Lawson’s (2001) observation that a decline in quality of life (in this case decreased community enjoyment) can lead to negative attitudes toward tourists.

### **Knowledge of the Tourism Industry**

Internal marketing efforts are beneficial because they typically consist of a resident education program. The following studies exemplify the consensus in the literature that increased resident knowledge of the tourism industry is associated with support for tourism efforts.

Davis, Allen, and Cosenza (1988) found that those residents with the strongest level of support for tourism, a cluster they called “Lovers,” scored the highest on the five survey questions assessing general knowledge of the tourism industry. Conversely, those with the lowest level of support for tourism, termed “Haters,” scored the lowest on the tourism knowledge assessment questions.

Keogh (1990) found that residents viewed tourism in their community more favorably when they were familiar with both the positive and the negative elements of development. Internal marketing efforts, as described above, provide one avenue for familiarizing residents with all elements of tourism development.

### **Doxey’s Irridex as a Model of Resident Reactions**

The Irridex model was used in Doxey’s seminal study comparing residents’ and visitors’ perceived impacts of tourism in Barbados, West Indies and Niagra-on-the-Lake, Ontario (Williams, 1982).

Ryan (1991, as cited in Burns and Holden, 1995, p. 121) outlined the four stages of Doxey’s Irridex as follows:

1. Euphoria: “visitors are welcome and there is little planning”
2. Apathy: “visitors are taken for granted and contact becomes more formal”
3. Annoyance: “saturation is approached and the local people have misgivings. Planners attempt to control via increasing infrastructure rather than limiting growth”
4. Antagonism: “open expression of irritation and planning is remedial yet promotion is increased to offset the deteriorating reputation of the resort.”

There are two primary arguments against Doxey’s Irridex as a model of resident reactions to tourism development. The first is that the model was designed

under the supposition that resident reactions to tourism development will necessarily worsen with time (Lankford & Howard, 1994). The second is that the model assumes homogeneity among residents (Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Lankford & Howard, 1994). In other words, Doxey did not take into account the fact that residents react differently to tourism development depending on a variety of factors.

While Doxey's Irridex has its limitations, it was a seminal piece because it drew attention to the fact that resident perceptions of tourism impacts cannot be ignored. Since the development of the Irridex, researchers have applied the technique of resident segmentation based on a variety of characteristics: type of contact with tourists (Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Krippendorf, 1987), attitudes toward tourism development (Davis et al., 1988), economic dependence on tourism, and others. Those that will be explored in the following subsections are: distance from tourist zone, birthplace, length of residence, and community attachment.

### **Distance from the Tourist Zone**

The distance between place of residence and the tourist zone appears regularly in the literature on resident perceptions of tourism development. This variable is especially relevant to the study of festivals because these events often take place within a delineated zone, such that impacts are concentrated within a small area.

Pizam (1978), in his seminal study on year-round residents of Cape Cod, Massachusetts, found that those residents who had more contact with tourists – namely, those mid-Cape residents who live closest to touristic activities – had more negative attitudes toward tourism than those residents living in areas of the Cape with fewer activities for tourists.

In contrast, Sheldon and Var (1984) found that residents of North Wales who lived in areas with higher tourist densities had more positive perceptions of tourism. Specifically, these residents “perceive tourism to be more important than other industries, appreciate the increased employment opportunities and see their public facilities in better condition because of tourism. They also are less prone to think that tourists are inconsiderate or unaware of their way of life” (p. 44). This last conclusion relates to the concept of internal marketing; residents with positive attitudes toward tourists contribute to the attractiveness of a tourist destination.

Belisle and Hoy (1980) studied resident perceptions of tourism in Santa Marta, Colombia. They defined their tourist zone in explicit geographic terms, outlining “a three-street ribbon extending along the Santa Marta Beach” (p. 87) as the central tourist zone, then drawing three concentric circles with a radius of 1.5 kilometers each from this beachfront area, resulting in three distance zones. Belisle and Hoy found a significant relationship between distance from the central tourist zone and perception of tourism impacts: the closer residents lived to the tourist zone, the more positively they perceived tourism impacts.

In their research on residents’ opinions on tourism development in the historic city of York, England, Snaith and Haley (1999) also found that residents who lived further from the central tourist zone had a stronger negative opinion toward tourism development.

Aside from Pizam’s (1978) conclusion, the literature supports the statement that residents who live closer to the tourist zone have more positive perceptions of tourism and its impacts.

## **Birthplace**

Studies have indicated that there is a relationship between resident perceptions of tourism impacts and place of birth. Sheldon and Var (1984) concluded “that lifelong residents are more sensitive to the impact of tourism on their way of life” (p. 43). Similarly, Um and Crompton (1987), through their use of birthplace as a component of their operationalization of community attachment, found that residents who were born in the study city perceived tourism impacts more negatively than those who were born elsewhere.

Davis et al. (1988) completed a segmentation study on Florida residents’ attitudes toward tourism. They found that the highest percentage of residents who were born in Florida fell into the category of “Haters” (“extremely negative opinions towards tourists and tourism in general,” [p. 4]), whereas the lowest percentage of native-born residents were categorized as “Lovers” (“pro-tourism and pro-growth,” [p. 4]).

Therefore, the general trend in the literature is that native-born residents have more negative perceptions of tourism impacts.

## **Length of Residence and “Learning to Live With Tourism”**

Similar to the findings on birthplace outlined above, length of residence has also been associated with resident perceptions of tourism impacts. It is consistently concluded in the literature that the longer one lives in a community, the more negative his/her perceptions of tourism impacts will be (Allen et al., 1988; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Um & Crompton, 1987).

Snaith and Haley (1999) interpreted their finding that residents who had lived in the city of York for a shorter period of time were more likely to recognize both the

positive and the negative impacts of tourism as an indication that long-time residents “learn to live with tourism” (p. 602) in their community. Although this might appear to be a beneficial outcome of tourism development, Snaith and Haley warned that, “the marginalisation of the negative could mean hidden frustration, whilst the loss of recognition of the positive may mean lost opportunities for positive word-of-mouth marketing” (p. 602).

Rothman (1978), in his study on resident reactions to seasonal visitors to two Delaware beach communities, concluded that residents of these towns have developed mechanisms to accommodate large numbers of summer tourists. Consequently, they are able to transition from shoulder season to peak season with ease, because coping strategies have been developed over time to adapt to the inconveniences that arise with a temporary increase in population.

Burns and Holden (1995) discussed general coping strategies that residents adopt in order to cope with the crowding inherent in peak-season travel. It was suggested that residents often take their own vacations during peak tourism season, which provides them with the opportunity to rent out their own houses to tourists. Residents can also benefit economically through various entrepreneurial strategies (e.g., selling home-grown fruit and flowers to tourists, renting out a room as a bed and breakfast type facility, charging a fee in exchange for a parking space in their driveway). Residents may change their routines so as to avoid tourists while shopping and running other daily errands. Still others may opt for a “self-imposed hibernation” (p. 118) in order to avoid interaction with tourists altogether.

Brunt and Courtney (1999) interpreted their finding that residents “do not believe that tourism disturbs local activities or creates more vandalism” (p. 503) as

an indicator that residents of the British coastal resort town of Dawlish “are able to adapt to the inconveniences caused by tourism” (p. 503).

While the existing literature does not come to a collective conclusion regarding the direction of the relationship between length of residence and perceptions of tourism impacts, the findings above suggest that there is a relationship of some sort between the two variables.

### **Community Attachment and Tourism Impacts**

Sociologists have two primary models through which to examine community attachment: the linear development model and the systemic model. Proponents of the linear development model contend that increases in population size and density influence community attachment (Toennies, 1887; Wirth, 1938; as cited in Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974), whereas those who support the systemic model argue that it is not population increase but rather length of residence that affects attachment (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974; Sampson, 1988). Kasarda and Janowitz stated that:

Since assimilation of newcomers into the social fabric of local communities is necessarily a temporal process, residential mobility operates as a barrier to the development of extensive friendship and kinship bonds and widespread local associational ties. Once established, though, such bonds strengthen community sentiments (p. 330).

Empirical findings in the sociological body of literature support this statement that, to an extent, community attachment is dependent upon length of residence.

