Empirical Research Article

Tour Leading in South America: Job Inputs and Outcomes

Journal of Travel Research
2020, Vol. 59(7) 1316–1330

DOI: 10.1177/0047287519880018
journals.sagepub.com/home/jtr
SAGE

Brendali Carrillo[1], Carla Barbieri[2], Whitney Knollenberg[2], and Michael B. Edwards[2]

Abstract

Tour Leader's (TLs) performance is a key determinant of tourists' satisfaction. Yet, research on the set of rewards and stressors (job inputs) that TLs experience and how these affect their quality of life and job satisfaction (job outcomes) is scant. This study, framed within the facet analysis model, fills this knowledge gap using data collected from 82 TLs operating in South America. Respondents were satisfied with nonfinancial rewards and perceived low stress levels resulting from their jobs. Although most reported positive psychological outcomes, they also acknowledged a decrease in their quality of convivial life. Analysis indicated that job inputs significantly affected TLs' psychological and convivial well-being and job satisfaction. Study results expand the scholarship of the inputs and outcomes of tour leading and provides managerial and policy insights to increase TLs' quality of life and job satisfaction, which is critical to enhance job performance.

Keywords

facet analysis model, quality of life, reward, stressor, tour leader, well-being, work environment

Introduction

Group package tours are an essential mode of travel for many international tourists, especially in developing countries where tourism is an important contributor to the growth of their economies (Wang et al. 2010). Tour operators create group package tours by combining different travel services (e.g., activities, accommodation, transportation) on preset itineraries that allow independent tourists to travel together within one or more countries (UNWTO 2010). Oftentimes, these itineraries are easy to replicate across companies, making it difficult for tour operators to differentiate themselves from their competition. In such a challenging and competitive market, Tour Leaders (TLs) have emerged as the main element for product differentiation among tour operators (Lin, Wang, and Chen 2008; Luoh and Tsaur 2013; Mossberg 1995; Wang, Hsieh, and Chen 2002; Wong and Wang 2009).

TLs are the tour operator's representatives during the trip; they manage the itinerary logistics and make sure that tourists experience the program as advertised (World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations 2003). In principle, TLs' duties circumscribe to ensuring tourists' safety and satisfaction and facilitating tourists' interaction with host communities and their natural and cultural resources (Luoh and Tsaur 2013; Wong and Wang 2009). Yet, their job is far more complex because it demands performing a wide array of roles, such as psychologist, entertainer, organizer, problem solver, translator, environmental and cultural interpreter, advertising endorser, and mediator (Bowie and Chang 2005; Carnicelli-Filho 2013; Cohen 1985; Curtin 2010; Lin, Wang, and Chen 2008; Mancini 1990; Tsaur et al. 2014; Weiler and Davis 1993).

The job responsibilities of TLs differ from those of Tour Guides, although some may overlap. For example, both TLs and Tour Guides are required to fulfill the expectations of tourists and the institutions they work for (Carnicelli-Filho 2013; Min 2014). Yet, the World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations (2003) makes clear distinctions between TLs and Tour Guides in terms of work environment, responsibilities, and training. In brief, Tour Guides work in a specific location and are trained to provide information on that particular place, requiring them to be officially recognized or licensed by a local authority (World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations 2003). In contrast, TLs are charged with the coordination and management of a tour's itinerary, which entails accompanying tourists across different destinations (World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations 2003). They do not need a license nor are they required to have any specific training to perform their job. The multiple functions, expectations, and skills that TLs must develop to fulfill their

[1]School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas, Lima, Peru
[2]Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

Corresponding Author:
Carla Barbieri, PhD, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, North Carolina State University, Campus Box 8004, 3028D Biltmore Hall, Raleigh, NC 27695-8004, USA.
Email: Carla_Barbieri@ncsu.edu

job requirements sets them apart from Tour Guides and makes TLs prone to specific work environment inputs and outputs deserving of deep scrutiny.

TLs in South America play a key role in the smooth operation of group package tours because adverse human events (e.g., local suppliers' noncompliance, riots) and natural disasters (e.g., earthquakes, landslides) commonly occur. To cope with these challenges, TLs must make use of their personal traits (e.g., empathy, patience) and professional skills (e.g., organization, networks). TLs' efforts to overcome the breadth of challenges encountered during trips may result in a mix of intense stressors that threaten their physical and emotional stability (Tsaur and Lin 2014; Wang et al. 2010; Wong and Wang 2009). At the same time, TLs often report that the job is very rewarding because of the array of social, educational, and travel opportunities provided (Mancini 1990; Wong and Wang 2009).

Both rewarding and stressful experiences in the workplace produce outcomes that affect employees' well-being and subsequent job performance. TLs' well-being and job performance are important issues to consider at multiple levels, yet there has been limited research dedicated to understanding this relationship in the context of TLs. At the individual level, there is growing concern across the tourism industry about physical, mental, and social well-being of employees because of working long hours under stressful conditions (Janta et al. 2011; Kara et al. 2013). It is especially important to assess stress levels among TLs because their job performance is an important influencer of tourist satisfaction (Cheng et al. 2016; Curtin 2010; Mossberg 1995; Tsaur and Lin 2014; Tsaur et al. 2014; Wong and Wang 2009).

At an organizational level, there has long been an emphasis on understanding the relationship between employee well-being and employee turnover, a chronic and costly challenge for tourism employers (O'Neill and Davis 2011). Additionally, retention of high-performing employees can act as a means of competitive advantage for tourism operators (McCole 2015). Broadly, at the destination level, group travel continues to be the medium through which many visitors experience a destination. Therefore, TLs' job performance may play a pivotal role in shaping visitors' experience with and image of a destination (Pereira 2015). Despite TLs' importance in the tourism industry and existing evidence indicating that tour leading affects TLs' well-being and job satisfaction (Tsaur and Lin 2014; Wang et al. 2010; Wong and Wang 2009), information is not readily available about the extent or influencers of those impacts.

Thus, this study was designed to measure the collective rewards and stressors (job inputs) that tour leading produces and their impacts in TLs' well-being and job satisfaction (job outcomes). This study was conducted in South America for two reasons. First, during the past 10 years this region had a 4.3% average annual growth in their international tourist arrivals (UNWTO 2019). Second, TLs play a pivotal role in South American international tourism, as some countries in the region rely on group tour providers to attract and service a majority of their visitors (PROMPERU 2015). However, there is a dearth of information related to TLs in this region, which is important to fill given the key role of TLs' performance in tourists' satisfaction. As such, this study contributes to the existing knowledge of employees' well-being within the tour leading environment and provides managerial intelligence to tour operators to enhance TLs' job satisfaction and performance. In doing so, tour operators can increase their business success by reducing costs associated with employees' turnover (Wong and Wang 2009; Yen et al. 2015) and retaining the best performers who help differentiate their product. Study findings are also important to inform tourism policies to safeguard TLs' careers (e.g., ensure job security), a critical need in developing countries where traveling with a TL is an increasing trend among international tourists (Wang et al. 2010).

Literature Review

The Facet Analysis Model: Job Inputs and Outcomes

The organizational management literature stresses the need to examine the effect of the work environment (job inputs) on individuals (job outcomes) when investigating issues related to employees' well-being and organizational effectiveness (Beehr 1995). According to the facet analysis model (Beehr and Newman 1978), the work environment contains elements that are likely to cause stress, which employees may experience at the psychological and physical levels. Such stress can have human consequences manifested in employees' psychological, physical, and behavioral well-being, as well as organizational consequences evidenced by the effect of employees' behavior on the company (e.g., absenteeism). These consequences can trigger adaptive responses of the employee, the organization, or third parties to remedy stressful situations. Given the complexity of responsibilities that TLs encounter, the facet analysis model is suitable to evaluate the set of job inputs, both positive and negative, that TLs encounter which may affect their quality of life (job outputs). By integrating theories from other disciplines, organizational management in this case, important contributions can be made to tour leading research (Chen, Weiler, and Black 2018).

The work environment also produces a set of rewards that can be intrinsic, when emanated from within the employee, or extrinsic when produced by others, such as customers or employers (Guzzo 1979; Ivancevich, Matteson, and Konopaske 2008; Reif 1975). The hospitality literature commonly differentiates between financial (e.g., bonus, salary) and nonfinancial (e.g., public recognition, promotion) rewards, especially when investigating the performance of frontline employees (Bustamam, Teng, and Abdullah 2014;

Chiang and Birtch 2008). Although overall rewards can be used to encourage employees' positive behavior and recruit or retain the right employees (Chiang and Birtch 2008), it is important to uncover employees' preferences (Zingheim and Schuster 1995). Evidence indicates that some individuals are more satisfied with financial rewards (Chau 1977; Dong, Droege, and Johnson 2002; Gunlu, Aksarayli, and Perçin 2010; Lam, Zhang, and Baum 2001) whereas others favor nonfinancial rewards (Chiang and Birtch 2008; Chuang, Yin and Dellmann-Jenkins 2009).

