UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Disaster Recovery Volunteerism and Intersecting Inequalities: A Case Study of Post-Katrina New Orleans

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Sociology

by

Ian MacKenzie Breckenridge-Jackson

June 2017

Dissertation Committee:
Dr. Ellen Reese, Chairperson
Dr. Katja M. Guenther
Dr. Christopher Chase-Dunn

The Dissertation of Ian MacKenzie Breckenridge-Jackson is approved:

_____

_____

_____

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was made possible through funding from the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program # 2011120379 (NSF GRFP), and by a Graduate Student Research Grant from the University of California Center for New Racial Studies (UCCNRS). I am deep grateful to both the NSF GRFP and the UCCNRS for supporting this work. I am also thankful to my team of research assistants for persevering through many hours of transcription. This work benefitted from thoughtful feedback from Robert Hanneman, Matthew Mahutga, Alfredo Mirandé, Tanya Nieri, Karen Pyke, Dylan Rodríguez, and Jane Ward, as well as anonymous reviewers from *Gender & Society* and *Social Problems*. The project was much improved by the oversight of Chris Chase-Dunn and Katja Guenther, both of whom have indelibly shaped my scholarly pursuits. Finally, this dissertation was made possible through the guidance of Ellen Reese, my committee chair. Her mentorship and unending generosity inspired me to be a better scholar at every stage of the research process.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the Breckenridge and Jackson families who gave me every chance to succeed; to the people of the Lower Ninth Ward; to my chosen family on Deslonde Street; to Leona Tate, Robert Green, and Malik Rahim, and Rebecca Cooper, Stephanie Dragoon, and Elizabeth Gelvin for making the dream of the Lower Ninth Ward Living Museum a reality; and to my partner, Caroline, who inspires me to move beyond myself, challenge injustice, and love radically.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Disaster Recovery Volunteerism and Intersecting Inequalities:
A Case Study of Post-Katrina New Orleans

by

Ian MacKenzie Breckenridge-Jackson

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Sociology
University of California, Riverside, June 2017
Dr. Ellen Reese, Chairperson

Over one million volunteers travelled to the Gulf Coast to engage in recovery efforts following Hurricane Katrina, and most chose New Orleans as their destination. To study these disaster recovery volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans, this dissertation uses a survey of volunteers as well as interviews with volunteers, volunteer coordinators, and New Orleans residents. Chapter 1 contextualizes the Katrina disaster and the convergence of volunteers that followed in the framework of anti-black genocide, the neoliberal racial state, and the nonprofit industrial complex. Chapter 2 develops a typology of nonlocal disaster volunteers: Servants (service-oriented), Activists (justice-oriented), and Tourists (travel-oriented). Chapter 3 finds that volunteers have positive impacts but also have negative impacts that reproduce intersecting race, class, and gender inequalities. Chapter 4 finds that volunteering impacted women in positive ways, including empowerment through masculine labor, and negative ways, including a gendered division of labor and gender harassment. I conclude that volunteerism is a double-edged sword best understood through an intersectional feminist lens.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CBL	Community based learning
CoBRAS	Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale
CNCS	Corporation for National and Community Service
EEOC	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GEQ	Gender Experiences Questionnaire
GNOCDC	Greater New Orleans Community Data Center
LGBTQ	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning
MDS	Mennonite Disaster Services
MEBS	Modified Economic Beliefs Scale
MHS	Modern Homophobia Scale
MOFRS	Modern and Old-Fashioned Racism Scale
NORM	New Orleans Rebirth Movement
NPIC	Nonprofit industrial complex
NS	Neosexism Scale
SEQ	Sexual Experiences Questionnaire
UNGC	United Nations Genocide Convention

Introduction

Before Hurricane Betsy hit the northeastern seaboard in 2012, Hurricane Katrina was the largest disaster in U.S. history. Direct storm and flood damage totaled $135 billion, 850,000 homes were severely damaged or destroyed (Espinoza 2006), and over 100,000 New Orleans residents were displaced (Hallegatte 2008). Historically, New Orleans has bounced back quickly from disaster both demographically and economically (Colten et al. 2008:7), but the recovery period following Hurricane Katrina was projected to be longer than that of any other studied disaster in American history (Kates et al. 2006).

All disasters and their outcomes are due to some combination of natural, technological, and social forces. For instance, the impact of Hurricane Sandy certainly had its social dimensions, but the storm was not generally interpreted as "ground zero" for social injustice the way post-Katrina New Orleans was. In this vein, the legacy of Hurricane Sandy has not tarnished the Obama administration in the same way that Hurricane Katrina has for the Bush administration. For Katrina, it was the failures of technology and society that solidified its place in American history.

Hurricane Katrina was a predicted and preventable social disaster driven by endemic social problems including racism and neoliberalism. The atrocities surrounding Katrina and the botched governmental response are well established as an example of racial disaster that resulted in the disproportionate loss of life and destruction of property for black New Orleanians (David and Enarson 2012; Dyson 2006; Giroux 2006; Hartman and Squires 2006; Johnson 2011; Muhammad 2006; South End Press 2007). The Katrina

disaster, however, has not been established as a manifestation of a continuous history anti-black genocide perpetrated by the racial state apparatus that is the U.S. government (Goldberg 2002; James and Redding 2005; Muhammad 2006; Omi and Winant 1994; Rodríguez 2007). It is within this context that volunteers from across the country and around the world came to New Orleans in droves to contribute to post-Katrina recovery efforts.