Research in the parks and recreation arena has been shaped by these sociological findings. McCool and Martin (1994) observed the importance of community attachment as “an important component of residents’ quality of life” (p. 29). Community attachment is particularly relevant within the context of tourism,

since tourism is often used as a community development tool. Planners must keep in mind that “the development process should not destroy the values people seek in the community” (p. 29).

While McCool and Martin (1994) recognized the association between length of residence and community attachment, they found that length of residence was not a suitable measure of attachment on its own, since some residents are able to become attached to a community more rapidly than others. Although they did take length of residence into consideration, McCool and Martin employed two additional items to measure attachment. First, they borrowed a question from the instrument of Kasarda and Janowitz (1974), who asked respondents how sorry they would be if they had to move away from their community. They also used a Likert scale to measure responses to the following: “I’d rather live in the town where I live now than anywhere else” (p. 30). In addition to their finding that length of residence could not be used as a singular predictor of community attachment, McCool and Martin found that residents of communities with higher levels of tourism development have the strongest sense of community attachment.

In their study on the relationship between community attachment and perceptions of tourism impacts, Um and Crompton (1987) developed a Guttman scale to measure attachment. Attachment was defined in terms of years of residence, birthplace, and heritage. (German heritage was viewed to be an important component of attachment because the target community was a Texas town founded by German settlers in 1845.) They found that, on the whole, respondents with higher community attachment scores were more likely to perceive tourism impacts less positively than those respondents reporting lower attachment.

## **FESTIVALS AND SPECIAL EVENTS**

### **Introduction**

Despite the growth in popularity of festivals and special events, there has been little research on their impacts on the host community. This section will review the existing literature on festivals and special events as both community and economic development tools.

### **Functions of Festivals and Special Events**

Festivals have long been used as an outlet for community celebration. Turner (1982) stated that, “[w]hen a social group...celebrates a particular event or occasion...it also ‘celebrates itself’” (p.16). Similarly, Yeoman, Robertson, Ali-Knight, Drummond, and McMahon-Beattie (2004) noted that, through celebration, communities solidify themselves in the creation of a common community identity.

In addition to the role of a festival as a community development tool, Getz and Frisby (1988) identified three additional perspectives on the examination of a festival: as an event intended for the enjoyment of the host community, as a leisure activity for visitors, and as an economic development tool. Increasingly, communities have turned to festivals and special events in their search for new ways to generate income.

### **Festival Tourism**

In order for a festival to have a positive economic impact on the host community, attendees must be drawn from outside the area. In other words, the festival must become an event that attracts residents as well as visitors. O’Sullivan and Jackson (2002) provided a definition of festival tourism, which is “a phenomenon

in which people from outside a festival locale visit during the festival period” (p. 325). Therefore, a festival can only be considered a tourism event if a portion of the attendees have traveled from other locations to participate in the festival.

Research on travel behavior has indicated that current travelers are seeking an authentic, unique experience (Travel Industry Association of America, 2003). Authenticity, as defined by Getz (1991), is, “[t]he property of being a genuine cultural event, artifact, or landscape; uncommercialized; not a tourist trap; reflecting the host community’s way of life and self-image” (p. 336). Since tourists are attracted to the “authentic,” it is certainly possible for a festival to maintain its function as a community development tool while simultaneously attracting tourists and tourist dollars to the community. Delamere and Hinch (1994) warned, however, that “festival organizers must not lose sight of the community’s interest in their rush to meet the demands of visitors” (p. 26). For this reason, the study of resident perceptions of the impacts of festivals and special events is significant.

### **Typologies of Festivals and Events**

Dimmock and Tiyce (2001) suggested that there are three types of festivals and events: mega events, hallmark events, and community-based events. An example of a mega event is the Olympic Games, which can affect an entire continent and requires immense resources. Hallmark events are somewhat smaller in scale and are “often developed primarily to enhance awareness, appeal and the profitability of a tourism destination over the short term” (p. 357). Finally, community-based events are smaller in scale than hallmark events and are held with the intention of celebrating the unique features of communities.

Ritchie (1984) defined hallmark events as one-time or recurring events developed to enhance the awareness, appeal, and profitability of a destination. He developed a typology of seven forms of hallmark events: world fairs, unique festivals, major sporting events, significant cultural events, historical milestones, classical events, and political events. Ritchie's definition of a hallmark event encompasses a wider variety of events than that of Dimmock and Tiyce (2001), but both typologies highlight the role of a special event as a showcase of a community's unique offerings.

## **SUMMARY**

Although they are three distinct bodies of literature, the research on volunteerism, resident perceptions of tourism impacts, and festivals and special events all contribute to the understanding of festival volunteers as an important subset of the general resident population. The next chapter will discuss the methodology developed to test the following four study hypotheses on volunteers' perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival.

## **HYPOTHESES**

Based on the findings from the literature outlined above, the following four hypotheses were developed:

1. There will be a significant relationship between driving time to the Cotton Exchange and perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival. Volunteers who live closer to the tourist zone will have stronger perceptions of the positive impacts, while volunteers who live further away from the tourist zone will have stronger perceptions of the negative impacts of the Azalea Festival.

2. There will be a significant negative relationship between length of residence and perceptions of positive impacts; the longer one has lived in Wilmington, the less likely he/she will be to perceive the positive impacts of the Azalea Festival.
3. There will be a significant relationship between birthplace (city) and perceptions of the social costs of the Azalea Festival; volunteers born in Wilmington will have stronger perceptions of the negative impacts of the Azalea Festival.
4. There will be a significant positive relationship between self-reported level of tourism knowledge and perceptions of the positive impacts of the Azalea Festival; volunteers who know more about the tourism industry will have stronger perceptions of the positive impacts of the festival.

## **Chapter 3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter provides descriptions of the present study's population, sampling frame, data collection processes, instrument development, limitations, and proposed statistical analyses.

#### **STUDY POPULATION**

The population was all individuals who volunteered with the North Carolina Azalea Festival, which was held March 31<sup>st</sup> through April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2004 in Wilmington, North Carolina. The Azalea Festival was selected because it is both a community celebration and a tourist attraction, drawing thousands of visitors each year.

#### **SAMPLING FRAMES FOR PRETEST AND STUDY**

The sampling frame for the pretest was a list of names and e-mail addresses of the 82 Azalea Festival committee chairs.

The sampling frame for the study consisted of all volunteers who chose to attend the post-festival Workers' Party, in addition to the pretest sampling frame of committee chairs.

#### **INTRODUCTION TO DATA COLLECTION**

In the present study, data were collected using three methods. First, an e-mail pretest was sent to a sample of committee chairs. Next, a paper-and-pencil questionnaire was distributed at a post-festival event, to which all Azalea Festival

volunteers were invited. Finally, a follow-up e-mail was sent to all committee chairs to obtain data from those who had not yet responded. Table 3.1 summarizes these three methods and shows the number of responses yielded from each.

**TABLE 3.1**  
**Methods of Data Collection from**  
**2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers**

Collection Attempt	Method	Sampling Technique	Number of Responses	Percent of Total Sample
Pretest	E-mail	Systematic sample of committee chairs	12	11.9%
On-site survey	Paper & pencil	Convenience sample	78	77.2%
Follow-up survey	E-mail	Sent to all committee chairs	11	10.9%

## **INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT**

### **Development of E-Mail Pretest Survey Instrument and Potential Limitations**

An e-mail survey instrument was constructed according to Dillman’s (2000) design recommendations for e-mail and Internet surveys. While it is acknowledged that there are limitations to a self-administered e-mail survey (to be enumerated below), the benefits in the present study, including “the nearly complete elimination of paper, postage, mailout, and data entry costs” (p. 352), as well as the quick turnaround time, were judged to outweigh the costs.

### **Pretest Distribution and Outcomes**

A pretest was distributed via e-mail to a systematic random sample of Azalea Festival committee chairs. (Refer to Appendix A for complete pretest instrument.)

Of the 34 surveys that were successfully sent, 14 were returned (12 via e-mail, 2 via postal mail), for a response rate of 41 percent. All 12 e-mail responses were received within two days of the original mailing; the two postal mail responses were received within one week of the original mailing. Since the pretest was primarily exploratory in nature, no follow-up e-mails were sent to non-respondents.