Job rewards and stressors produce collective positive and negative outcomes on employees. Job rewards are positive to the extent that employees perceive them as valuable (Bustamam, Teng, and Abdullah 2014; Rice, Frone, and McFarlin 1992). Although job rewards overall provide employees with a sense of fulfillment with their performance (Armstrong 2010; Jaques 1961), financial rewards tend to increase job satisfaction (Bustamam, Teng, and Abdullah 2014) and nonfinancial rewards stimulate extra-task performance (Chiang and Birtch 2008). Conversely, job stressors produce negative outcomes that affect employee's psychological, physical, or behavioral well-being. Negative psychological outcomes relate to poor employees' mental health, predominantly depression and burnout (Beehr 1995; Ivancevich, Matteson, and Konopaske 2008). Common physical outcomes include cardiovascular diseases, gastrointestinal disorders, and respiratory problems (Chandola, Brunner, and Marmot 2006; Ivancevich, Matteson, and Konopaske 2008). Negative behavioral outcomes include adverse patterns of conduct, like drug abuse and eating disorders (Siegrist and Rödel 2006), as well as aggressive or withdrawal behaviors, like hostility and absenteeism (Chen and Spector 1992; Gupta and Beehr 1979; Hemingway and Smith 1999).

Job outcomes, both positive and negative, have a direct effect on employee's work performance and the organizational climate (Beehr and Newman 1978). Yet, job outcomes manifested during high-stressed work situations may have repercussions in employee's personal lives (Beehr 1995; Mottaz 1985) by constraining their leisure time (Vrijkotte, Van Doornen, and De Geus 2000), damaging their health (Bosma et al. 1998), and diminishing their interpersonal relationships (Beehr and Newman 1978; Karatepe and Baddar 2006). However, the effects of the work environment on employees are not straightforward as personal attributes (e.g., demographics, job characteristics, and physical health conditions) influence employees' perceptions of job inputs and their consequent outcomes (Beehr 1995; Chiang and Birtch 2008; Fox, Spector, and Miles 2001; Görgens-Ekermans and Brand 2012; Ivancevich, Matteson, and Konopaske 2008; Lam, Zhang, and Baum 2001; Yates, Tennstedt, and Chang 1999).

Investigating the job input-outcome relationship is critical because its effect on individuals' well-being in their multiple life domains (e.g., family, leisure, and job) can produce consequences beyond individuals' lives. Employees' satisfaction with their job determines their productivity, orientation toward organizational goals, and general work stability (Bustamam, Teng, and Abdullah 2014). Thus, increasing employees' job satisfaction not only has the potential to improve their well-being but to also benefit the companies they work for (Edirisooriyaa 2014; Ivancevich, Matteson, and Konopaske 2008). Since life domains are interrelated, any positive or negative effect over one might affect the others (Karatepe and Baddar 2006; Karatepe and Kilic 2007; Lin, Wong, and Ho 2013), which can further expand the impacts of the work environment on employees' family or personal realms.

Job Inputs and Outcomes of Tour Leading

The work environment of tour leading posits a variety of unique inputs (rewards and stressors) that are different from other jobs. Although TLs' rewards are still unexplored, Mancini (1990) highlights the opportunity to travel to exotic places, enjoy beautiful scenery and fine cuisine, and receive monetary compensation. For TLs, job stressors are often caused by undesirable incidents that happen during the trip, which jeopardize the operation of the group package tours and affect their well-being (Tsaur and Lin 2014; Wang et al. 2010). TLs' job stressors can emerge from the group tour they are leading or their tour company. Stressors originated while guiding a tour can be caused by the TLs themselves (e.g., missing a bus due to negligence), the tourists (e.g., unpunctuality) or exogenous factors (e.g., theft incidents); the latter deemed as the most intense because they are beyond TLs' control and tend to occur unexpectedly (Wang et al. 2010). Stressors emerging from tour operators can be related to managerial decisions, such as rescheduling, or operational mistakes, such as wrong booking (Tsaur and Lin 2014).

The extant literature indicates that the tour leading produces several positive and negative job outcomes that have not been studied profoundly (Tsaur and Lin 2014; Wang et al. 2010; Wong and Wang 2009). A sense of achievement perceived as the result of overcoming challenges has been identified as a valuable positive outcome for TLs (Mancini 1990; Wong and Wang 2009). Conversely, Tsaur and Lin (2014) state that reduced quality sleep, chronic indigestion, and menstrual cycle disorder (for female TLs) are the common negative outcomes that TLs experience because of job stressors. Likewise, research on the effect of personal attributes in the job input–outcome related to tour leading is limited (Mancini 1990; Tsaur and Lin 2014). Wong and Wang (2009) concluded that male and female TLs are equally capable of displaying the necessary emotions to deal with job stress, although tourists perceive female TLs as more relaxed and carrying less tension (Wong and Lee 2012). Job background also influences perceptions of job inputs and outcomes as years of experience foster the development of

professional skills that can improve TLs' capacity to manage stressors (Min 2010; Wong and Wang 2009).

In brief, evidence in the literature indicates that the work environment of tour leading produces a set of rewards and stressors unique to this profession, whose outcomes may affect TLs' well-being and job satisfaction. However, information on TLs' job inputs and outcomes is inconclusive because of its limited scope and nongeneralizable results. First, most studies have focused on stressors (Tsaur and Lin 2014; Wang et al. 2010; Wong and Wang 2009) instead of rewards (Mancini 1990), and no study has simultaneously examined both types of inputs. Second, available studies have been conducted in geographic areas (e.g., Asia, Europe) with different work conditions and regulations (e.g., salary policies) than South America. Third, the outcomes of tour leading are still an unexplored arena. Finally, the scholarship has not advanced into studying the personal attributes associated with job inputs and their consequent outcomes.

The scarce information on the input-outcome relationship in the tour leading work environment calls for further investigation (Wong and Wang 2009) because it can affect TL's job performance and, ultimately, tourists' satisfaction with the group package tour (Bowie and Chang 2005; Curtin 2010; Mossberg 1995; Su et al. 2014; Tai 2014; Tsaur and Teng 2017; Wang et al. 2007). Levels of satisfaction among tourists may lead to behaviors and attitudes like level of customer loyalty, repurchase intentions, and word-of-mouth descriptions, which altogether affect the reputation of tour operators (Mossberg 1995; Wong and Wang 2009; Tai 2014). Therefore, managing the job inputs of tour leading can have positive repercussions over the set of actors involved in the delivery of tourism services, including the TLs themselves, the tourists, the tour operators, and the overall tourism sector of countries where group package tours are the preferred mode of travel. Thus, this study will fill a gap in the literature by identifying specific rewards, stressors, and outcomes that affect TL's well-being and job satisfaction. Findings will assist tour operators to improve their reward management systems and design training strategies to reduce levels of stress (Min 2014), which ultimately can maximize TLs' job satisfaction.

Research Methods

This study elucidates on the extent to which the work environment affects TLs' well-being and job satisfaction. To do so, this study was designed to (1) evaluate the rewards and stressors (job inputs) that TLs perceive from their work environment; (2) assess the perceived impact of the work environment on TLs' well-being and job satisfaction (job outcomes); (3) test associations between TLs' personal attributes and job inputs and outcomes; and (4) identify whether TLs' job inputs are associated with job outcomes. The study population was TLs who currently operate or had previously operated in South America. Given a complete list of TLs in that region is not available, non-probability purposive sampling was used, which although useful for this study prevents generalization to the entire population (Vaske 2008). First, an initial pool of participants was identified from the personal network of one researcher ($n = 56$) who used to work as a TL in the region. To implement a snowball sampling approach, these TLs were asked to refer to the survey other TLs in their own networks (Hair, Bush, and Ortinau 2006). To expand the number of potential participants, tour operators in South America were asked to forward the survey to their TLs.