More than a million people volunteered in Gulf Coast recovery efforts in the first five years following Hurricane Katrina and the failure of New Orleans' levee system on August 29, 2005 (Corporation for National and Community Service 2010). Luft (2008) notes that, "despite national black outrage and activity in response to Katrina, as well as the ongoing organizing of local communities of color, the people who composed New Orleans' largest grassroots effort were primarily nonlocal whites" (p. 10). While their numbers have diminished since peaking between 2007 and 2009, a steady stream of volunteers continue to come to the city and work through volunteer-based recovery organizations addressing a combination of issues directly and indirectly related to Hurricane Katrina.

Disaster volunteers are diverse in their orientations and actions. While robust literatures exist around disaster response, volunteerism, activism, and volunteer tourism, little scholarly attention has been given to how these four literatures overlap, and combining insights from each of them can further our understanding of disaster volunteerism. This is the first study to comprehensively examine the full range of nonlocal disaster recovery volunteer types and their significance in recovery work.

Combining insights from existing literatures in volunteerism, disaster response and recovery, volunteer tourism, service learning and activism, I aim to improve our understanding of the diversity of recovery volunteer types.

Further, this is a study of how intersecting systems of power shape the effects of volunteers on the communities they enter and on each other. In the broader context of the neoliberal racial state and racial genocide, I analyze how race and class inequality shape interactions between socioeconomically privileged white volunteers and disadvantaged black beneficiaries and how gender inequality shapes interactions between volunteers. Disaster volunteers are important to study, and becoming more so, as global warming increases the rate and magnitude of natural disasters, social inequalities continue to render marginalized people disproportionately vulnerable to disaster, the volunteer tourism industry expands, and neoliberalism guts direct governmental aid to disaster victims and therefore increases reliance on volunteer-based social services (David and Enarson 2012; Johnson 2011; Wolensky 1979).

In this study, I argue that we need to combine insights from the literature on volunteers and social movements to best understand Katrina volunteers' various motivations, political consciousness, and activities. I then draw insights from critical race and feminist theory and scholarship to understand how the impacts of volunteerism (on beneficiaries and on volunteers themselves) are shaped by racism, classism, and patriarchy. This introduction begins to review the literature on disaster recovery volunteerism and describes my theoretical frameworks to set up the larger project,

describes the methods used for data collection and analysis, and provides an overview of the chapters to come.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous research on volunteerism, disaster response and recovery, volunteer tourism, service learning, and activism are mostly published in topical interdisciplinary journals such as *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* and *Disasters* and written by sociologists, psychologists, and political scientists. In what follows, I introduce the relevant literatures to set up the research questions for the chapters to come.

Definition(s) of Volunteerism

Due in part to the particularities of the Katrina disaster, volunteers brought varying approaches to their work, which demands a closer look at what exactly we mean by the term "volunteer." Wilson (2000:215) defines volunteerism as "any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another person, group, or organization." However, the boundaries between employee and volunteer are debated in the literature with regard to whether volunteers may be remunerated and whether altruistic motives are necessary as long as "public" goods and services are produced at below market rates. Further, the lines between volunteerism, spontaneous helping behavior, and care giving are controversial as is the meaning of being an active participant in a voluntary association. Volunteerism also overlaps with other social institutions to produce particular types of volunteerism such as those based on religion (i.e., faith-based volunteerism) (Wilson and

Janoski 1995), education (i.e., service learning) (Kraft 1996), tourism (i.e., volunteer tourism) (Wearing and McGehee 2013) and other phenomena such as social change (i.e., activism) (Wilson 2000) and disaster volunteerism (Wolensky 1979), each of which may further overlap.

In short, volunteerism is anything but homogeneous. Wilson (2000:233–4) notes that "'volunteering' embraces a vast array of quite disparate activities. It is probably not fruitful to try to explain all activities with the same theory nor to treat all activities as if they were the same with respect to consequences." Therefore, it is necessary to dissect what is known about post-Katrina volunteers and the types of volunteerism they exemplify.

The influx of volunteers to a disaster site is nothing new. Disaster zones typically attract a cadre of volunteer professionals and para-professionals, such as fire fighters, police officers, and EMTs, known as disaster responders in existing literature. I am not studying this type of volunteer here. Instead, I focus on civilian volunteers – those without professional training or experience in disaster work. During the immediate "disaster response" phase (e.g., search and rescue activities), disaster responders generally establish a perimeter around the affected area to manage, in part, such nonprofessional volunteers (Barsky et al. 2007; Fernandez, Barbera, and Van Drop 2006; Kendra and Wachtendorf 2003; Phillips 2009; Souza 2009; Waugh and Streib 2006; Wolensky 1979). As the immediate threat passes, the perimeter is lifted and the "disaster recovery" phase begins, what Mileti (1999:220) refers to as "putting a disaster-stricken community back together."

Wolensky (1979: 33) argues that the conceptualization of disaster volunteerism has been narrow in part because "studies have been limited to the immediate post-impact stage." Despite this critique, most studies still do not differentiate between *disaster response volunteerism* and *disaster recovery volunteerism* (though their focus is usually one or the other) and therefore conflate the two, with few and limited exceptions (Danielson 2010; Phillips 2009; Shaw and Goda 2004). It is important to address this shortcoming because "various stages represent environments with different demands that may in turn bring differences in volunteerism" (Wolensky 1979:33). While I borrow heavily from Wolensky's schema to differentiate disaster response versus recovery volunteers and to differentiate different types of disaster recovery volunteers, my focus is entirely on variations in recovery volunteers who are not from the affected community, who he lumps together in his altruistic category.