The pretest was a valuable first step for testing the instrument and for refining methods of delivery and receipt. Although the request for suggestions about the content and clarity of the survey instrument did not elicit as many comments as anticipated, three key points were made salient through the process of distribution and collection of responses.

First, the response options to the question regarding length of residence were identified as being non-exhaustive; the pretest did not include a response option for those respondents living outside the greater Wilmington area. This item was revised to include a response option in the final instrument that read, "I do not reside in the greater Wilmington community."

Secondly, several respondents voiced their discomfort with the closed-ended, multiple-choice nature of the survey instrument. In the final instrument, comments were clearly invited in the introduction and a space for comments was provided at the end of the survey.

Finally, the phenomenon of truncated e-mail responses was identified as a potential limitation to the collection of complete, usable data. While there is no way to circumvent the dilemma of e-mails that "bounce" back to the sender due to an error in the address or a problem with the account, this predicament of truncated e-mails seemed to be preventable and potential solutions were investigated. However,

since the majority of the study's responses were collected via paper-and-pencil at the post-festival Workers' Party, this did not prove to be a substantial limitation.

### **Final On-Site Instrument Used in Data Collection**

The final on-site survey instrument, distributed to volunteer attendees at the Workers' Party and then converted into e-mail form and sent to committee chairs and co-chairs to obtain additional data, consisted of three sections, along with an introductory statement and instructions for completion and submission. The three sections were: perceptions of Azalea Festival impacts on the host community, level of attachment to the greater Wilmington community, and additional socio-demographic variables. (See Appendix B for complete on-site survey instrument.)

#### Section I: Perceptions of Azalea Festival Impacts on the Host Community.

The first section of the survey contained 13 statements measuring four categories of perceptions of the Azalea Festival's impacts: community cohesiveness (four statements), economic benefits (three statements), social incentives (three statements), and social costs (three statements). Individual impact statements were measured on a five-point Likert-style scale, anchored at either end with response options of "Totally Disagree" and "Totally Agree," and with a mid-point "Neutral" response option. Twelve of the 13 statements were borrowed from Gursoy et al.'s (2004) instrument designed to measure festival and event organizers' perceptions of the socio-economic impacts of festivals and events on host communities. No overall reliability coefficient was reported for the original instrument; however, acceptable composite reliability scores (from 0.60 to 0.75) were found for all four impact categories. Gursoy et al.'s original instrument contained just two statements measuring social costs: "Increase traffic congestion" and "Put pressure on local

services” (p. 176). A third social cost item was added to the survey in the present study (“The Azalea Festival results in an increase in resource consumption [for example: water, electricity, and waste disposal]”) in order to obtain more comprehensive information about Azalea Festival volunteers’ perceptions of social costs. Table 3.2 outlines the four categories of perceived impacts and their corresponding impact statements.

**Table 3.2**  
**Perceived Impact Categories and Individual Impact Statements**  
**Included on Final Instrument Distributed to 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers**

Perceived Impact Categories	Individual Impact Statements: The Azalea Festival...
Community Cohesiveness	Enhances my community’s image Builds community pride Helps preserve the local culture of Wilmington Generates revenue for civic projects
Economic Benefits	Increases the standard of living in my community Increases employment opportunities Encourages residents to develop new facilities
Social Incentives	Offers family-based recreation activities Promotes local organizations and businesses Provides more recreational opportunities
Social Costs	Puts pressure on local services such as police and fire protection Results in an increase in resource consumption (for example: water, electricity, and waste disposal) Causes a general increase in crowding and congestion in the city of Wilmington

Section II: Level of Attachment to the Greater Wilmington Community. The second section of the instrument was a seven-item Guttman-type scale measuring community attachment, adapted from Jurowski et al.’s (1997) investigation of resident reactions to tourism development in their community. Statements were worded so that, ideally, respondents would be able to make a distinction between

general feelings about the greater Wilmington community and specific sentiments toward the Azalea Festival (e.g., “Apart from the Azalea Festival, what happens in the greater Wilmington community is important to me”). All seven statements were measured using dichotomous true-false responses. Statements reflecting a positive attitude toward the greater Wilmington community received a score of 1, while statements reflecting a negative attitude toward the greater Wilmington community received a score of 0. The possible range of total scores was 0 (no attachment to the greater Wilmington community) to 7 (very high level of attachment to the greater Wilmington community).

Section III: Additional Socio-Demographic Variables. Based upon findings from the literature on host resident perceptions of tourism impacts, the final section of the survey instrument consisted of a series of 10 open- and closed-ended questions pertaining to the following independent variables: distance from the tourist zone, knowledge of the tourism industry in Wilmington, number of years as a volunteer with the Azalea Festival, level of volunteer involvement, duration of annual volunteer commitment, primary motivation for volunteering, gender, age, birthplace, and length of residence in Wilmington.

Distance from the tourist zone was operationalized in the present study as driving time – in minutes – from place of residence to the Cotton Exchange, a collection of restaurants and shops that is a popular tourist destination in historic downtown Wilmington. Knowledge of the tourism industry was self-reported, with three possible response options: “extensive knowledge,” “some knowledge,” or “little or no knowledge.”

## **METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION**

The Workers' Party, held each year to thank all those involved with the Azalea Festival and to celebrate the completion of a successful event, was selected as the setting for on-site data collection. This year's Workers' Party took place on April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2004 in the Warwick Center on the University of North Carolina at Wilmington's campus.

With prior approval from the Workers' Party committee chair, a table was positioned at the front entrance of the venue, near the registration desk, so that potential respondents could be contacted upon arrival. A gift certificate to a local restaurant was used as an incentive to attract attendees to the table. Using a convenience sampling technique, a total of 78 questionnaires were collected. The next week, a follow-up e-mail was sent to all 82 committee chairs, asking them to complete an electronic version of the questionnaire if they had been unable to complete the questionnaire at the Workers' Party (e.g., did not attend, did not have their reading glasses). It was also requested that committee chairs forward the e-mail survey on to their respective committee members, if e-mail addresses were known. (See Appendix C for the follow-up e-mail.) This effort produced 11 additional responses. Due to the small sample size, pretest responses were also included in the sample, for a total sample size of 101.

## **LIMITATIONS**

An initial assumption of the present study was that a sampling frame comprised of a majority of Azalea Festival volunteers' e-mail addresses would be able to be obtained, since it was originally understood that committee chairs relied on e-mail to inform their committee members of meetings and other responsibilities.

Hence, the instrument was designed to be an e-mail survey. One of the fundamental limitations to an e-mail survey, however, is that the questionnaire itself must be kept clear and succinct, since the simplicity of the instrument is directly related to the response rate. Recipients are less likely to respond to an e-mail message that is not “respondent-friendly” (Dillman, 2000, pp. 300-302). Survey length, therefore, influenced construction of the instrument administered in the present study, and the collection of extensive data from individual respondents was not possible.

Another general limitation to an e-mail survey is that those individuals without e-mail access will be inherently excluded from the sampling frame, thereby preventing the attainment of a representative sample of the general population.

A convenience sampling technique was employed in the present study, which limits generalizability since only volunteers who (a) attended the Workers’ Party, or (b) received the follow-up e-mail sent to committee chairs were included in the sampling frame. Moreover, only those volunteers who elected to complete the survey are represented. It is probable that the sample is not representative of the population of all Azalea Festival volunteers. Consequently, there is the potential for bias in the data, whereby the opinions of those volunteers who felt strongly enough about the festival to respond to the requests for information are favored.

A final limitation is the small sample size ( $n = 101$ ). As noted above, responses from the pretest were included in the data analysis; however, due to alterations to the survey instrument from the pretest to the final instrument, some items could be analyzed using only the responses from the on-site and follow-up surveys ( $n = 89$ ).

## **SUMMARY**

This chapter offered a summary of the framework utilized for empirical testing of the hypothesized relationships between socio-demographic characteristics of Azalea Festival volunteers and their perceptions of the positive and negative impacts of the festival.

Chapter 4 will review the results from the statistical analyses conducted on the data, which will provide justification for confirmation or refutation of the study's four hypotheses. The anticipated statistical analyses are as follows: t-tests will be conducted to analyze the statistical significance of the mean differences between the variables of interest for the first and third hypotheses, a Pearson correlation will be used to test the strength of the relationship predicted in the second hypothesis, and a chi-square analysis will be performed to test the association between the variables in the fourth hypothesis.