Survey Instrument and Procedures

Framed within the facet analysis model (Beehr and Newman 1978) that calls for contextualizing assessments to specific work characteristics, a survey instrument was developed to capture the unique set of job inputs and outcomes that TLs experience. A series of scales were developed to measure the inputs (rewards, stressors) that were described in the literature, as well as the outcomes (well-being and job satisfaction) that TLs may experience. Given the extensive use of the facet analysis model in different work environments, convergent validity of the constructs was not performed during the pretesting. Financial (5 items; e.g., salary) and nonfinancial (11 items; e.g., praise from tourists) rewards (Bustamam, Teng, and Abdullah 2014; Mottaz 1985) were queried using 5-point Likert-type satisfaction scales (1 = very unsatisfied to 5 = very satisfied). Stressors identified in the literature (Beehr and Newman 1978; Tsaur and Lin 2014; Wang et al. 2010; Wong and Wang 2009) related to the TLs' roles (10 items, e.g., managing the tour budget), the nature of the job (6 items; e.g., constant packing/unpacking), tourists' behaviors (5 items; e.g., tourists' ailments), and external factors (9 items; e.g., strikes) were assessed using a series of 5-point unidirectional scales (1 = not stressful; 5 = extremely stressful).

Job outcomes were operationalized as indicators of well-being and job satisfaction. A series of 5-point Likert-type scales (1 = decreased significantly; 5 = increased significantly) were used to assess psychological (9 items; e.g., anxiety), behavioral (7 items; e.g., alcohol consumption), and convivial (3 items; e.g., quality of family life) well-being (Beehr and Newman 1978; Ivancevich, Matteson, and Konopaske 2008). Overall job satisfaction was queried using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = very unsatisfied; 5 = very satisfied). The survey also collected personal information in terms of demographics, including respondent's age in years and level of formal education through four categories. Given that respondents spanned different regions, economic standing was queried through a 5-point scale describing participants' spending and saving capacity (e.g., I earn enough to cover my basic needs) suitable for global contexts (Barbieri and Sotomayor 2013). Job background

was queried in terms of years of experience, typical tour length, and typical group size.

A research team member who is a native Spanish speaker translated the survey instrument from English into Spanish. A second research team member, who is also a native Spanish speaker, reviewed the translation. The instrument was entered into a web-based survey platform and was pretested among Spanish speakers for face validity. Pretesting revealed that the survey could be completed in about 10 minutes. After some wording adjustments, the survey was deployed in late 2017. The initial sample of TLs working in South America was sent a generic link to the survey and a request to send the link to members of their own networks meeting the inclusion criteria of the study. Considering TLs may have various non-active time during their trips, participants were allowed to respond to the survey in several sessions. The generic link did not allow tracking of the number of eligible respondents from the initial contact list, so the response rate was unknown. Three reminders were sent to the contact list during the period of data collection, following the Tailored Design Method for online surveying (Dillman, Smyth, and Christian 2014).

Data collection spanned seven weeks and yielded 101 responses; 82 valid responses were obtained after removing seven cases for not fitting the study criteria (i.e., never worked as TLs, no work experience in South America) and 12 because of incompleteness (less than one-third of the instrument completed). Given that the population of TLs is not available, nonresponse bias was checked by comparing the key demographic and job background variables of the first and late waves of respondents (Armstrong and Overton 1977). Statistical results indicate no significant differences on the gender ($p = 0.895$), age ($p = 0.455$), education level ($p = 0.742$), and economic standing ($p = 0.488$) between groups. Likewise, tests show that both groups are statistically similar regarding their years of experience as TLs ($p = 0.841$), the last time they lead a group ($p = 0.738$), and their job modality—freelance versus permanent ($p = 0.639$).

Data Preparation and Statistical Procedures

The study sample included participants who work or have ever worked as TLs. Since active and inactive TLs may have fundamental background differences, preliminary analysis were conducted to evaluate the suitability of treating them as a homogenous group. The statistical comparison between active (have led a tour within the past year) and inactive (have not led a tour in the last year) showed no significant differences in their key demographic and job background variables. Statistical results indicate no significant differences on their age ($p = 0.411$), education level ($p = 0.101$), economic standing ($p = 0.830$), years of experience as TLs ($p = 0.093$), and whether they mostly work under freelance or permanent contract ($p = 0.083$). Although the proportion of females among inactive TLs was significantly larger as compared to active TLs ($p = 0.025$), this difference was not deemed to prevent treating both groups as one.

Analyses for this study included descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to profile respondents in terms of demographic and job background characteristics and to summarize job inputs and outcomes. Cronbach's alphas were computed to test the internal reliability of each dimension of rewards (financial, nonfinancial), stressors (job roles, nature of the job, tourists' behaviors, external factors), and outcomes (psychological, behavioral, convivial). A minimum alpha of 0.600 was deemed acceptable because of the small sample size (Leech, Barrett, and Morgan 2005). A dimension composite mean was calculated by averaging the scores of each of its comprising items for use in further analysis. To confirm the suitability of treating active and inactive TLs as one group, a series of *t*-tests were performed to compare the rewards and stressors between both groups.

A series of multiple linear regressions were used to address study objectives. The first set of regressions examined the extent to which respondents' demographics (age, education level, economic situation) and job background (group size, trip length, years of experience) predict job inputs in terms of satisfaction with financial and nonfinancial rewards and levels of stress resulting from TLs' roles, the nature of the job, tourists' behaviors, and external factors. The second set of linear regressions tested the relationships between respondents' demographics and job background and job outcomes in terms of psychological, behavioral, and convivial well-being and job satisfaction. The last set of linear regressions examined the relationships between job inputs (independent variables) and job outcomes (dependent variables). The sample size exceeded the minimum of five cases per independent variable for multiple linear regressions (Garson 2014) for each of the study models.

Results

Most respondents were male (58.4%), between 31 and 40 years old (69.3%; $M = 37.1$ years old), and with high levels of formal education (Table 1). About one-half (48.0%) held an undergraduate degree and 10.4% had a graduate degree. In terms of economic situation, 43.4% lived with some comfort but did not have saving capacity, and 34.2% lived with some comfort and had saving capacity. The larger proportion of respondents (42.8%) were either married or living with a partner at the time of the study, while 29.9% were single and not in a stable relationship. Most respondents were active TLs (67.1%) and worked freelance (86.4%; Table 2). Respondents were almost evenly distributed between those with fewer than six years of experience (54.9%) and six years or more (45.1%). A typical tour for respondents was composed of 11–15 passengers (56.1%) and had a duration of 15–21 days (55.6%). The vast majority of participants

Table 1. Sociodemographic Profile of Respondents.

Sociodemographic Indicators	Number	Percent
Gender ($n = 77$)		
Female	32	41.6
Male	45	58.4
Age, years ($n = 75$)		
25–30	7	9.3
31–35	22	29.2
36–40	30	40.1
41–45	12	16.0
46–53	4	5.4
Mean (in years)	37.1	
Level of education ($n = 77$)		
High school	1	1.3
Technical degree (3 years)	31	40.3
Undergraduate degree (5 years)	37	48.0
Graduate degree	8	10.4
Economic situation ($n = 76$)		
I am barely getting by	2	2.6
I earn enough to cover my basic needs	11	14.5
I live with some comfort, but I cannot save money	33	43.4
I live with comfort and I am able to save some money	26	34.2
Income is not a problem for me	4	5.3
Relationship status ($n = 77$)		
Single and not in a stable relationship	23	29.9
Single in a stable relationship	9	11.7
Married or living with a partner	33	42.8
Divorced or separated	12	15.6
Widowed	0	0.0

Table 2. Professional Profile of Respondents.

Professional Indicators	Number	Percent
Tour leader status ($n = 82$)		
Active (led a tour led in the last year)	55	67.1
Inactive (led a tour at least 1 year ago)	27	32.9
Work modality ($n = 81$)		
Freelance	70	86.4
Permanent	11	13.6
Years of experience ($n = 80$)		
<3	14	17.5
3–5	30	37.4
6–10	23	28.8
≥ 11	13	16.3
Mean (in years)	6.4	
Typical group size (n = 82)		
1–5 passengers	2	2.4
6–10 passengers	20	24.4
11–15 passengers	46	56.1
≥ 16 passengers	14	17.1
Typical trip length, days ($n = 81$)		
1–7	4	4.9
8–14	23	28.4
15–21	45	55.6
≥ 22	9	11.1
Main countries of operation[a] ($n = 77$)		
Peru	63	81.8
Bolivia	56	72.7
Mercosur standing members [b]	27	35.1
Other South American countries	37	48.1
Countries outside South America	3	3.9

[a]Percentage adds to more than 100% because respondents could include several countries.
[b]Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay.

reported Peru (81.8%) and Bolivia (72.7%) as their main countries of operation. More than one third (35.1%) worked in countries of the Southern Common Market–MERCOSUR–trade bloc (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay), and in other South American countries (48.1%).