Complex "insider/outsider" dynamics take place in many social settings, including volunteerism. Naples (1996:1) argues that "shifts in constructions of 'community' that accompan[y] ongoing social, demographic, and political changes" determine the boundaries of who is an "insider" at any given time (Allen 2006; McCorkel and Myers 2003; Merriam et al. 2001; Shope 2006; Villenas 1996; Zavella 1987; Zinn 1979). Socioeconomically privileged, white folks traveled hundreds and even thousands of miles to volunteer in New Orleans' socioeconomically disadvantaged, black communities (Hilderbrand et al. 2007). In this case, the combination of geographic and social distance seems to heighten the "outsider"-ness of post-Katrina recovery volunteers in contrast to the "insider"-ness of New Orleans residents.

What drew these "outsiders" to post-Katrina New Orleans? Several factors offer partial explanations: the magnitude of the disaster, the social injustices that left this community vulnerable to disaster, and New Orleans' status as a tourist destination. Drawing theoretical insights from literature on volunteers and social movements, I argue that the motivations and activities of volunteers are shaped by pre-existing ideologies, organizational affiliations, and network ties, which influence how the disaster event is perceived and addressed and produce very different types of volunteers.

Race, Class, and Volunteer Impacts on Beneficiaries

After first getting a clearer picture of variation among volunteers, I turn to their impacts on the people and communities they serve. There is no doubt that volunteers contributed a wealth of free labor to post-Katrina recovery efforts in New Orleans, and did so through many different activities ranging from hands-on labor to protest. Volunteers vary greatly, and this may apply to the quality and therefore outcomes of volunteer labor itself (Barsky et al. 2007; Fernandez 2007; Kendra and Wachtendorf 2003). In the recovery phase in New Orleans, volunteers varied from "experienced general contractors and social service volunteers" (Dass-Brailsford et al. 2011:31) to veteran community organizers and activists to well-intentioned but unskilled and inexperienced college students, volunteer tourists, and regular people.

Despite their differences, volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans were overwhelmingly white and socioeconomically privileged. In contrast, service beneficiaries and host communities were largely black and working-class or precariously

middle-class. Existing research on volunteer tourism and community based learning (CBL) finds that such interactions can be a double-edged sword. On the one hand, these interactions may reduce prejudices and provide valuable knowledge and skills for volunteers to effect long-term social change (Crabtree 1998; Dass-Brailsford et al. 2011; Higgins-Desbiolles 2003; McGehee 2012; Raymond and Hall 2008). On the other hand, they may reinforce existing stereotypes held by volunteers, reinforce hierarchy between giver and receiver, and potentially harm individual beneficiaries and/or their communities (Dass-Brailsford et al. 2011; Guttentag 2009; Heldman 2011; McGehee 2012). Drawing on these literatures as well as theoretical insights from critical race and intersectional feminist theories, I ague that intersecting systems of power (with a focus on race, class, and gender) shape the outcomes of volunteer labor and the treatment of beneficiaries and host communities by outside volunteers.

Reproducing and Challenging Patriarchy Among Volunteers

Just as volunteers affected beneficiaries and host communities, they affected each other. Most volunteers shared a position of race and class privilege as white middle-class people but they varied regarding gender privilege. Gender inequality shaped their interactions, their division of labor, and the structure of volunteer organizations.

Gender inequalities manifest both in organizational structures and micro-interactions. In addition to individual differences, organizations are structured by intersecting systems of power that reproduce the societal status quo (Acker 2006), which also holds true in studies of volunteer and social movement organizations (Acker 1990;

Blee 2003; Irons 1998; McAdam 1990; McPherson and Smith-Lovin 1982, 1986; Popielarz 1999; Taniguchi 2006; Thorne 1975; Ward 2008; Wilson 2000). At the interactional level, "doing work" is so bound up in "doing gender" that sex-based harassment is a common occurrence for women in work settings (Martin 2003; Miller 1997; Piotrkowski 1998; Schilt 2006; Williams 1995). However, we have little understanding of this for volunteers, particularly in disaster settings. Drawing theoretical insights from the literatures on sex-based harassment, organizational inequality regimes, and doing gender at work, I argue that intersecting systems of power (with a focus on gender in a white and socioeconomically privileged space) shape women's experiences of empowerment and discrimination by other volunteers in disaster recovery volunteerism.

METHODS AND DATA

In this study, I employ a mixed methods approach. I first conducted interviews with volunteer coordinators, and used those contacts to help to recruit respondents for an online survey of volunteers, and then conducted follow up interviews with volunteers. Regarding the contours and impacts of volunteers on beneficiaries and their communities, I also conducted interviews with residents of the Lower Ninth Ward, a heavily black neighborhood with high rates of home ownership and the area hardest hit by flooding post-Katrina. Further, I use oral histories with Lower Ninth Ward residents collected by the Lower Ninth Ward Living Museum to understand how the Katrina disaster fits within a larger framework of anti-black genocide in the United States. I discuss each of these in turn after considering my position as a researcher and former disaster recovery volunteer.