## **Chapter 4**

### **RESULTS**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter contains a descriptive summary of the sample of Azalea Festival volunteers, followed by an explanation of the statistical analyses conducted to test the four hypotheses of the study. These hypotheses predicted that volunteer perceptions of festival impacts would parallel findings on general resident perceptions of tourism impacts.

#### **SAMPLE OF AZALEA FESTIVAL VOLUNTEERS**

Three methods were used to distribute and collect information. The majority of questionnaires (77.2%) were completed by volunteers at the annual post-festival Workers' Party. The following week, an e-mail was sent to committee chairs to elicit additional responses, which resulted in 11 completed questionnaires (10.9%). Due to the similarity between the pretest and the final instrument, pretest data ( $n = 10$ ) were also used, comprising 11.9% of the final sample of 101 volunteers.

Of the questionnaires that were collected, 50.5% of the respondents were male and 49.5% were female. A majority (51.5%) of the respondents were born in North Carolina, and 23.3% of the sample was born in Wilmington, North Carolina. Respondents ranged from 20 to 76 years of age, with a mean age of 47.2 years. The average length of residence in Wilmington was 24.7 years, with responses ranging from zero to 72 years. Respondents reported an average driving time of 16.6 minutes to the Cotton Exchange (used to represent Wilmington's tourist zone), with a minimum response of one minute and a maximum response of 35 minutes.

Most respondents self-reported that they had some knowledge of the tourism industry in Wilmington (69.3%), with 23.8% reporting extensive knowledge and 6.9% reporting little or no knowledge on the subject.

Respondents averaged 9.34 years of volunteer commitment to the Azalea Festival. In terms of the duration of annual volunteer commitment, 16.1% reported a one-day commitment, 33.3% reported a two- or three-day commitment, and 50.6% reported a commitment of more than three days per year. Committee chairs or co-chairs comprised 41.6% of the sample, while 58.4% of respondents held a non-committee chair role.

The community attachment measure had possible scores ranging from 0 (no attachment to the greater Wilmington community) to 7 (very high level of attachment to the greater Wilmington community). Overall, respondents had a very high level of attachment, with a mean attachment score of 6.49. A majority of the sample (87.1%) had a score of 6 or 7.

The most common motivation for volunteering was “I wanted to make a contribution to the community” (35.6%), followed by “I had family members or friends who were also Azalea Festival volunteers” (31.7%).

## **STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND RESULTS**

### **Introduction**

The preceding chapter explained the development of the instrument used in the present study, which was a three-part survey on Azalea Festival volunteers’ perceptions of the festival’s impacts, attachment to the greater Wilmington community, and additional independent variables selected from the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts. This section will describe the statistical

methods used to analyze data from the first and third sections of the survey in an attempt to determine whether findings from the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts apply to volunteers' perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival on the greater Wilmington community.

As outlined in Chapter 3, perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival were measured using 13 statements corresponding to four impact categories. (Refer back to Table 3.2 to review these statements and impact categories.) In the data analysis, the categories of community cohesiveness, economic benefits, and social incentives were treated as measures of perceived positive impacts (a higher score indicates a stronger positive perception), whereas the category of social costs was considered to be a measure of perceived negative impacts (a higher score indicates a stronger negative perception).

For Hypotheses 1, 2, and 4, the mean scores for the four impact categories were used as the basis for analysis. Hypothesis 3, however, dealt specifically with social costs, so the individual impact statements were analyzed in addition to mean social cost scores.

The following four independent variables (previously identified in the literature as associated with resident perceptions of tourism impacts) were selected for analysis from the third section of the survey: distance from the tourist zone, length of residence, place of birth, and level of knowledge about the tourism industry. These variables were chosen because of their potential for practical utility; it would not be difficult for volunteer managers to assess these variables among their volunteer pool.

All of the statistical analyses reported were conducted using the statistical package SPSS 12.0 for Windows.

## Hypothesis 1

Based on findings from the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts, it was hypothesized that volunteers who lived closer to the tourist zone would have significantly stronger perceptions of the three categories of positive impacts of the Azalea Festival and that volunteers who lived further from the tourist zone would have significantly stronger perceptions of the social costs of the Azalea Festival (Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Snaith & Haley, 1999).

To test whether a relationship existed between distance from the tourist zone and volunteers' perceptions of the positive and negative impacts of the Azalea Festival, the sample was first divided into two groups. Respondents who lived within a 15-minute drive from the Cotton Exchange were classified as "close to the Cotton Exchange" and respondents reporting a driving time greater than 15 minutes were classified as "far from the Cotton Exchange." Group sample sizes, means, and standard deviations for all four perceived impact categories appear in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1**  
**2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceived Impact Category Means**  
**By Driving Distance Group**

Two Driving Distance Groups	Statistic	Community Cohesiveness	Economic Benefits	Social Incentives	Social Costs
Close to Cotton Exchange	Mean	4.3050	3.5533	4.2067	3.7075
	N	50	50	50	49
	Std. Deviation	.50832	.72409	.57888	.86504
Far from Cotton Exchange	Mean	4.3222	3.5455	4.1481	3.8030
	N	45	44	45	44
	Std. Deviation	.62072	.67088	.72319	.65619
Total	Mean	4.3132	3.5496	4.1789	3.7527
	N	95	94	95	93
	Std. Deviation	.56135	.69596	.64835	.77069

A t-test was conducted to compare the means of the two groups for the four perceived impact categories. Table 4.2 displays the statistical output from this test. No statistically significant differences were found; therefore, driving distance to the tourist zone did not affect volunteers' perceptions of the positive or negative impacts of the Azalea Festival.

**Table 4.2**  
**Comparison of 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers'**  
**Perceptions of Impacts by Distance from the Tourist Zone**

Impact Category	t-test for Equality of Means Between Driving Distance Groups						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Community Cohesiveness	-.149	93	.882	-.01722	.11595	-.24748	.21304
Economic Benefits	.054	92	.957	.00788	.14464	-.27938	.29514
Social Incentives	.437	93	.663	.05852	.13380	-.20718	.32422
Social Costs	-.595	91	.553	-.09555	.16063	-.41462	.22353

## Hypothesis 2

The goal of the second hypothesis was to determine whether there was a significant relationship between Azalea Festival volunteers' length of residence in Wilmington and their perceptions of festival impacts. Based on the consensus in the literature that the longer residents live in a community, the more negative their perceptions of tourism impacts will be (Allen et al., 1988; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Um & Crompton, 1987), along with the theory that residents "learn to live with tourism" (Snaith & Haley, 1999, p. 602), it was hypothesized that there would be a negative

correlation between length of residence and perceptions of the positive impacts of the Azalea Festival.

A Pearson correlation was calculated between length of residence and perceptions of all four categories of impacts to determine what type of relationship, if any, existed between these two variables. The small  $r^2$  values, which appear in Table 4.3, indicate that only a small proportion of the variability in perception scores can be explained by a linear relationship with length of residence (i.e., as length of residence increases, perceptions of the positive impacts of the Azalea Festival decrease). Therefore, the data do not support the second hypothesis of a negative correlation between volunteers' length of residence and their perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival.

**Table 4.3**  
**Correlation Between 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers'**  
**Length of Residence and Perceptions of Impacts**

	Perceptions of Impacts				
	Statistic	Community Cohesiveness	Economic Benefits	Social Incentives	Social Costs
Length of Residence	Pearson Correlation ( $r$ )	.042	.140	.138	.183
	$r^2$	.001764	.0196	.019044	.033489
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.707	.205	.211	.099
	N	84	84	84	82

### Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis predicted that volunteers who were born in Wilmington would report higher scores for the perceived impact category measuring social costs

of the Azalea Festival than respondents born outside of Wilmington. This hypothesis was developed based on findings in the literature on birthplace as it affects resident perceptions of tourism impacts (Davis et al., 1988; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Um & Crompton, 1987).

Table 4.4 summarizes the sample sizes for each birthplace group and their mean scores for all four perceived impact categories.