Work Environment Inputs: Rewards and Stressors

Respondents were overall satisfied with the *Nonfinancial* rewards they obtain from tour leading ($M = 4.02$, SD = 0.50; $\alpha = 0.802$) while neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the *Financial* rewards ($M = 3.18$, SD = 0.62; $\alpha = 0.664$; Table 3). Individually, the most satisfying rewards were all nonfinancial in nature, namely seeing their tourists happy ($M = 4.71$), visiting exciting places ($M = 4.55$), receiving praise from tourists ($M = 4.54$), and the opportunity for constant learning ($M = 4.53$). Tips ($M = 3.61$) and salary ($M = 3.60$) were the most satisfying financial rewards. Most respondents (55.5%) were unsatisfied with the insurance for accidents they have ($M = 2.46$). No significant differences were found on the financial ($p = 0.595$) and nonfinancial ($p = 0.352$) between active and inactive TLs.

Overall, respondents did not perceive tour leading as a very stressful job (Table 4). Considered by dimensions, *External Factors* generated the highest levels of stress ($M = 3.15$, SD = 0.63; $\alpha = 0.796$), especially because of issues at border crossing ($M = 3.73$), theft incidents ($M = 3.70$), strikes ($M = 3.64$), and transportation accidents ($M = 3.53$). More than one quarter reported that constant changes in altitude (28.2%; $M = 2.22$) and weather conditions (31.2%; $M = 2.08$) were not stressful. Stressors related to *Tourists' Behaviors* ($M = 3.01$, SD = 0.79; $\alpha = 0.805$) followed. About half of respondents (46.8%) reported that tourists superseding TLs' authority was very or extremely stressful ($M = 3.24$). Not being on time and ailments were the lowest tourist-related stressors, although both still at moderate levels ($M = 2.84$).

Table 3. Respondents' Levels of Satisfaction with the Rewards of Tour Leading.

Job Rewards (n = 82) [a]	Very Unsatisfied, %	Unsatisfied, %	Neutral, %	Satisfied, %	Very Satisfied, %	M [b]	SD
Nonfinancial Rewards (α = 0.802)							
Seeing my tourists happy	1.2	1.2	1.2	18.3	78.1	4.71	0.68
Visiting exciting places	2.4	0.0	6.1	23.2	68.3	4.55	0.82
Praise from tourists	0.0	0.0	8.8	28.8	62.4	4.54	0.66
Constant learning	1.2	0.0	2.5	37.0	59.3	4.53	0.67
Working outside of an office	0.0	0.0	7.4	40.7	51.9	4.44	0.63
Autonomy to make decisions	2.5	4.9	14.6	39.0	39.0	4.07	0.98
Support from other TLs	0.0	3.7	24.4	41.5	30.5	3.99	0.84
Praise from managers	4.9	3.7	36.6	29.2	25.6	3.67	1.06
Time off during trips	2.5	13.6	34.6	42.0	7.4	3.38	0.90
Promotion opportunities	3.7	21.3	34.9	26.3	13.8	3.25	1.06
Training opportunities	8.6	21.0	35.8	27.2	7.4	3.04	1.07
Composite Mean						4.02	0.50
Financial Rewards (α = 0.664)							
Tips	2.5	6.1	34.1	42.7	14.6	3.61	0.90
Salary	1.2	16.3	16.3	53.7	12.5	3.60	0.95
Meal allowance	6.2	19.8	34.6	34.6	4.8	3.12	0.99
Commissions for sales	3.7	12.3	58.1	22.2	3.7	3.10	0.80
Insurance for accidents	23.5	32.0	22.2	19.8	2.5	2.46	1.13
Composite Mean						3.18	0.62

[a] All financial and nonfinancial rewards (M = 3.60; SD = 0.49; α = 0.837).
[b] Measured on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 = very unsatisfied to 5 = very satisfied.

Characteristics of tour leading itself, either due to the *Nature of the Job* (M = 2.68, SD = 0.68; α = 0.813) or *Job Roles* (M = 2.52, SD = 0.64; α = 0.846) did not appear as major sources of stress. All items related to the *Nature of the Job* were perceived to generate slight-to-moderate levels of stress, long rides being the highest stressor (M = 2.92) and constant packing/unpacking the lowest one (M = 2.36). Stress related to *Job Roles* showed more variation. Collecting tips for others (M = 3.22) and being responsible for tourists' safety (M = 3.10) were perceived as moderately stressful; facilitating the interaction between tourists and locals (M = 1.70) and giving information about the destination (M = 1.52) were seen as not or slightly stressful. No significant differences were found between active and inactive TLs on stress emanated from external factors (p = 0.180), tourists' behaviors (p = 0.383), the nature of the job (p = 0.273), or their multiple job roles (p = 0.394).

Work Environment Outcomes: Tour Leaders' Well-being and Job Satisfaction

Overall, respondents were satisfied (48.0%) or very satisfied (29.9%) with their tour leading job (M = 3.88, SD = 1.12). Cronbach's tests yielded acceptable-to-strong internal reliability in the *Psychological* (α = 0.855), *Behavioral* (α = 0.680), and *Convivial* (α = 0.669) well-being dimensions, after two items (i.e., healthy diet, exercise) were removed from the *Behavioral* dimension (Table 5). Within the *Psychological* well-being dimension (M = 2.81, SD = 0.77), a large proportion of respondents reported positive outcomes, namely, having experienced at least some increase in their self-esteem (68.8%; M = 3.97) and at least some decrease in depression (48.7%, M = 2.41). Conversely, most reported having increased their mental fatigue (55.1%; M = 3.37) due to their job.

Respondents reported few subtle changes in their *Behavioral* well-being due to their tour leading jobs (M = 2.85, SD = 0.62). One third reported at least some increase in their caffeine consumption (36.3%; M = 3.19) and one quarter some decrease in their use of tobacco (26.2%; M = 2.65), gambling activities (24.6%; M = 2.62), or use of recreational drugs (25.0%; M = 2.61). Similar proportions of participants indicated having increased (32.9%) and decreased (30.1%) their consumption of alcohol as a consequence of their tour leading job (M = 2.96). Results indicate that tour leading exerts negative outcomes in the *Convivial* well-being of TLs (M = 2.36, SD = 0.86). The majority of respondents reported a decrease in their quality of social (51.3%; M = 2.75), family (63.1%; M = 2.22), and romantic (63.0%; M = 2.12) lives due to their jobs.

Personal Attributes Associated with Job Inputs and Outcomes

Multiple linear regressions indicated that TLs' personal attributes were associated with level of satisfaction with

Table 4. Levels of stress perceived from tour leading.

Job Stressors ($n = 82$)	Not Stressful, %	Slightly Stressful, %	Moderately Stressful, %	Very Stressful, %	Extremely Stressful, %	M^a	SD
External Factors ($\alpha = 0.796$)							
Issues at border crossings	3.9	7.7	25.6	37.2	25.6	3.73	1.05
Theft incidents	3.9	6.5	20.8	53.2	15.6	3.70	0.95
Strikes	3.8	7.7	29.5	38.5	20.5	3.64	1.02
Transportation accidents	5.2	6.5	32.5	41.5	14.3	3.53	1.00
Delays in transportation	2.6	21.8	33.3	38.5	3.8	3.19	0.91
Natural disasters	7.7	15.4	37.2	29.4	10.3	3.19	1.07
Sexual harassment	11.7	16.9	35.0	28.6	7.8	3.04	1.12
Constant changes in altitude	28.2	35.8	24.4	9.0	2.6	2.22	1.04
Constant changes in weather	31.2	37.6	26.0	2.6	2.6	2.08	0.96
Composite Mean						3.15	0.63
Tourists' Behaviors ($\alpha = 0.805$)							
Superseding TLs' authority	8.9	21.5	22.8	30.3	16.5	3.24	1.22
Unreasonable demands	5.0	30.0	25.0	30.0	10.0	3.10	1.10
Misunderstanding instructions	3.8	22.5	42.4	26.3	5.0	3.06	0.92
Not being on time	7.5	26.3	42.4	22.5	1.3	2.84	0.91
Ailments	12.5	26.3	33.7	20.0	7.5	2.84	1.12
Composite mean						3.01	0.79
Nature of the Job ($\alpha = 0.813$)							
Long rides	5.1	27.8	40.5	22.8	3.8	2.92	0.93
Variable monthly income	5.0	30.0	38.7	22.5	3.8	2.90	0.94
Long work hours per day	6.3	26.3	44.9	17.5	5.0	2.89	0.94
Multitasking	13.7	38.8	33.8	11.3	2.4	2.50	0.96
Limited free time during trips	11.3	42.4	35.0	8.8	2.5	2.49	0.90
Constant packing/unpacking	21.3	37.4	28.8	8.8	3.7	2.36	1.03
Composite mean						2.68	0.68
Job Roles ($\alpha = 0.846$)							
Collecting tips for others	7.3	19.5	30.5	29.3	13.4	3.22	1.13
Being responsible for tourists' safety	6.1	22.0	36.6	26.8	8.5	3.10	1.04
Solving problems while touring	7.3	28.0	39.0	19.5	6.2	2.89	1.01
Keeping the group entertained at all times	17.3	28.3	27.2	21.0	6.2	2.70	1.17
Managing the tour budget	14.6	29.3	40.2	13.4	2.5	2.60	0.98
Handling the trip logistics	13.4	34.1	37.8	13.4	1.3	2.55	0.93
Leading large groups	19.8	33.3	28.4	12.3	6.2	2.52	1.13
Leading long trips	23.5	32.1	29.6	12.3	2.5	2.38	1.06
Facilitate the interaction between tourists and locals	43.9	45.2	8.5	2.4	0.0	1.70	0.73
Give information about the destination	57.4	34.1	7.3	1.2	0.0	1.52	0.69
Composite mean						2.52	0.64