Standpoint

Feminist standpoint theorists argue that attempting to conduct research as the objective, outside observer that is idealized in the traditional scientific framework in fact obscures how the researcher's social position influences the questions they ask, the data they collect, and their interpretations of that data (Anzaldua 1987; Collins 1990; Harding 1993; Hartsock 1983; hooks 1981; Smith 1974, 1990; Yuval-Davis 2006). While this particular study is not ethnographic and does not strongly reflect on my social position as a researcher throughout, it is important to be reflexive about how my social position as a well-educated white heterosexual man from an upper middle-class background informs my analysis of topics deeply rooted in intersecting systems of power. It would be naïve to suggest that I am somehow able to shed my own trappings in order to engage in this work. Further, my social position has and continues to shape my participation in post-Katrina recovery volunteerism.

I have volunteered in post-Katrina recovery efforts in New Orleans since 2006, and this has shaped my interest in this subject, my construction of data collection instruments, and my position within disaster recovery social networks. Between May 2006 and June 2011, I volunteered with three different organizations for a total of eight months in the field, broken up over approximately twelve trips ranging from one week to two months in length. I first traveled to New Orleans in May of 2006 through a college sponsored alternative break club, a common experience among volunteers. This club partnered with a local grassroots organization in New Orleans that put students to work

mucking[1] and gutting flooded homes in the Ninth Ward. On subsequent trips, I shuttled teams of volunteers to work sites, tutored grade school students, and delivered meals to homeless shelters. Through organizational networks, I was given the opportunity to serve in different capacities with a family homeless shelter and a homeless shelter specifically for women and children. While performing service work, I also regularly attended protests, for example, in favor of equitable rebuilding, against the closure of public housing, and against the displacement of a homeless encampment.

In 2011, I helped to found the Lower Ninth Ward Living Museum, an entirely free nonprofit neighborhood museum dedicated to community empowerment. The Living Museum serves not only to educate visitors on the history and present state of the Lower Ninth Ward but as a community space for neighborhood residents. As of this writing, I continue to serve as co-Executive Director.

Oral Histories with Current and Former Lower Ninth Ward Residents

To better understand the context in which volunteers worked, I draw from the Lower Ninth Ward Living Museum's archive of 70 oral histories with residents of New Orlean's Lower Ninth Ward neighborhood. In 2000, the Lower Ninth Ward was 98 percent black, which dropped to 96 percent in 2010 (Greater New Orleans Community Data Center 2012). Only a fraction of Lower Ninth Ward residents have been able to

1 Mucking is removing waterlogged and otherwise damaged furniture and other belongings from homes. Gutting refers to stripping the inside of a house down to wooden studs in preparation for rebuilding.

return home, and only a fraction of the neighborhood has been rebuilt, which is discussed in greater detail in the first empirical chapter (GNOCDC 2015).

The Lower Ninth Ward Living Museum is a nonprofit neighborhood museum dedicated to community empowerment that is run primarily by nonlocal white volunteers, including myself. Volunteers at the Living Museum collected oral histories via door-to-door canvassing in the Lower Ninth Ward. Some current and former residents of the neighborhood also visited the museum and were asked if they would like to participate in an oral history interview. As is often the case with oral histories, an interview guide (see Appendix 1) was used only as a loose framework to get the conversation started (Perks and Thomson 1998). Volunteers at the Living Museum began collecting oral histories during the summer of 2012 and continue to do so. Most oral histories were conducted in the participant's home and a few were conducted in the Living Museum. Most oral histories were recorded as both audio and video, though some participants chose only to be recorded using audio. All oral histories were later transcribed and coded for themes by volunteers at the Living Museum.

Interviews with Lower Ninth Ward Residents

Another source of data I collected for this dissertation was in-depth interviews with residents. I interviewed 15 residents of New Orleans' Lower Ninth Ward neighborhood in order to get their perspective on their interactions with volunteers and the larger impacts of volunteers on the neighborhood (See Appendix 2 for interview guide). Since my focus is not on the extreme minority of nonblack perspectives, only

black residents were interviewed. I recruited participants by tagging along with outreach efforts for the Lower Ninth Ward Living Museum (as discussed above). While aware of critiques of research conducted by "outsiders" rather than "insiders" (Allen 2006; McCorkel and Myers 2003; Merriam et al. 2001; Naples 1996; Shope 2006; Villenas 1996; Zavella 1987; Zinn 1979), I initially chose this sampling method because it was advantageous.

Residents of the Lower Ninth Ward are perhaps the best sources of information about the impacts of volunteers on them through interactions and on their community. Participants, however, were overwhelmingly positive in their evaluation of volunteers. This may be due to the presence of interviewer effects. While I do not dismiss positive interactions between outsider white volunteers and local black residents out of hand, the strong critiques of many volunteer coordinators indicate that the more negative or mixed interactions have been obscured in my initial interviews with black residents. Given New Orleans' long and violent racial history and present, my social position as a white person, and my affiliation with and piggybacking upon a volunteer organization largely run by white outsiders, it seems unlikely that a local black resident with strongly negative impressions of volunteers would agree to do an interview in the first place, and those with mixed opinions may be unlikely to voice their more critical thoughts to me. There is a need for future research on this topic conducted by researchers whose identities mitigate these interviewer effects.