**Table 4.4**  
**2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceived Impact Category Means**  
**By Place of Birth**

Born in Wilmington?	Statistic	Community Cohesiveness	Economic Benefits	Social Incentives	Social Costs
Yes	Mean	4.4286	3.7667	4.3651	3.6984
	N	21	20	21	21
No	Mean	4.2900	3.5022	4.1378	3.7534
	N	75	75	75	73
Total	Mean	4.3203	3.5579	4.1875	3.7411
	N	96	95	96	94

The dependent variable of interest for the third hypothesis was social costs. Therefore, a t-test for equality of means was conducted for this impact category, which showed that the difference in mean social cost perception scores between those born in Wilmington and those born outside of Wilmington was not significant ( $t = -.285, \alpha = .776$ ). Table 4.5 presents the statistical results from this t-test.

**Table 4.5**  
**Comparison of 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers'**  
**Perceptions of Social Costs by Place of Birth**

Impact Category	t-test for Equality of Means Between Birthplace Groups						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Social Costs	-.285	92	.776	-.05501	.19278	-.43790	.32787

The three statements comprising the impact category of social costs were also analyzed. Table 4.6 displays the mean scores for the two birthplace groups for the individual social cost impact statements.

**Table 4.6**  
**Perceived Impacts of Social Cost Items for**  
**2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers by Place of Birth**

Born in Wilmington?	Statistic	Puts pressure on local services	Results in an increase in resource consumption	Causes a general increase in crowding
Yes	Mean	3.29	4.05	3.82
	N	21	22	22
No	Mean	3.53	3.92	3.84
	N	77	77	75
Total	Mean	3.48	3.95	3.84
	N	98	99	97

The t-tests reported in Table 4.7 show that the mean differences between birthplace groups are not statistically significant for any of the three individual social cost statements. Consequently, the data suggest that birthplace does not have a significant effect on volunteers' perceptions of the social costs of the Azalea Festival.

**Table 4.7**  
**Comparison of 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers'**  
**Perceptions of Social Cost Items by Place of Birth**

Social Cost Item	t-test for Equality of Means Between Birthplace Groups						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Puts pressure on local services	-.995	96	.322	-.247	.248	-.739	.246
Results in an increase in resource consumption	.534	97	.594	.123	.231	-.335	.582
Causes a general increase in crowding	-.087	95	.931	-.022	.250	-.519	.475

#### **Hypothesis 4**

The goal of the fourth hypothesis was to test whether volunteers with more knowledge of the tourism industry would have stronger perceptions of the positive impacts of the festival. This prediction was determined based upon findings in the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts (Davis et al., 1988; Keogh, 1990).

As summarized in Table 4.8, the majority of the sample (69.3%) reported that they had some knowledge of the tourism industry in Wilmington. The mean scores for each of the perceived impact categories for the three levels of knowledge appear in Table 4.9.

**Table 4.8**  
**2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Response Frequencies for**  
**Levels of Knowledge of Wilmington's Tourism Industry**

Level of Knowledge	Frequency	Percent of Sample
Little or no knowledge	7	6.9
Some knowledge	70	69.3
Extensive knowledge	24	23.8
Total	101	100.0

**Table 4.9**  
**2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers' Perceived Impact Category Means**  
**By Level of Knowledge of Tourism Industry**

Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	Statistic	Community Cohesiveness	Economic Benefits	Social Incentives	Social Costs
Little or no knowledge	Mean	4.3214	3.9048	4.3810	4.0000
	N	7	7	7	7
Some knowledge	Mean	4.3097	3.5354	4.1990	3.7128
	N	67	66	67	65
Extensive knowledge	Mean	4.3523	3.5152	4.0909	3.7424
	N	22	22	22	22
Total	Mean	4.3203	3.5579	4.1875	3.7411
	N	96	95	96	94

To compare the distribution of responses among the three knowledge groups, perceived impact category means were aggregated within each group and cross tabulations were completed, as displayed in Tables 4.10 through 4.13.

**Table 4.10**  
**Distribution of Perceptions of Community Cohesiveness by**  
**Knowledge Level Group for 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers**

			Grouped Community Cohesiveness Means			Total
			2-2.99	3-3.99	4-5	
Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	Little or no knowledge	Count	0	1	6	7
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	.0%	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
	Some knowledge	Count	1	11	55	67
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	1.5%	16.4%	82.1%	100.0%
	Extensive knowledge	Count	2	0	20	22
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	9.1%	.0%	90.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	3	12	81	96
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	3.1%	12.5%	84.4%	100.0%

**Table 4.11**  
**Distribution of Perceptions of Economic Benefits by**  
**Knowledge Level Group for 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers**

			Grouped Economic Benefits Means				Total
			1-1.99	2-2.99	3-3.99	4-5	
Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	Little or no knowledge	Count	0	0	3	4	7
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	.0%	.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Some knowledge	Count	2	5	37	22	66
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	3.0%	7.6%	56.1%	33.3%	100.0%
	Extensive knowledge	Count	1	4	8	9	22
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	4.5%	18.2%	36.4%	40.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	3	9	48	35	95
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	3.2%	9.5%	50.5%	36.8%	100.0%

**Table 4.12**  
**Distribution of Perceptions of Social Incentives by Knowledge Level Group For**  
**2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers**

			Grouped Social Incentives Means				Total
			1-1.99	2-2.99	3-3.99	4-5	
Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	Little or no knowledge	Count	0	0	1	6	7
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	.0%	.0%	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
	Some knowledge	Count	0	2	14	51	67
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	.0%	3.0%	20.9%	76.1%	100.0%
	Extensive knowledge	Count	1	1	6	14	22
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	4.5%	4.5%	27.3%	63.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	1	3	21	71	96
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	1.0%	3.1%	21.9%	74.0%	100.0%

**Table 4.13**  
**Distribution of Perceptions of Social Costs by Knowledge Level Group**  
**For 2004 Azalea Festival Volunteers**

			Grouped Social Cost Means				Total
			1-1.99	2-2.99	3-3.99	4-5	
Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	Little or no knowledge	Count	0	0	3	4	7
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	.0%	.0%	42.9%	57.1%	100.0%
	Some knowledge	Count	1	9	23	32	65
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	1.5%	13.8%	35.4%	49.2%	100.0%
	Extensive knowledge	Count	1	2	7	12	22
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	4.5%	9.1%	31.8%	54.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	2	11	33	48	94
		% within Knowledge of Tourism Industry in Wilmington	2.1%	11.7%	35.1%	51.1%	100.0%

The small number of respondents reporting “Little or no knowledge” of the tourism industry ( $n = 7$ ), in addition to the low variability among responses (i.e., the general tendency toward high responses), presented a roadblock for statistical analysis. Due to the sample’s inability to meet the qualifications for the intended chi-square analysis, the descriptive statistics in the tables above are the only statistic reported. Specifically, there are many cells in the 3 x 4 table containing fewer than five responses, particularly for the “Little or no knowledge” group. Hypothesis 4 can neither be supported nor refuted using data from this study; however, with a larger sample size or a sample with more variability in its responses, the relationship between volunteers’ knowledge of the tourism industry and perceptions of impacts could be explored.

## **SUMMARY**

This chapter provided a description of the statistical analyses pertinent to the study's four hypotheses. Chapter 5 will include a discussion of these results, particularly conjectures regarding the absence of statistical support for the hypotheses. This lack of statistical significance does not indicate that the present study does not have meaningful results. In fact, the finding that there were no statistically significant differences within the sample of Azalea Festival volunteers has implications for the theoretical and practical significance of the study, to be explained in further detail in the next chapter. Furthermore, applications of the present study's results will be discussed and future research considerations will be proposed.

## Chapter 5

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to test whether the findings from the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts applied to festival volunteers as a specific subset of residents. Little empirical research has been conducted on festival tourism, apart from reports on the economic impact of festivals and special events. Hence, the scholarly aim of the study was to contribute to the literature on festival tourism through the exploration of perceived impacts of festivals on a host community.

The practical aim of the study was to identify specific variables within a group of volunteers that could be used by event managers to better understand volunteer perceptions of festival impacts. This knowledge of perceived impacts would contribute to the creation of satisfying experiences for diverse groups of volunteers, leading to improved recruitment and retention of festival volunteers. Since volunteers play a vital role in the execution of festivals as well as the ongoing marketing and promotion efforts of these events, such understanding of variables that relate to perceived impacts would be valuable.