[a]Measured on a 5-point scale (1 = not stressful; 5 = extremely stressful). All job stressors: $M = 2.82$; $SD = 0.58$; $\alpha = 0.910$.

financial ($R^2 = 0.291$, $p = 0.001$) and nonfinancial ($R^2 = 0.209$, $p = 0.014$) rewards (Table 6). No significant associations were found between participants' personal attributes and any of the job stressors dimensions. When controlling for other variables, TLs' demographics appeared as significant predictors of TLs' satisfaction with the financial and nonfinancial rewards of their job. Specifically, negative associations were found between age and satisfaction with nonfinancial rewards ($\beta = -0.347$, $p = 0.029$) and between education level and satisfaction with financial rewards ($\beta = -0.289$, $p = 0.008$). Conversely, the better the TLs' economic situation, the more satisfied they were with their financial rewards ($\beta = 0.391$, $p = 0.001$). In regard to job background indicators, the longer the trips respondents led, the lower their satisfaction with nonfinancial rewards was ($\beta = -0.388$, $p = 0.003$) but also the higher levels of stress related to the nature of the job ($\beta = 0.332$, $p = 0.016$) and tourists' behaviors ($\beta = 0.398$, $p = 0.004$). Analyses showed no significant associations between participants' personal attributes and their job outcomes.

Table 5. Respondents' Perceived Changes in Their Well-being Due to Their Tour-Leading Job.

Job Outcomes (n = 78)	Decreased Significantly, %	Decreased Some, %	Stayed the Same, %	Increased Some, %	Increased Significantly, %	M[a]	SD
Psychological Well-being (α = 0.855)							
Self-esteem	3.9	2.6	24.7	29.9	38.9	3.97[c]	1.05
Mental fatigue	7.7	14.1	23.1	43.6	11.5	3.37	1.11
Suppressed emotions	7.7	7.7	44.9	28.2	11.5	3.28	1.03
Anxiety	10.3	14.1	38.4	23.1	14.1	3.17	1.16
Fears	14.3	11.7	50.6	19.5	3.9	2.87	1.02
Frustration	16.9	23.4	31.1	14.3	14.3	2.86	1.27
Anger	19.5	13.0	44.1	20.8	2.6	2.74	1.08
Boredom	26.3	19.7	32.9	11.8	9.3	2.58	1.26
Depression	33.8	14.9	33.8	12.2	5.3	2.41	1.23
Composite mean						2.81	0.77
Behavioral Well-being (α = 0.680)[b]							
Caffeine intake	7.2	7.2	49.3	31.9	4.4	3.19	0.91
Sleeping issues	12.0	6.7	58.7	13.3	9.3	3.01	1.03
Alcohol consumption	16.4	13.7	37.0	23.3	9.6	2.96	1.20
Use of medicine	12.9	4.3	65.7	11.4	5.7	2.93	0.95
Use of tobacco	26.2	0.0	61.5	7.7	4.6	2.65	1.10
Gambling	23.1	1.5	67.7	6.2	1.5	2.62	0.96
Use of recreational drugs	25.0	0.0	67.2	4.7	3.1	2.61	1.02
Composite mean						2.85	0.62
Convivial Well-being (α = 0.669)							
Quality of social life	23.7	27.6	11.8	23.7	13.2	2.75	1.40
Quality of family life	26.3	36.8	26.3	9.2	1.4	2.22	0.99
Quality of romantic life	32.9	30.1	30.1	5.5	1.4	2.12	0.99
Composite mean						2.36	0.86

a. Measured on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 = decreased significantly to 5 = increased significantly.
b. Healthy diet ($M = 2.57$; $SD = 1.18$) and Exercise ($M = 2.47$; $SD = 1.29$) were removed to increase reliability.
c. The reverse mean for self-esteem ($M = 2.03$) was used to calculate the reliability and mean of the Psychological dimension to reflect opposing direction of this item as compared to the others.

Table 6. Respondents' Personal Attributes Associated With Job Inputs.

Independent Variables: Personal Attributes	Dependent Variables: Job Inputs (standardized β and significance)					
	Rewards		Stressors			
	Financial	Nonfinancial	Job Roles	Nature of the Job	Tourists' Behaviors	External Factors
Demographics						
Age	−0.015	−0.347*	−0.066	0.126	0.057	−0.004
Education level	−0.289*	−0.175	0.064	0.005	−0.074	−0.019
Economic situation	0.391*	0.044	0.020	0.070	0.037	−0.184
Job Background						
Number of tourists per trip	–0.156	0.054	−0.078	−0.133	−0.113	−0.107
Number of days per trip	−0.190	−0.388*	0.125	0.332*	0.398*	0.188
Years of experience	−0.022	−0.056	0.023	−0.113	−0.016	−0.097
Model Statistics						
R	0.539	0.457	0.169	0.334	0.381	0.322
R^2	0.291	0.209	0.029	0.111	0.145	0.104
p value	0.001	0.014	0.923	0.236	0.101	0.282

*$p < 0.050$.

Table 7. Participants' Work Environment Inputs Associated with Job Outcomes.

	Job Outcomes (Standardized β and Significance)			
Independent Variables	Psychological Well-being	Behavioral Well-being	Convivial Well-being	Job Satisfaction
Rewards				
Financial	0.015	−0.279**	0.074	−0.081
Nonfinancial	−0.223*	0.108	0.139	0.290**
Stressors				
Job roles	0.106	0.092	−0.413**	−0.299*
Nature of the job	0.218	0.074	0.178	0.011
Tourists' behaviors	0.272*	0.125	−0.143	−0.048
External factors	−0.201	−0.072	−0.037	0.127
Model Statistics				
R	0.531	0.325	0.481	0.418
R^2	0.281	0.106	0.232	0.175
p value	<0.001	0.243	0.005	0.032

*$p < 0.100$, **$p < 0.050$.

Associations between Job Inputs and Outcomes of Tour Leading

Simultaneous multiple linear regressions resulted in three significant models indicating that TLs' satisfaction with the rewards and levels of stress their job produce (inputs) were associated with well-being and job satisfaction (outcomes). Specifically, job inputs were found to be associated with psychological ($R^2 = 0.281$, $p < 0.001$) and convivial ($R^2 = 0.232$, $p = 0.005$) outcomes and with overall job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.175$, $p = 0.032$); analysis did not yield a significant model between job inputs and behavioral outcomes (Table 7). When controlling for other variables, respondents' level of satisfaction with financial rewards showed a negative association with their behavioral job outcomes ($\beta = –0.279$, $p = 0.044$). Satisfaction with nonfinancial rewards was found to be negatively associated with TLs' psychological outcomes ($\beta = −0.223$, $p = .080$) and positively associated with their overall job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.290$, $p = 0.037$). The more stress TLs perceived from their multiple job roles, the lower were the quality of their convivial relationships ($\beta = −0.413$, $p = 0.007$) and overall job satisfaction ($\beta = −0.299$, $p = 0.055$). Levels of stress coming from tourists' behaviors were positively associated with participants' psychological outcomes ($\beta = 0.272$, $p = 0.054$).

Discussion

Beehr and Newman (1978) call for the contextualization of the facet analysis model in different work environments. Results indicated that facet analysis model of job stress was suitable to identify the mix of inputs and outcomes that tour leading produces as well as to shed light on the extent to which the rewards and stressors of this work environment affect TLs' well-being and job satisfaction. Findings confirmed that the opportunity to visit exciting places is one of the main job rewards of tour leading (Mancini 1990) and that TLs are mainly affected by stressors that emerge from factors outside of their control (Wang et al. 2010). It was also confirmed that a negative association exists between level of education and satisfaction with financial rewards (Lam, Zhang, and Baum 2001). Most importantly, the application of the facet analysis model to the tour leading work environment enabled the identification of new job inputs and outcomes and reaffirmed the necessity to include context in such evaluation, which enriches the scholarship related to tour leading and provides insights to enhance this job in the ground.