Interviews with Volunteer Coordinators

To learn about volunteers more broadly, I conducted 25 interviews with volunteer coordinators from over two dozen organizations in New Orleans. Volunteer coordinators are an excellent source of information about volunteers because they interact with so many and can report on their motivations, framing, and work without the social desirability bias of self-reported data. Additionally, long-term exposure to volunteers gives volunteer coordinators the ability to identify and compare different types of volunteers. On the other hand, volunteer coordinators may be susceptible to a form of social desirability that volunteers are not and may therefore be more savvy and perhaps less candid than rank-and-file volunteers given their public relations experience. For my sample, I restricted interviews to volunteer coordinators who had supervised at least 100 volunteers and had served in their position for at least six months.

Different types of volunteers tend to be associated with different types of organizations, and therefore studies of one or a small number of organizations provide only a limited understanding of volunteerism. Initial interview participants were located through organizations identified by the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) (2010) as contributing to Gulf Coast rebuilding (see Appendix 3), and through existing contacts with volunteers, organizational leaders, and New Orleans residents. Further contacts were then made through recommendations from interview participants, including organizations that were founded or became active after the CNCS list was published.

Volunteer organizations range widely in terms of the number of volunteer participants since Katrina, with the smallest organization hosting several hundred volunteers to the largest hosting over 30,000 volunteers. While initial interviews focused on rebuilding organizations, I broadened the scope to include social services, advocacy, protest, and other forms of recovery involving outside volunteers. My sample included a mix of faith-based and secular organizations. Most organizations were service-based in their formal mission statements and lacked an overtly political orientation, while several organizations were openly oriented towards social justice. My sample is rich in terms of organizational size as well as religious and social justice orientation. The demographic breakdown of volunteer coordinator interview participants is presented in Table 1.

These interviews were conducted over a three month period in 2011, six years after Hurricane Katrina hit the Gulf Coast. Interviews lasted between 45 minutes and three hours, with an average interview time of 1.5 hours. Prior to the interview itself, participants were asked to fill out a short survey to self-report basic demographics of age, race/ethnicity, income, gender, sexuality, religion, and political ideology, as well as whether they were an organizational administrator or volunteer administrator, whether they had served as a volunteer supervisor for over six months, and whether they had supervised over 100 volunteers. This survey form also changed slightly over the course of the first few interviews and then remained constant for the sake of comparability (see Appendix 4a for final iteration). The interview guide was also modified as interviews prompted revision (see Appendix 4b for the final iteration). Interviews generally took place in the respondent's home, place of business, or one of many local coffee shops.

Table 1 – Interview Participants – Volunteer Coordinator and Volunteer Demographics

Variable		N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age						
	Coordinators	25	35.6	12.7	21.0	64.0
	Volunteers	31	34.3	16.5	21.0	78.0
		Volunteer Coordinators		**Volunteers**		
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency		Percentage
Race						
	White	19	76.0	25		78.1
	Black	5	20.0	0		0.0
	Latino	1	4.0	0		0.0
	Asian, P.I.	0	0.0	1		3.1
	Multiracial	0	0.0	6		18.8
Sex/Gender						
	Male	13	52.0	16		50.0
	Female	12	48.0	13		40.6
	Genderqueer	-	-	3		9.4
Sexual Orientation						
	LGBTQ	7	28.0	10		31.3
	Heterosexual	18	72.0	22		68.8
Education						
	HS or less	7	28.0	2		6.3
	BA	11	44.0	18		56.3
	Graduate	7	28.0	12		37.5
Personal Income						
	<$25K	7	30.4	-		-
	$25K-$50K	6	26.1	-		-
	$50K-$75K	5	21.7	-		-
	>$75K	5	21.7	-		-
Household Income						
	<$50K	5	33.3	16		55.2
	$50K-$75K	4	26.7	3		10.4
	>$75K	6	40.0	10		34.5
Political Ideology						
	Ext. Lib.	10	41.7	6		20.0
	Lib.	6	25.0	16		53.3
	Slightly Lib.	3	12.5	3		10.0
	Moderate	2	8.3	2		6.7
	Slightly Con.	0	0.0	0		0.0
	Cons.	2	8.3	3		10.0
	Ext. Con.	0	0.0	0		0.0
	Don't know	1	4.2	0		0.0
Religion						
	Protestant	8	32.0	3		9.7
	Catholic	5	20.0	3		9.7
	Jewish	0	0.0	2		6.5
	None	9	36.0	9		29.0
	Other	3	12.0	4		12.9
	Spiritual	-	-	9		29.0

Three interviews were conducted by phone because face-to-face meetings were not possible. All interviews were digitally recorded and later transcribed. Prior to the interview itself, participants were asked to complete a short survey to self-report basic demographic characteristics and political ideology, as well as whether they fit the above criteria for a volunteer coordinator.

Survey of Volunteers

I used an online survey to gather information from 176 respondents who volunteered in post-Katrina New Orleans. I gathered information directly from volunteers because it provides more specific information about individual volunteers' ideologies, network ties, motives, issue framing, actions, and the effects of their experience (and how these interact and cluster together) than the general impressions of volunteer coordinators. As a largely white and socioeconomically privileged group, post-Katrina recovery volunteers generally lend themselves to an online survey. Internet use goes up dramatically with increased household income and educational attainment. Black people have lower rates of internet use than whites and Latinos, but all three groups have high rates of use. Internet use goes down dramatically when comparing younger and older age groups (Sue and Ritter 2012). Thus, retired and therefore older volunteers will likely be underrepresented (Sue and Ritter 2012).