From the results reported in Chapter 4, it was concluded that there was no statistical support for the first three hypotheses; all were rejected. The fourth hypothesis could be neither supported nor refuted via statistical analysis. Hence, the general statistical conclusion of the study is that findings from the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts do not apply to volunteers' perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival.

The following sections will first discuss the conclusions relevant to each hypothesis. Attempts will then be made to explain why findings from the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts did not apply to the present study's sample of Azalea Festival volunteers and their perceptions of the impacts of the festival on the host community. Methodological recommendations and suggestions for future research will also be proposed.

### **HYPOTHESIS 1: DISTANCE FROM TOURIST ZONE**

The first hypothesis predicted that volunteers who lived closer to the tourist zone (operationalized by driving distance, in minutes, to the Cotton Exchange) would have stronger perceptions of the positive impacts of the Azalea Festival than volunteers who lived further from the tourist zone. As described in the previous chapter, a t-test determined that there were no significant differences in the means for any of the perceived impact categories between volunteers living within 15 minutes of the Cotton Exchange and those volunteers living more than 15 minutes from the Cotton Exchange. Thus, it is concluded that, for the present study's sample of volunteers, distance from the tourist zone does not affect perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival.

One explanation for this conclusion is simply that volunteers differ from the general resident population in their perceptions of tourism-related impacts. It is reasonable to conclude that there would be a difference between volunteers' perceptions of a specific event to which they contribute their time and residents' perceptions of an industry about whose development they might be uninterested.

On balance, volunteers in both driving distance groups agreed with the statements on perceived impacts of the Azalea Festival. None of the impact

category means fell below “Neutral,” implying that respondents had strong perceptions of all categories of impacts of the Azalea Festival on the host community of Wilmington. Table 4.1 illustrated that the lowest total mean score was 3.55 (for the category of economic benefits for all respondents), and the highest mean score was 4.30 (for the category of community cohesiveness for all respondents).

Since no statistically significant difference was found between the driving distance group means in any of the four categories, the distribution of the scores could have been compared between the two groups instead of the mean scores. However, an overwhelming majority of responses fell into the “Agree” and “Totally Agree” options, so even a statistically significant difference in the distribution of scores between groups would not suggest much. The difference between the number of “Agree” and “Totally Agree” responses would not serve as a strong indication of differences between groups, since both response options indicate agreement with the perceived impact statements. For this reason, a statistical analysis of response distributions between driving groups was not conducted.

In the present study, self-selection was twofold. Not only had respondents already indicated some level of support for the festival in their choice to volunteer with the Azalea Festival organization, but also, through the convenience sampling technique employed, they decided to complete the survey. This phenomenon of “dual self-selection” is a limitation of the present study (and any convenience sample of volunteers, for that matter), and it reflects a potential bias in favor of those volunteers with stronger opinions.

For this reason, perhaps the variable of distance from the tourist zone is not pertinent to research on festival volunteers. When sampling from a population of volunteers, researchers must keep in mind that a form of self-selection has already

taken place; volunteers, by definition, have chosen to donate their time and energy to an organization. This choice implies a certain level of dedication. In the case of the present study, Azalea Festival volunteers might not have been as concerned as the general resident population about the distance between their place of residence and the central tourist zone since, through their volunteer commitment, they had already agreed to participate in the festival.

Further investigation of festival volunteers might consider analyzing the relationship between volunteers' amount of contact with tourists (depending on volunteer duty, for example) and their perceptions of the impacts of the festival on the host community.

## **HYPOTHESIS 2: LENGTH OF RESIDENCE**

The second hypothesis predicted that there would be a negative relationship between Azalea Festival volunteers' length of residence in Wilmington and their perceptions of positive impacts of the festival. A Pearson correlation indicated that there was no significant correlation between these two variables. Therefore, findings on resident perceptions of tourism impacts were not applicable to Azalea Festival volunteers' perceptions of the impacts of the festival.

One possible explanation for this finding is that perhaps Azalea Festival volunteers, unlike the general Wilmington population, do not view the event as a tourist attraction but rather as a community celebration. If this is indeed the case, it would follow that volunteers' perceptions of a community celebration's impacts would not resemble residents' perceptions of tourism impacts.

Future research on festival volunteers should first consider how the event is perceived by those who contribute to the planning and execution of the event,

namely, the volunteer cohort along with any other board of directors or planning committee. This information should then be used to establish appropriate research objectives and hypotheses. Getz and Frisby's (1988) information on four ways to examine a festival (as a community development tool, an event intended for the enjoyment of the host community, a leisure activity for visitors, or an economic development tool) could be utilized in a preliminary assessment of this type.

Another possible explanation for the absence of any significant relationship between length of residence and perceptions of Azalea Festival impacts is that long-time residents of Wilmington might not continue their volunteer involvement with the Azalea Festival organization if they did not believe that the festival had positive impacts on the community. It is possible that only those long-time residents with a positive outlook on the Azalea Festival were included in the sample.

Finally, perhaps analysis of length of residence as an independent variable is becoming irrelevant as our society becomes increasingly mobile. In the past, it was not uncommon for people to live in the same town their entire lives, whereas today, frequent relocation is typical. Thus, variables such as perceptions of tourism impacts and community attachment may not be as dependent upon length of residence as they once were.

### **HYPOTHESIS 3: BIRTHPLACE**

The third hypothesis predicted that volunteers born in Wilmington would have stronger perceptions of the negative impacts of the Azalea Festival than volunteers born outside of Wilmington. Through the use of a t-test, no statistically significant differences were found between the means of the two groups. Hypothesis 3 was consequently rejected, which led to the conclusion that birthplace did not have a

significant effect on volunteers' perceptions of the negative impacts of the Azalea Festival.

Similar to the conclusion regarding length of residence, since the sample in the present study is comprised of festival volunteers, it is possible that those residents who were born in Wilmington and have strong negative perceptions of the impacts of the Azalea Festival would not choose to donate their time to the Azalea Festival organization, thereby excluding them from the population of festival volunteers from which the sample was derived.

Additional research on volunteer motivations would be useful with regard to identifying volunteers with some negative perceptions of the impacts of the festival. Individuals whose primary motivation for volunteering is to make a contribution to the community would most likely cease their volunteer commitment if they felt that the event had negative impacts on the community. On the other hand, individuals who identify social motivations for volunteering (i.e., spending time with friends and family, meeting new people) might continue to volunteer even if they did have some negative perceptions of the impacts of the event. An investigation of volunteer motivations would be beneficial to volunteer managers, who could use the resultant information to effectively assign responsibilities according to motivations for volunteering.

#### **HYPOTHESIS 4: KNOWLEDGE OF THE TOURISM INDUSTRY**

With respect to the hypothesis that volunteers with greater knowledge of Wilmington's tourism industry would have stronger perceptions of the positive impacts of the Azalea Festival, no conclusion could be made from the existing data.

The small sample size did not accommodate a chi-square analysis, and only descriptive statistics could be reported.

From the outset, it was acknowledged that a self-reported measure of knowledge of the tourism industry would be problematic. Previous research measured this variable using a battery of questions (see Davis et al., 1988), but because of the attempt in the present study to keep the survey instrument short in length (since it was originally designed as an e-mail survey), it was determined that one question would suffice.

There were two primary limitations to the single self-reported measure of tourism industry knowledge. First is the issue of interpreting the response options; two respondents with similar levels of knowledge might categorize themselves differently due to their different interpretations of “little or no knowledge,” “some knowledge,” and “extensive knowledge.” Secondly, as a result of the small sample size and the unequal distribution across the three response options, predictive statistical analysis could not be performed.

Tables 4.12 through 4.15 in the previous chapter illustrated that a number of cells did not contain the minimum of five responses needed to perform a chi-square analysis. The contents of these tables, however, are still informative regarding the data set of the present study.

Although there were only seven respondents reporting “Little or no knowledge” of Wilmington’s tourism industry, it is interesting that across the four impact categories, there were no mean perception scores lower than 3 (“Neutral”). This statistic suggests that, of the respondents reporting little or no knowledge of the tourism industry, perceptions of all four categories of impacts were strong.