Discussion of Scholarly Contributions

Regarding job inputs, this study found that seeing tourists happy provided high satisfaction to the TLs in this sample, which is important considering that delivering happiness is a basic duty of tour operators (Bowie and Chang 2005) and that tourists highly appreciate TLs' effort in that regard (Holloway 1981; Quiroga 1990; Wong and Lee 2012). Yet, TLs in this sample were only slightly satisfied with tourists' tips, which is difficult to manage because they depend on tourists' discretion (Bowie and Chang 2005; Wang et al. 2010). This study also identified four new stressors of tour leading. Two were derived from external factors (border crossings and strikes). These situations are common for TLs in South America, and their importance calls for further examination to determine their extent in other geographies. The other two emerged from TLs' job roles. Collecting tips for others (e.g., drivers, local guides) that may be related to the pressure that

TLs feel to increase the income of local people (Holloway 1981; Wong and Lee 2012) and being responsible for tourists' safety, which is linked to the major reason tourists choose to travel in group package tours (Quiroga 1990; Wang et al. 2010). Being in large groups and undertaking long trips are major burdens of packaged tour providers (Quiroga 1990). Yet, leading tours with such characteristics did not appear as remarkably high stressors in this study, maybe because they represent higher financial earnings to TLs (Wang and Chen 2002).

Although it was previously suggested that tour leading produces several positive and negative outcomes that altogether affect TLs' well-being and job satisfaction (Tsaur and Lin 2014; Wong and Wang 2009), this study provides a holistic evaluation of these outcomes and is the first one to frame such an investigation within the facet analysis model. Positively, the depression decrease and self-esteem increase that TLs reported is notable. Given respondents' overall low stress and high satisfaction with nonfinancial rewards, these results are consistent with the organizational literature stating positive correlations between job stress and depression (Ivancevich, Matteson, and Konopaske 2008) and positive correlations between satisfaction with job rewards and self-esteem (Bakker et al. 2000). The array of negative psychological outcomes TLs reported (e.g., increased mental fatigue) and their positive association with levels of stress derived from tourists' behaviors is in line with the paramount effort TLs place to satisfy tourists' demands (Wong and Wang 2009). Yet, the greatest burden that the work environment exerts on TLs relates to the quality of their convivial life in their social, family, and romantic realms. TLs in this sample reported decreases in the quality of their romantic lives. Considering most of the TLs in the sample also reported being in a stable relationship, the potential impact of job conditions on family stability may be concerning. Stressors related to the many roles TLs perform exerted the most negative effect on their convivial outcomes, which aligns with the limited time they have to invest on their interpersonal relationships while traveling (Tsaur and Lin 2014).

The significance of tour leading inputs found in this study challenges existing knowledge in other industries and geographies, which reaffirms the importance of contextualizing studies related to the work environment (Beehr and Newman 1978; Diener, Oishi, and Lucas 2003). Results of the TLs' work environment indicate major differences with those stated in the hospitality sector. TLs reported greater satisfaction with nonfinancial job rewards than with financial ones, which is the opposite of that in the prevailing literature of frontline hotel employees (Bustamam, Teng, and Abdullah 2014). Unlike workers in the hospitality sector (Chiang and Birtch 2008), financial rewards did not appear to impact the overall job satisfaction of the TLs in the study sample. Finally, the impact of personal attributes on employees' assessment of the overall job inputs and outcomes of tour leading was less pronounced than those reported in the hospitality sector (Chiang and Birtch 2008; Lam, Zhang, and Baum 2001).

From a geographic perspective, TLs' slight satisfaction with their salary appears to be an improved condition compared to the dissatisfaction reported among Asian TLs (Wong and Wang 2009). This result may stem from differences in contract conditions, as TLs in South America tend to receive a fixed daily salary for the duration of the itinerary, regardless of their hiring conditions, whereas Asian freelance TLs' incomes depend on tourists' tips and suppliers' commissions. Conversely, study respondents reported low to moderate levels of stress related to tourists' behaviors (e.g., lateness) and the nature of the job (e.g., long rides), which are consistently reported as major stressors in Asia (Bowie and Chang 2005; Tsaur and Lin 2014; Wang et al. 2010; Wong and Lee 2012; Wong and Wang 2009) and beyond (Cohen 1985; Holloway 1981; Lin, Wang and Chen 2008). Contrary to evidence garnered among Taiwanese TLs (Tsaur and Lin 2014; Wong and Wang 2009), work environment does not appear to have major effects in the behavioral well-being (e.g., sleeping issues) of TLs in South America. Yet, the negative association between length of the trip and quality of convivial life confirms similar reports across regions, which stems from the difficulty to maintain personal relationships while away from home for long periods (Tsaur and Lin 2014).

Practical Implications

The identification of the unique mix of job inputs and outcomes from this study provides managerial intelligence to improve the job performance. Low levels of satisfaction with the nonfinancial and financial rewards tour operators have control over (e.g., praise, insurance) suggest they can improve their rewards systems to improve job performance and satisfaction. For example, tour operators can develop monthly newsletters to recognize the achievements of outstanding TLs by highlighting creative ways to overcome specific challenges or to satisfy unique tourists' requests. Such public recognition would increase TLs' pride and create a space for community learning, resulting in a boost in job performance. Results indicating that the older and more educated the TL the lower the satisfaction with nonfinancial and financial rewards, respectively, suggest the need to revise rewards systems to retain TLs with accumulated on-the-field expertise. Considering education level in the rewards system is of special relevance as it also showed a significant negative effect on overall job satisfaction.

Results also provide managerial insights on how to increase TLs' quality of life. Since longer trips tend to increase TLs' levels of stress and decrease job satisfaction and convivial life, it is suggested that tour operators schedule varied length itineraries for their TLs to prevent job burnout, which ultimately can decrease their job performance. Given that external factors were the most stressful for participants, this study echoes Wang et al. (2010) in encouraging tour

operators to train their TLs in simulated risk scenarios and to constantly remind them and their tourists of the potential risks involved in the trips.

The decrease in TLs' quality of convivial life suggests that tour operators should give their TLs opportunities to spend quality time with their families without threatening their job security. It is suggested that the perks that tour operators usually receive (e.g., courtesy hotel stays) are packaged and passed to their TLs as paid family weekend getaways, which they can include within the reward systems. As a whole, these practical suggestions contribute to the advancement of efforts to improve the individual well-being of tourism employees (Janta et al. 2011). Additionally, they provide tour operators with organizational-level policies that may help to address the challenges of reducing employee turnover (O'Neill and Davis 2011) and increasing competitive advantage (McCole 2015).

The study results also provide policy insights at the destination level. Of special concern is the high levels of stress that TLs experience at border crossings given that most TLs were operating in the MERCOSUR region, whose alliance is supposed to guarantee the free movement of citizens across their borders. Therefore, it must be stressed that government agencies of South American countries find a way to facilitate the flow of TLs across their borders. The low level of satisfaction that TLs reported with their job insurance shows the overall lack of legal protection they have in their jobs. This finding aligns with previous studies that have illustrated that most tourism and hospitality employees are dissatisfied with the level of insurance provided by their employer, which can contribute to employee turnover (Namasivayam, Miao, and Zhao 2007; Jaworski et al. 2018). As such, this finding reaffirms the need to expand the existing knowledge of the quality of life of the tourism workforce at the macro level, such as labor regulation, that receive the least attention (Baum et al. 2016). Certainly, the lack of legal protection calls for developing policies to guarantee TLs' safety, especially considering the risks of a job that involves a large proportion of time on the road. It is pertinent and important to acknowledge that the suite of managerial and policy suggestions aforementioned are intended to enhance the well-being and job satisfaction of TLs, which in turn can contribute to the growth of the international tourism industry in South America.

Study Limitations and Insights for Future Research

Study findings and implications related to TLs' work environment and its effects on their well-being and job satisfaction should be interpreted with caution in view of the study limitations. First, the absence of a directory of TLs or any formal agency prevented from determining the size of the study population and the proportion of surveyed TLs. Although the snowball sampling technique was an effective method to surpass the minimum number of respondents for conducting multiple linear regressions (Garson 2014), the small sample size reduces the power of these analyses. Using a nonprobability sample also prevents the generalization of the study results (Vaske 2008). It is especially pertinent to stress that the results are not intended to be generalized across South America because of the diverse nature of the countries in this region. As such, future studies should consider investigating TLs' inputs and outcomes in specific regions or countries to control for political, legal, and economic intervening factors. Second, the initial contact list was composed of professional acquaintances of one researcher, which may have led to social biases (Nederhof 1985), especially when reporting behaviors that are socially unacceptable (e.g., alcohol consumption). Third, job outcomes of tour leading were based on TLs' perceptions at the time that they took the survey. Thus, participants' emotional state at the given moment could have influenced their responses.