No sample frame of post-Katrina recovery volunteers is available, nor is the universe easily identifiable, and therefore a probability sample was unfeasible. While nonprobability sampling negates strong statistical inferences, it does allow exploratory

analysis of an undertheorized population (Sue and Ritter 2012). My best option was to combine purposive, convenience, and snowball sampling approaches. First, several volunteer organizations agreed to send an announcement to their email lists with a link to the survey. Second, I sent the link to the survey to all my personal contacts that volunteered in post-Katrina New Orleans and asked them to forward it to anyone they knew who volunteered. Finally, I created a Facebook page with a link to the survey, sent a personal message to invite volunteers for whom I did not have an email address, and asked them to share the page with volunteers they knew. I sent a second correspondence to individuals who did not respond to my first query. The 176 responses fall easily within the range of 30 to 500 responses suggested by Sue and Ritter (2012) for online survey sample size.

This survey was designed for completion within 5-10 minutes to minimize the low response and completion rates typical for internet-based surveys. In the survey, I gathered basic demographic data as well as information about respondents' organizational affiliations, political and social ideologies, motives for engaging in disaster recovery volunteerism, and their volunteer activities. While most of the survey is quantitative, I ask four open ended qualitative questions at the end of the survey regarding how volunteering impacted their life trajectory, how their views on race and class were affected by volunteering, and how gender shaped their experience as a volunteer. Appendix 5 provides the final survey instrument.

In general, volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans tend to be disproportionately young, white, socioeconomically privileged, queer, in a relationship, without a child,

students, or working part time. Demographic information for survey respondents is summarized in Table 2a and Table 2b, along with data about the general population of the U.S. as a point of comparison, drawn from the General Social Survey in 2014. My sample appears similar to the general population with regard to gender, but this seems to be where the similarities end. The average age of my respondents, compared to the general population, is significantly younger (40 years old compared to 49 years old), and a significantly higher percentage of my respondents are 18-29 years (49 percent compared to 15 percent). Further, a significantly higher percentage of my respondents are white (82 percent compared to 72 percent), have a Bachelor's degree (53 percent compared to 19 percent) or graduate degree (37 percent compared to 11 percent), identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, or queer (LGBTQ) (22 percent compared to 5 percent), identify as Jewish (4 percent compared to 2 percent) as an "other" religious identity (10 percent compared to 1 percent), have a steady partner (75 percent compared to 63 percent), and do not have a child (87 percent compared to 28 percent). Conversely, a significantly lower percentage of my respondents, when compared to the general population, are 30-39 years old (12 percent compared to 19 percent), 40-49 years old (8 percent compared to 17 percent), or 50-59 years old (13 percent compared to 20 percent). Further, a significantly lower percentage are black (3 percent compared to 14 percent), have less than a high school degree (0 percent compared to 13 percent), have a high school degree or equivalent (9 percent compared to 50 percent), have an Associate's degree (1 percent compared to 7 percent), identify as Protestant (28 percent compared to 45 percent), or identify as Catholic (17 percent compared to 24 percent).

Table 2a – Survey Respondents – Volunteer Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Med	SD	Min	Max
Age	154	40.3*	30.0	17.7	20.0	86.0
Age (GSS)	2529	49.0	49.0	17.4	18.0	89+

			GSS 2014	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Age (in 2014)				
18-29	75	48.7*	388	15.3
30-39	18	11.7*	487	19.3
40-49	12	7.8*	417	16.5
50-59	20	13.0*	511	20.2
60-69	15	9.7	368	14.6
70 and over	14	9.1	358	14.2
Sex/Gender				
Female	86	52.8 (54.1)	1397	55.0
Male	73	44.8 (45.9)	1141	45.0
Genderqueer	3	1.8	-	-
Transsexual	1	0.6	-	-
Race				
White	136	82.4*	1781	70.1
Multi-racial	14	8.5	181	7.2
Black	5	3.0*	353	14.0
Latino	5	3.0	121	4.8
Asian, P.I.	3	1.8	73	2.9
Other	2	1.2	10	0.4
Education				
Less than HS	0	0.0*	330	13.0
HS or equivalent	14	8.7*	1269	50.0
AA	2	1.2*	186	7.3
BA	86	53.1*	472	18.6
Graduate	60	37.0*	281	11.1
Sexual Orientation				
Heterosexual	126	78.3*	2195	95.2
LGBTQ	35	21.7*	110	4.8
Work Status (while volunteering in New Orleans)┼				
Student	58	35.2*	90	3.5
Full Time	53	32.1*	1230	48.5
Part Time	31	18.8*	273	10.8
Other	14	8.5*	76	3.0
Retired	13	7.9*	460	18.1
Underemployed	7	4.2	-	-
Unemployed	6	3.6	104	4.1
Temp. Unemp.	4	2.4	40	1.6
Homemaker	0	0.0*	263	10.4

* Compares my sample to GSS, significant at the $p < .05$ using t-test or z-test

┼ My measure allowed respondents to check all that apply, while the GSS measure required a single response, so these measures are not strictly comparable.

Table 2b – Survey Respondents – Volunteer Descriptive Statistics (Cont.)