For the levels of “some knowledge” and “extensive knowledge,” the distributions of individual respondents’ means across the four impact categories were, on the whole, quite similar. The category of economic benefits displayed some difference, however, with 22.7% of respondents with extensive knowledge having a mean economic benefits score lower than 3 (meaning that they disagreed with the statements regarding the economic benefits of the Azalea Festival) and only 10.6% of respondents with some knowledge having a mean economic benefits score lower than 3. Although the statistical significance of this distributional difference could not be tested, it is worth noting that, within the sample, respondents with extensive knowledge of the tourism industry were less likely than respondents with some knowledge to agree with the perceived impact statements dealing with the economic benefits of the Azalea Festival.

## **METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Sample Size**

As discussed above, the small sample created some difficulties with statistical analysis. In the future, projected statistical analyses – suitable to the sample size – should be considered in the development of testable hypotheses.

### **Representativeness of the Sample**

Sampling from a population of volunteers is difficult because of the phenomenon of dual self-selection mentioned in the discussion of Hypothesis 1 above. In future studies on volunteers, researchers should strive to obtain data from volunteers in a wide variety of roles and with multiple motivations for volunteer participation. Ideally, this effort would encapsulate a broader range of perceptions,

which would increase the variability of responses and lead to statistically significant results. Response bias should also be taken into consideration, since dedicated volunteers will most likely want to portray the event in the best possible light.

## **CONCLUSION**

Although the present study did not result in any statistically significant findings, the conclusion that findings from the literature on resident perceptions of tourism impacts did not apply to a sample of Azalea Festival volunteers' perceptions of the festival's impacts indicates that there may be some fundamental differences between volunteers and the general population.

Despite their diverse demographic profile, Azalea Festival volunteers had relatively homogenous perceptions of the impacts of the festival. It would be worthwhile to compare volunteer perceptions of the impacts of festivals across a variety of events in order to determine whether homogeneity in volunteer perceptions is a general trend or specific to the Azalea Festival volunteer cohort. In future investigations, festivals could be selected for comparative analysis based upon their age, duration, attendance, and number of volunteers. Additional comparative studies could be conducted to investigate whether there are characteristics that differentiate festival volunteers from volunteers in other types of organizations (civic groups, public recreation departments, art museums or other cultural entities, etc.).

Continued research, with the objective of furthering the understanding of volunteers, will contribute to the development of high quality, satisfying volunteer experiences. Managers of festivals and special events, who rely heavily on volunteer participation, will be able to apply this knowledge to improve their recruitment and retention efforts.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, L. R., Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Kieselbach, S. (1988). The impact of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(1), 16-21.
- Arai, S. M. (2000). Typology of volunteers for a changing sociopolitical context: The impact on social capital, citizenship and civil society. *Society and Leisure*, 23(2), 327-352.
- Auld, C., & Cuskelly, G. (2001). Behavioural characteristics of volunteers: Implications for community sport and recreation organisations. *Australian Parks and Leisure*, 4(2), 29-37.
- Backman, K. F., Wicks, B., & Silverberg, K. E. (1997). Coproduction of recreation services. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 15(3), 58-75.
- Belisle, F. J., & Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents: A case study in Santa Marta, Colombia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7(1), 83-101.
- Brunt, P. & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 493-515.
- Burns, P. M., & Holden, A. (1995). *Tourism: A new perspective*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Caldwell, L., & Andereck, K. (1994). Motives for initiating and continuing membership in a recreation-related voluntary association. *Leisure Sciences*, 16, 33-44.
- Davis, D., Allen, J., & Cosenza, R. M. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests and opinions toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(2), 2-8.
- Delamere, T., & Hinch, T. (1994). Community festivals: Celebration or sellout? *Recreation Canada*, 52(1), 26-29.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dimmock, K. & Tiyce, M. (2001). Festivals and events: Celebrating special interest tourism. In N. Douglas, N. Douglas, & R. Derrett (Eds.), *Special Interest Tourism: Context and Cases* (pp. 355-383). John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd.: Brisbane.

- Farrell, J. M., Johnston, M. E., & Twynam, G. D. (1998). Volunteer motivation, satisfaction, and management at an elite sporting competition. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 288-300.
- Getz, D. (1991). *Festivals, special events, and tourism*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Getz, D. & Frisby, W. (1988). Evaluating management effectiveness in community-run festivals. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27, 22-27.
- Goldblatt, J. J. (1997). Quality event leadership for staff and volunteers. In *Special Events: Best Practices in Modern Event Management* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), (pp.129-140). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Gursoy, D., Kim, K., & Uysal, M. (2004). Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organizers: An extension and validation. *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 171-181.
- Henderson, K. A. (1981). Motivations and perceptions of volunteerism as a leisure activity. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 13(3), 208-218.
- Huang, Y., & Stewart, W. P. (1996). Rural tourism development: Shifting basis of community solidarity. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(4), 26-31.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(2), 3-11.
- Kasarda, J. D., & Janowitz, M. (1974). Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review*, 39(June), 328-339.
- Keogh, B. (1990). Public participation in community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 449-465.
- Krippendorf, J. (1987). *The holiday makers: Understanding the impact of leisure and travel* (V. Andrassy, Trans.). London: Heinemann.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 121-139.
- Madrigal, R. (1995). Residents' perceptions and the role of government. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), 86-102.
- McCool, S. F., & Martin, S. R. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 29-34.
- O'Sullivan, D., & Jackson, M. J. (2002). Festival tourism: A contributor to sustainable local economic development? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(4), 325-342.

- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 586-599.
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourist impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(4), 8-12.
- Ritchie, J. R. B. (1984). Assessing the impact of hallmark events: Conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23(1), 2-11.
- Ross, G. F. (1992). Resident perceptions of the impact of tourism on an Australian city. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(3), 13-17.
- Rothman, R. A. (1978). Residents and transients: Community reaction to seasonal visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(3), 8-13.
- Sampson, R. J. (1988). Local friendship ties and community attachment in mass society: A multilevel systemic model. *American Sociological Review*, 53(October), 766-779.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5, 40-47.
- Silverberg, K., Ellis, G., Backman, K., & Backman, S. (1999). An identification and explication of a typology of public parks and recreation volunteers. *World Leisure and Recreation*, 41(2), 30-34.
- Snaith, T., & Haley, A. (1999). Residents' opinions of tourism development in the historic city of York, England. *Tourism Management*, 20(5), 595-603.
- Travel Industry Association of America (2003). *Geotourism: The new trend in travel*.
- Turner, V. (1982). Introduction. In V. Turner (Ed.), *Celebration: Studies in festivity and ritual*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring residents' attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(1), 27-29.
- Williams, J., & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 269-290.
- Williams, T. A. (1982). Impacts of domestic tourism on host population: The evolution of a model. In T. V. Singh & J. Kaur (Eds.), *Studies in Tourism, Wildlife Parks Conservation* (pp. 214-224). New Delhi: Metropolitan Book Co.
- Yeoman, I., Robertson, M., Ali-Knight, J., Drummond, S., & McMahon-Beattie, U. (2004). *Festival and events management: An international arts and culture perspective*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

**APPENDIX A**  
**E-MAIL PRETEST**

Greetings, Azalea Festival Committee Chair!

You have been randomly selected to receive the following brief survey on your perceptions of Wilmington and the North Carolina Azalea Festival, which I mentioned at last week's Azalea Festival committee meeting (March 15, 2004). I would greatly appreciate it if you could please take five minutes of your time to complete the survey by this Friday, March 26<sup>th</sup>. Your contribution will be an invaluable part of my master's thesis on volunteer involvement in festivals and special events. Additionally, I welcome any suggestions you might have on ways to improve my survey instrument.

There are two ways to complete this survey:

1. Touch the "Reply" command on your computer, enter your responses, and touch "Send."
2. Print this message and return it with your answers to the following address:

Dept. of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management  
c/o Holly Bosley  
NCSU - Box 8004  
Raleigh, NC 27695-8004

Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me (Holly Bosley) at 919-515-6061, or by email at [hebosley@ncsu.edu](mailto:hebosley@ncsu.edu). Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

\*\*\*\*\*

Please indicate whether you find the following statements to be true or false. Please type an "X" anywhere between the brackets that precede the response you wish to select, like this: [X]. Don't forget to hit "Reply" before attempting to enter your responses.

Aside from my involvement with the Azalea Festival, I have negative feelings for the greater Wilmington community.

- True
- False

Other than my outlook on the Azalea Festival, I have no particular feeling for the greater Wilmington community.