Study results call for future examination of TLs' physical job outcomes (e.g., chronic stomachache) moving beyond perceptions into actual health indicators (e.g., imbalanced heart rate). To do so, it is suggested to first use qualitative methods to identify physical occurrences that TLs experience, followed by experimental designs to measure physical variations before and after treatments (e.g., long trips) and across time. As evidence indicated the influence of personality traits over employees' perceptions of job inputs and outcomes (Diener, Oishi, and Lucas 2003; Ivancevich, Matteson, and Konopaske 2008), future research should examine that association for TLs. Likewise, future studies may consider testing for the impact of emotional intelligence, especially among females, on the stress caused by tour leading as it was found to be a key coping strategy among female tour guides (Min 2010, 2014).

Future studies should also expand on the examination of the influence of job satisfaction. This study examined overall job satisfaction as a job outcome, but could also be an intervening variable of job outcomes. When conducting future research on TLs, it is suggested to maintain a multidisciplinary approach, like in this study, as a mix of academic constructs (e.g., work-family conflicts) were found to intermingle in TLs' well-being. Study results that contrast existing evidence in other regions across the globe and in other industries reaffirms the need to contextualize future studies; thus, it is suggested to replicate this study in other locations as well as other industries complementary to tourism (e.g., restaurants). In doing so, it would be advisable to investigate specific contextual factors (e.g., preponderance of commissions for sales) using qualitative methods of inquiry.

Conclusion

Tour leading entails the escorting of tourists across different destinations, usually crossing national borders, in a safe and enjoyable manner. At first glance, tour leading looks like an

ideal job because of the unique rewards it offers, especially the opportunity to visit exciting places. Yet, TLs' work environment exposes them to unique stressors (e.g., natural disasters, long working hours without supervision) that make this job a very challenging one. Although the literature stressed the importance of TLs for the tourism industry (Tsaur et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2010), little was known about the extent to which the job environment of tour leading affected TLs' well-being and job satisfaction. This study took a step forward by measuring the effect of job rewards and stressors in TLs' well-being and job satisfaction using a multidisciplinary approach framed within the facet analysis model (Beehr and Newman 1978).

In doing so, this study enhanced our understanding of tour leading by identifying four new job stressors emanating from the nature of the TL job (collecting tips for others, being responsible for tourists' safety) and from external sources (border crossing and strikes). Contextualizing the study results, the main study conclusion is that leading tours in South America is a very rewarding and not very stressful job. Yet, the benefits of this job come at the expense of negative outcomes that affect TLs' lives within and beyond their work environment, especially in terms of decreased quality of their convivial life. The information that emerged in this study also delivered several managerial and policy suggestions intended to improve tour TLs' well-being and job satisfaction, which in turn can contribute to job performance and ultimately the economies of South American countries with strong tourism receipts.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iDs

Carla Barbieri https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8079-2316
Whitney Knollenberg https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1551-9262

References

Armstrong, M. 2010. *Armstrong's Handbook of Reward Management Practice: Improving Performance through Reward*. London: Kogan Page.

Armstrong, J. S., and T. S. Overton. 1977. "Estimating Nonresponse Bias in Mail Surveys." *Journal of Marketing Research* 14 (3): 396–402.

Bakker, A. B., C. H. Killmer, J. Siegrist, and W. B. Schaufeli. 2000. "Effort–Reward Imbalance and Burnout among Nurses." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 31 (4): 884–91.

Barbieri, C., and S. Sotomayor. 2013. "Surf Travel Behavior and Destination Preferences: An Application of the Serious Leisure Inventory and Measure." *Tourism Management* 35:111–21.

Baum, T., A. Kralj, R. N. Robinson, and D. J. Solnet. 2016. "Tourism Workforce Research: A Review, Taxonomy and Agenda." *Annals of Tourism Research* 60:1–22.

Beehr, T. A. 1995. *Psychological Stress in the Workplace*. London: Routledge.

Beehr, T. A., and J. E. Newman. 1978. "Job Stress, Employee Health, and Organizational Effectiveness: A Facet Analysis, Model, and Literature Review." *Personnel Psychology* 31 (4): 665–99.

Bosma, H., R. Peter, J. Siegrist, and M. Marmot. 1998. "Two Alternative Job Stress Models and the Risk of Coronary Heart Disease." *American Journal of Public Health* 88 (1): 68–74.

Bowie, D., and J. C. Chang. 2005. "Tourist Satisfaction: A View from a Mixed International Guided Package Tour." *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 11 (4): 303–22.

Bustamam, F. L., S. S. Teng, and F. Z. Abdullah. 2014. "Reward Management and Job Satisfaction among Frontline Employees in Hotel Industry in Malaysia." *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences* 144:392–402.

Carnicelli-Filho, S. 2013. "The Emotional Life of Adventure Guides." *Annals of Tourism Research* 43:192–209.

Chandola, T., E. Brunner, and M. Marmot. 2006. "Chronic Stress at Work and the Metabolic Syndrome: Prospective Study." *British Medical Journal* 332 (7540): 521–25.

Chau, T. 1977. "Workers Attitudes in Hong Kong: A Comparison with Other Countries." *The Hong Kong Manager* 13:8–13.

Chen, H., B. Weiler, and R. Black. 2018. "Exploring Knowledge-Building in Tour Guiding Research: A Content Analysis of Empirical Papers on Tour Guiding, 1980–2015." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 37:59–67.

Chen, P. Y., and P. E. Spector. 1992. "Relationships of Work Stressors with Aggression, Withdrawal, Theft and Substance Use: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 65 (3): 177–84.

Cheng, J. C., C. Y. Chen, H. Y. Teng, and C. H. Yen. 2016. "Tour Leaders' Job Crafting and Job Outcomes: The Moderating Role of Perceived Organizational Support." *Tourism Management Perspectives* 20:19–29.

Chiang, F. F., and T. A. Birtch. 2008. "Achieving Task and Extra-Task-Related Behaviors: A Case of Gender and Position Differences in the Perceived Role of Rewards in the Hotel Industry." *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 27 (4): 491–503.

Chuang, N. K., D. Yin, and M. Dellmann-Jenkins. 2009. "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors Impacting Casino Hotel Chefs' Job Satisfaction." *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 21 (3): 323–40.

Cohen, E. 1985. "The Tourist Guide: The Origins, Structure and Dynamics of a Role." *Annals of Tourism Research* 12 (1): 5–29.

Curtin, S. 2010. "Managing the Wildlife Tourism Experience: The Importance of Tour Leaders." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 12(3): 219–36.

Diener, E., S. Oishi, and R. E. Lucas. 2003. "Personality, Culture, and Subjective Well-Being: Emotional and Cognitive Evaluations of Life." *Annual Review of Psychology* 54 (1): 403–25.

Dillman, D. A., J. D. Smyth, and L. M. Christian. 2014. *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Edirisooriyaa, W. A. 2014. "Impact of Rewards on Employee Performance: With Special Reference to ElectriCo." *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Management and Economics* 26:27.

Fox, S., P. E. Spector, and D. Miles. 2001. "Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) in Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 59 (3): 291–309.

Garson, D. 2014. *Multiple Regression*. Asheboro: Statistical Associates.

Görgens-Ekermans, G., and T. Brand. 2012. "Emotional Intelligence as a Moderator in the Stress–Burnout Relationship: A Questionnaire Study on Nurses." *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 21 (15/16): 2275–85.

Gunlu, E., M. Aksarayli, and N. Şahin Perçin. 2010. "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Hotel Managers in Turkey." *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 22 (5): 693–717.

Gupta, N., and T. A. Beehr. 1979. "Job Stress and Employee Behaviors." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 23 (3): 373–87.

Guzzo, R. A. 1979. "Types of Rewards, Cognitions, and Work Motivation." *Academy of Management Review* 4 (1): 75–86.

Hair, J., R. Bush, and D. Ortinau. 2006. *Marketing Research: Within a Changing Information Environment*, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Hemingway, M. A., and C. S. Smith. 1999. "Organizational Climate and Occupational Stressors as Predictors of Withdrawal Behaviours and Injuries in Nurses." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 72 (3): 285–99.

Holloway, C. J. 1981. "The Guided Tour: A Sociological Approach." *Annals of Tourism Research* 8 (3): 377–402.