			GSS 2014	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Religion				
Protestant	46	28.0*	1124	44.6
None (Agnostic/Atheist)	34	20.7	522	20.7
Catholic	28	17.1*	606	24.0
Spiritual	21	12.8	-	-
Other	16	9.8*	30	1.2
Non-den. Christ.	10	6.1	135	5.4
Jewish	7	4.3*	40	1.6
Buddhist	1	0.6	26	1.0
Islamic	1	0.6	9	0.4
Hindu	0	0.0	13	0.5
Orthodox Christian	0	0.0	9	0.4
Inter-denom.	0	0.0	4	0.2
Native American	0	0.0	2	0.1
Frequency of religious service attendance				
Never	27	16.6*	669	26.5
Less than once a year	18	11.0	183	7.2
Once or twice a year	22	13.5	337	13.3
Several times a year	17	10.4	250	9.9
About once a month	3	1.8*	149	5.9
2-3 times a month	8	4.9	217	8.6
Nearly every week	19	11.7*	114	4.5
Every week	36	22.1	431	17.1
Several times a week	13	8.0	175	6.9
Relationship Status				
No partner	40	24.8*	462	36.6
Cohabitate	100	62.1	682	54.1
Live separately	21	13.0	117	9.3
Parental Status				
No children	141	87.0*	704	27.8
Parent	21	13.0*	1826	72.2
Household Income				
<$10K	33	20.5*	206	8.5
$10K-$20K	14	8.7	264	10.9
$20K-$30K	5	3.1*	278	11.5
$30K-$40K	23	14.3	245	10.2
$40K-$50K	0	0.0*	173	7.2
$50K-$60K	13	8.1	208	8.6
$60K-$75K	6	3.7*	227	9.4
$75K-$90K	11	6.8	172	7.1
$90K-$110K	9	5.6	167	6.9
$110K-$130K	12	7.5*	94	3.9
$130K-$150K	6	3.7	73	3.0
>$150K	13	8.1	207	8.6
Don't know	16	9.9*	98	4.1

* Compares my sample to GSS, significant at the $p < .05$ using t-test or z-test

A few of my measures are modified in ways that make them not strictly comparable with the GSS data using tests of significance. Respondents may have volunteered in New Orleans over a long period, so I asked them to check all work statuses that applied while they were volunteering (e.g., they may have reported having been both a student and working full time), while the GSS only allows respondents to select a single response. With that said, a significantly higher percentage of my respondents, compared to the general population, were students (35 percent compared to 4 percent), working part time (19 percent compared to 11 percent), or reported "other" as a working status (9 percent compared to 3 percent). Conversely, a significantly lower percentage of my respondents were working full time (32 percent compared to 49 percent), retired (8 percent compared to 18 percent), or a homemaker (0 percent compared to 10 percent).

While I include a measure for household income, it does not appear to be valid. Despite nearly universal qualitative reports that volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans were disproportionately economically privileged, this is not reflected in my survey data. When asked for their best estimate of total household income when volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans, a significantly higher percentage of my respondents, when compared to the general population, reported less than $10,000 (21 percent compared to 9 percent), which directly contradicts the qualitative data. Further, a significantly higher percentage of my respondents report that do not know their total family income (10 percent compared to 4 percent). A possible explanation is that a significantly higher percentage of my respondents were 18-29 years old or report being student while

volunteering, as discussed above. Therefore, my best guess is that these respondents reported their individual income, despite likely being dependent on their parents for financial support, who are likely to be middle class or above. Given the invalidity of this data, I do not include it in any analysis.

Table 3a and Table 3b summarize statistics on respondents' experiences as volunteers in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina. These questions are not from the GSS and are therefore not comparable. Most respondents (61 percent) had never been to New Orleans prior to volunteering after Hurricane Katrina, while 23 percent had been there for vacation. They largely came from states in the Midwest (39 percent) and West (34 percent), while 14 percent came from the South (4 percent from Louisiana) and 12 percent came from the Northeast. Respondents report volunteering fairly evenly across the years following Katrina, with a slight peak in 2007. Most respondents returned to New Orleans after their initial trip, with only about one third of respondents (34 percent) reporting only a single trip, one in five (19 percent) reporting two trips, 16 percent reporting three trips, 6 percent reporting 4 trips, and one in four (25 percent) reporting five or more trips. Most respondents volunteered over the course of one year (27 percent), two years (26 percent), or three years (15 percent). The most common trip length from respondents was one week (43 percent), though most volunteers came for longer periods of time. One in five (21 percent) of respondents report relocating to New Orleans while or after volunteering. Most respondents report working between 7 and 10 hours per day (79 percent).

Table 3a – Survey Respondents – Descriptive Statistics Specific to Volunteering

Variable	N	Mean	Med	SD	Min	Max
Org Involvements	176	1.8	1.0	1.2	0.0	6.0
Types of orgs	149	2.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	9.0
Years Volunteered	173	3.2	2.0	2.3	1.0	9.0
Hours worked per day	169	8.2	8.0	2.6	1.0	24.0
Types of work done	174	5.5	4.0	4.1	1.0	20.0
		Frequency		Percent		
Been to New Orleans prior to volunteering after Hurricane Katrina (check all that apply)						
No		108		61.4		
I lived there		6		3.4		
For family		6		3.4		
For work		11		6.3		
For vacation		40		22.7		
Yes, other		13		7.7		
Region lived in when first volunteered in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina						
Northeast		21		12.1		
Midwest		67		38.5		
South		25		14.4		
(Louisiana)		*(7)*		*(4.0)*		
West		40		34.5		
Outside U.S.		1		0.6		
Years have volunteered in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina (check all that apply)						
2005┼		--		--		
2006		62		35.2		
2007		78		44.3		
2008		74		42.1		
2009		69		39.2		
2010		68		38.6		
2011		73		41.5		
2012		55		31.3		
2013		39		22.2		
2014		33		18.8		
Total years volunteered (summed from above)						
1		46		26.6		
2		45		26.0		
3		26		15.0		
4		14		8.1		
5		14		8.1		
6		8		4.6		
7		6		3.5		
8		5		2.9		
9		9		5.2		
Number of trips						
1		58		33.9		
2		33		19.3		
3		28		16.4		
4		10		5.9		
5 or more		42		24.6		

┼ Missing data due to error in survey instrument

Table 3b – Survey Respondents – Descriptive Statistics Specific to Volunteering (Cont.)