- True
- False

Except for my role with the Azalea Festival, I do not think of myself as being from the greater Wilmington community.

- True
- False

Apart from the Azalea Festival, what happens in the greater Wilmington community is important to me.

- True
- False

Not counting my attachment to the Azalea Festival, I have an emotional attachment to the greater Wilmington community - it has meaning to me.

- True
- False

In addition to my commitment to the Azalea Festival, I am willing to invest my talent or time to make the greater Wilmington community an even better place.

- True
- False



To what degree do you agree with the following statements? (Again, please type an "X" anywhere between the appropriate brackets.)

1. The Azalea Festival puts pressure on local services such as police and fire protection.

- Totally agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Totally disagree

2. The Azalea Festival enhances my community's image.

- Totally agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Totally disagree

3. The Azalea Festival increases the standard of living in my community.

- Totally agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Totally disagree

4. The Azalea Festival builds community pride.

- Totally agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Totally disagree

5. The Azalea Festival offers family-based recreation activities.

- Totally agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Totally disagree

6. The Azalea Festival results in an increase in resource consumption, including water, electricity, and waste disposal.

- Totally agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Totally disagree

7. The Azalea Festival helps preserve the local culture of Wilmington.

- Totally agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Totally disagree

8. The Azalea Festival promotes local organizations and businesses.

- Totally agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Totally disagree

9. The Azalea Festival increases employment opportunities.  
[ ] Totally agree  
[ ] Agree  
[ ] Neutral  
[ ] Disagree  
[ ] Totally disagree
10. The Azalea Festival causes a general increase in crowding and congestion in the city of Wilmington.  
[ ] Totally agree  
[ ] Agree  
[ ] Neutral  
[ ] Disagree  
[ ] Totally disagree
11. The Azalea Festival encourages residents to develop new facilities.  
[ ] Totally agree  
[ ] Agree  
[ ] Neutral  
[ ] Disagree  
[ ] Totally disagree
12. The Azalea Festival provides more recreational opportunities.  
[ ] Totally agree  
[ ] Agree  
[ ] Neutral  
[ ] Disagree  
[ ] Totally disagree
13. The Azalea Festival generates revenues for civic projects.  
[ ] Totally agree  
[ ] Agree  
[ ] Neutral  
[ ] Disagree  
[ ] Totally disagree

\*\*\*\*\*

Thank you for your time! Please add any suggestions on the content or clarity of the survey here:

**APPENDIX B**  
**ON-SITE SURVEY INSTRUMENT**



## **NORTH CAROLINA AZALEA FESTIVAL VOLUNTEER QUESTIONNAIRE**

Greetings!

The following brief survey contains a series of questions regarding your involvement with the North Carolina Azalea Festival as well as your perceptions of the greater Wilmington community. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey. We welcome any general comments you might have on your experiences with the Azalea Festival.

Your responses will be kept confidential, and only summary data will be reported.

Your contribution will be an invaluable part of a research project on volunteer involvement in festivals and special events. We hope that the findings will be of use to the Azalea Festival organization in the future. Thank you!

Holly E. Bosley  
hebosley@ncsu.edu  
Graduate Student

Dr. Larry D. Gustke  
larry\_gustke@ncsu.edu  
Associate Professor

*Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management  
North Carolina State University—Box 8004  
Raleigh, NC 27695-8004  
(919) 515-6061*

## AZALEA FESTIVAL QUESTIONNAIRE

**Section I** – This section contains statements on how you feel about the Azalea Festival. Circle the number that represents your response.

**1. The Azalea Festival enhances my community's image.**

Totally Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Totally Agree 5
--------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

**2. The Azalea Festival increases the standard of living in my community.**

Totally Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Totally Agree 5
--------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

**3. The Azalea Festival puts pressure on local services such as police and fire protection.**

Totally Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Totally Agree 5
--------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

**4. The Azalea Festival builds community pride.**

Totally Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Totally Agree 5
--------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

**5. The Azalea Festival offers family-based recreation activities.**

Totally Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Totally Agree 5
--------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

**6. The Azalea Festival results in an increase in resource consumption (for example: water, electricity, and waste disposal).**

Totally Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Totally Agree 5
--------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

**7. The Azalea Festival helps preserve the local culture of Wilmington.**

Totally Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Totally Agree 5
--------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	-----------------------

**8. The Azalea Festival promotes local organizations and businesses.**

Totally Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
1	2	3	4	5

**9. The Azalea Festival increases employment opportunities.**

Totally Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
1	2	3	4	5

**10. The Azalea Festival causes a general increase in crowding and congestion in the city of Wilmington.**

Totally Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
1	2	3	4	5

**11. The Azalea Festival encourages residents to develop new facilities.**

Totally Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
1	2	3	4	5

**12. The Azalea Festival provides more recreational opportunities.**

Totally Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
1	2	3	4	5

**13. The Azalea Festival generates revenues for civic projects.**

Totally Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
1	2	3	4	5

**Section II** – *This section contains a few statements on what you think about the greater Wilmington community. Mark your response with an “X”.*

1. Aside from my involvement with the Azalea Festival, I have negative feelings for the greater Wilmington community.

True  
 False

2. Other than my outlook on the Azalea Festival, I have no particular feeling for the greater Wilmington community.

True  
 False

3. Except for my role with the Azalea Festival, I do not think of myself as being from the greater Wilmington community.

True

False

4. Apart from the Azalea Festival, what happens in the greater Wilmington community is important to me.

True

False

5. Not counting my attachment to the Azalea Festival, I have an emotional attachment to the greater Wilmington community – it has meaning to me.

True

False

6. In addition to my commitment to the Azalea Festival, I am willing to invest my talent or time to make the greater Wilmington community an even better place.

True

False

7. Beyond my contribution to the Azalea Festival, I am willing to make financial sacrifices for the sake of the greater Wilmington community.

True

False

**Section III** – *This last section contains a few general questions about you and your involvement with the Azalea Festival. Mark your response with an “X”, or write in your response when appropriate.*

1. From your place of residence, please estimate the average driving time, in minutes, to The Cotton Exchange:

\_\_\_\_\_ minutes

2. How would you rate your knowledge of the tourism industry in Wilmington?

I have extensive knowledge on this subject.

I have some knowledge on this subject.

I have little or no knowledge on this subject.

3. Including this year (2004), how many years have you volunteered with the Azalea Festival?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

4. How many days per year do you commit to volunteer efforts for the Azalea Festival?

- One day per year
- Two to three days per year
- More than three days per year

5. Are you a committee chair/co-chair for the Azalea Festival?

- Yes
- No

6. Which statement best describes your primary motivation for volunteering with the Azalea Festival?

- I wanted to make a contribution to the community.
- I wanted to learn more about community issues.
- I wanted to use my skills to contribute to the Azalea Festival organization.
- I wanted to gain experience that would be useful in my paid employment.
- I wanted to meet new people.
- I had family members or friends who were also Azalea Festival volunteers.
- None of the above.

7. Are you:

- Male
- Female

8. In what year were you born? \_\_\_\_\_

9. Where were you born (city and state)? \_\_\_\_\_

10. How many years have you lived in Wilmington?

\_\_\_\_\_ years    -or-    \_\_\_\_\_ I do not live in Wilmington.

11. May we contact you via telephone or e-mail as a follow-up to this study?

Yes  
Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

No

***Thank you for your time! Please feel free to add comments about the Azalea Festival or about any of your responses to the above questions:***

**APPENDIX C**  
**FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL**

Greetings! Thanks so much to those of you who completed a volunteer survey at the Workers' Party last Saturday night. Your opinions will help me greatly as I work toward my master's degree at NC State. If you did not attend the party or did not have a chance to fill out a questionnaire, please take a few minutes to complete the following e-survey. Additionally, if you have committee members with whom you communicate via email, I'd appreciate it if you passed this e-mail along to them, as well. There are two ways to complete the survey:

1. Touch the "Reply" command on your computer, enter your responses, and touch "Send."
2. Print this message and return it with your answers to the following address:

Dept. of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management  
c/o Holly Bosley  
NCSU - Box 8004  
Raleigh, NC 27695-8004

Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me (Holly Bosley) at 919-515-6061, or by email at [hebosley@ncsu.edu](mailto:hebosley@ncsu.edu). Thank you in advance for your cooperation!