Ivancevich, J. M., M. T. Matteson, and R. Konopaske. 2008. *Organizational Behavior and Management*, 8th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Janta, H., A. Ladkin, L. Brown, and P. Lugosi. 2011. "Employment Experiences of Polish Migrant Workers in the UK Hospitality Sector." *Tourism Management* 32 (5): 1006–19.

Jaques, E. 1961. *Equitable Payment*. London: Heinemann.

Jaworski, C., S. Ravichandran, A. C. Karpinski, and S. Singh. 2018. "The Effects of Training Satisfaction, Employee Benefits, and Incentives on Part-Time Employees' Commitment." *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 74: 1-12.

Kara, D., M. Uysal, M. J. Sirgy, and G. Lee. 2013. "The Effects of Leadership Style on Employee Well-Being in Hospitality." *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 34:9-18.

Karatepe, O. M., and L. Baddar. 2006. "An Empirical Study of the Selected Consequences of Frontline Employees' Work–Family Conflict and Family–Work Conflict." *Tourism Management* 27 (5): 1017–28.

Karatepe, O. M., and H. Kilic. 2007. "Relationships of Supervisor Support and Conflicts in the Work-Family Interface with the Selected Job Outcomes of Frontline Employees." *Tourism Management* 28 (1): 238–52.

Lam, T., H. Zhang, and T. Baum. 2001. "An Investigation of Employees' Job Satisfaction: The Case of Hotels in Hong Kong." *Tourism Management* 22 (2): 157–65.

Leech, N. L., K. C. Barrett, and G. A. Morgan. 2005. *SPSS for Intermediate Statistics: Use and Interpretation*. New York: Psychology Press.

Lin, C. T., K. C. Wang, and W. Y. Chen. 2008. "Female Tour Leaders as Advertising Endorsers." *Service Industries Journal* 28 (9): 1265–75.

Lin, J.-H., J.-Y. Wong, and C.-H. Ho. 2013. "Promoting Frontline Employees' Quality of Life: Leisure Benefit Systems and Work-to-Leisure Conflicts." *Tourism Management* 36:178–87.

Luoh, H. F., and S. H. Tsaur. 2013. "The Effects of Age Stereotypes on Tour Leader Roles." *Journal of Travel Research* 53 (1): 111–23.

Mancini, M. 1990. *Conducting Tours: A Practical Guide*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

McCole, D. 2015. "Seasonal Employees: The Link between Sense of Community and Retention." *Journal of Travel Research* 54 (2): 193–205.

Min, J. C. 2010. "Tour Guides Emotional Intelligence in Relation to Demographic Characteristics." *African Journal of Business Management* 4 (17): 3730–37.

Min, J. 2014. "The Relationships between Emotional Intelligence, Job Stress, and Quality Of Life among Tour Guides." *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 19 (10): 1170–90.

Mossberg, L. L. 1995. "Tour Leaders and Their Importance in Charter Tours." *Tourism Management* 16 (6): 437–45.

Mottaz, C. J. 1985. "The Relative Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards as Determinants of Work Satisfaction." *Sociological Quarterly* 26 (3): 365–85.

Namasivayam, K., L. Miao, and X. Zhao. 2007. "An Investigation of the Relationships between Compensation Practices and Firm Performance in the US Hotel Industry." *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 26 (3): 574–87.

Nederhof, A. J. 1985. "Methods of Coping with Social Desirability Bias: A Review." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 15 (3): 263–80.

O'Neill, J. W., and K. Davis. 2011. "Work Stress and Well-Being in the Hotel Industry." *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 30 (2): 385–90.

Pereira, A. M. 2015. "Tour Guides and Destination Image: Evidence from Portugal." *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management* 3 (7/8): 129–50.

PROMPERU. 2015. "El Perú Como Destino Para la Operación Turística." from www.promperu.gob.pe (accessed May 28, 2019).

Quiroga, I. 1990. "Characteristics of Packaged Tours in Europe." *Annals of Tourism Research* 17 (2): 185–207.

Reif, W. E. 1975. "Intrinsic versus Extrinsic Rewards: Resolving the Controversy." *Human Resource Management* 14 (2): 1–10.

Rice, R. W., M. R. Frone, and D. B. McFarlin. 1992. "Work-Nonwork Conflict and the Perceived Quality of Life." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13 (2): 155–168.

Siegrist, J., and A. Rödel. 2006. "Work Stress and Health Risk Behavior." *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health* 32 (6): 473–81.

Su, C. J., J. H. Yang, K. Badaoui, and N. Cho. 2014. "Tour Leaders' Impression Management and Job Performance: Exploring the Moderating Role of Tourists' Self-Monitoring." *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 19 (3): 356–73.

Tai, F. M. 2014. "Explore Characteristics of Leadership and Apply to Tour Leader." *Journal of Global Business Management* 10 (2): 76–93.

Tsaur, S. H., and W. R. Lin. 2014. "Hassles of Tour Leaders." *Tourism Management* 45:28–38.

Tsaur, S. H., and H. Y. Teng. 2017. "Exploring Tour Guiding Styles: The Perspective of Tour Leader Roles." *Tourism Management* 59:438–48.

Tsaur, S. H., D. H. Wu, C. H. Yen, and M. H. Wu H. 2014. "Promoting Relationship Marketing of Tour Leaders' Blog: The Role of Charisma." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 16 (5): 417–28.

UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization). 2010. *International Recommendations for Tourism Statistics 2008*. New York: United Nations.

UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization). 2019. World Tourism Barometer 19 (1). https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/wtobarometereng (accessed March 15, 2019).

Vaske, J. J. 2008. *Survey Research and Analysis: Applications in Parks, Recreation and Human Dimensions*. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing Inc.

Vrijkotte, T. G., L. J. Van Doornen, and E. J. De Geus. 2000. "Effects of Work Stress on Ambulatory Blood Pressure, Heart Rate, and Heart Rate Variability." *Hypertension* 35 (4): 880–86.

Wang, K. C., A. T. Hsieh, and W. Y. Chen. 2002. "Is the Tour Leader an Effective Endorser for Group Package Tour Brochures?" *Tourism Management* 23 (5): 489–98.

Wang, K. C., A. T. Hsieh, S. H. Chou, and Y. S. Lin. 2007. "GPTCCC: An Instrument for Measuring Group Package Tour Service." *Tourism Management* 28 (2): 361–76.

Wang, K. C., P. C. Jao, H. C. Chan, and C. H. Chung. 2010. "Group Package Tour Leader's Intrinsic Risks." *Annals of Tourism Research* 37 (1): 154–79.

Weiler, B., and D. Davis. 1993. "An Exploratory Investigation into the Roles of the Nature-Based Tour Leader." *Tourism Management* 14 (2): 91–98.

Wong, J. Y., and C. H. Wang. 2009. "Emotional Labor of The Tour Leaders: An Exploratory Study." *Tourism Management* 30 (2): 249–59.

Wong, J.-Y., and W.-H. Lee. 2012. "Leadership through Service: An Exploratory Study of the Leadership Styles of Tour Leaders." *Tourism Management* 33 (5): 1112-21.

World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations. 2003. "What Is a Tourist Guide?" http://www.wftga.org/main.php?page=what_is_a_tourist_guide (accessed October 23, 2016).

Yates, M. E., S. Tennstedt, and B. H. Chang. 1999. "Contributors to and Mediators of Psychological Well-Being for Informal Caregivers." *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 54 (1): 12–22.

Yen, C. H., C. Y. Chen, J. C. Cheng, and H. Y. Teng. 2015. "Brand Attachment, Tour Leader Attachment, and Behavioral Intentions of Tourists." *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research* 42 (3): 365–91.

Zingheim, P. K., and J. R. Schuster. 1995. "Moving One Notch North: Executing the Transition to New Pay." *Compensation & Benefits Review* 27 (4): 33–39.

Author Biographies

Brendali Carrillo is a Faculty Member in the School of Hospitality and Tourism Management at the Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas (UPC, Peru). She has worked in the tourism industry for over ten years in both public and private sectors. Her research seeks to enhance the socio-cultural and wellbeing impacts of tourism development.

Carla Barbieri is a Professor in the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management at North Carolina State University (USA) where she leads the "Agritourism & Societal Wellbeing" lab. She conducts research on sustainable tourism, mainly related to agricultural and natural resources.

Whitney Knollenberg is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management at North Carolina State University (USA). She investigates the synergies between the food and tourism systems as well as the role of leadership and policy in sustainable tourism development.

Michael B. Edwards is an Associate Professor in the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management at North Carolina State University (USA). His primary research seeks to enhance sustainable community capacity for health development by reducing social inequality in access to physical activity and sport environments.