	Frequency	Percentage
Longest single trip		
A few days	3	1.8
One week	73	42.9
2 or 3 weeks	27	15.9
One month	17	10.0
2 or 3 months	25	14.7
3-6 months	5	2.9
6-11 months	3	1.8
A year or more	17	10.0
Relocated to New Orleans		
No	134	78.8
Still in NOLA	17	10.0
Yes, relocated	19	11.2
Forms of participation		
Gutted flooded homes	102	58.0
Low skilled construction	141	80.1
Skilled construction	56	31.8
Neighborhood clean-up	93	52.8
Served meals	59	33.5
Tutored children	41	23.3
Provided shelter	10	5.7
Connected people to services	49	27.8
Provided counseling	16	9.1
Used online technologies	27	15.3
Gave money to volunteer org.	79	44.9
Gave money to political org.	18	10.2
Contacted government official	25	14.2
Attended city meetings	22	13.5
Spoke at city meetings	3	1.7
Consciousness raising	43	24.4
Signed a petition/public letter	41	23.3
Boycotted certain products	17	9.7
Buycotted certain products	22	12.5
Wore campaign badge/sticker	23	13.1
Joined a strike	3	1.7
Rally, demonstration, march, vigil	53	30.1
Direct action (civil disobedience)	14	8.0
Engaged in illegal forms of action	4	2.3
Used violent forms of action	0	0.0

Instead of asking their current political views, I asked respondents to report their political views before and after volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans, which are summarized in Table 4a and Table 4b, along with their attitudes regarding altruism, race, class, gender, and sexuality. Before coming to New Orleans to volunteer, a significantly higher percentage of my respondents, compared to the general population, identified as liberal (35 percent compared to 12 percent) or extremely liberal (19 percent compared to 4 percent). Conversely, a significantly lower percentage of my respondents identify as moderate (11 percent compared to 40 percent) or slightly conservative (4 percent compared to 14 percent). However, there was no statistically significant difference between the percent of my respondents and that of the general population that identified as slightly liberal (16 percent compared to 11 percent), conservative (14 percent compared to 15 percent), or extremely conservative (2 percent compared to 4 percent). I describe and analyze shifts in volunteers' political views after volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans in the ensuing chapters.

Further, my respondents tend to hold more altruistic attitudes than the general population. Regarding the statement, "those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others," a significantly higher percentage of my respondents, when compared to the general population, strongly disagree (39 percent compared to 4 percent) or somewhat disagree (32 percent compared to 19 percent), and a significantly smaller percentage neither agree nor disagree (12 percent compared to 24 percent), somewhat agree (15 percent compared to 41 percent), or strongly agree (3 percent compared to 12 percent). Regarding the statement, "personally assisting people in

Table 4a – Survey Respondents – Attitudes

Variable	Frequency	Percent	GSS 2014 Frequency	GSS 2014 Percent
Political Ideology				
Before volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans				
Extremely Liberal	30	18.6*	94	3.8
Liberal	56	34.8*	304	12.4
Slightly Liberal	25	15.5	263	10.7
Moderate	18	11.2*	989	40.4
Slighly Conservative	7	4.4*	334	13.6
Conservative	22	13.7	358	14.6
Extremely Conservative	3	1.9	107	4.4
After volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans				
Extremely Liberal	50	30.5˜	-	-
Liberal	47	28.7	-	-
Slightly Liberal	19	11.6	-	-
Moderate	19	11.6	-	-
Slighly Conservative	6	3.7	-	-
Conservative	19	11.6	-	-
Extremely Conservative	4	2.4	-	-
Racial Attitudes				
If a racial minority family with about the same income and education as I have moved in next door, I would mind a great deal				
Strongly Disagree	143	86.1	-	-
Somewhat Disagree	9	5.4	-	-
Neither	11	6.6	-	-
Somewhat Agree	1	0.6	-	-
Strongly Agree	2	1.2	-	-
Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations				
Strongly Disagree	110	66.7	-	-
Somewhat Disagree	38	23.0	-	-
Neither	7	4.2	-	-
Somewhat Agree	6	3.6	-	-
Strongly Agree	4	2.4	-	-
White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin				
Strongly Disagree	5	3.0	-	-
Somewhat Disagree	8	4.8	-	-
Neither	18	10.8	-	-
Somewhat Agree	34	20.5	-	-
Strongly Agree	101	60.8	-	-
Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people				
Strongly Disagree	84	51.2	-	-
Somewhat Disagree	31	18.9	-	-
Neither	27	16.5	-	-
Somewhat Agree	16	9.8	-	-
Strongly Agree	6	3.7	-	-

* Compares my sample to GSS, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

˜ Compares political views before and after volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

Table 4b – Survey Respondents – Attitudes (Cont.)

Variable	Frequency	Percent	GSS 2014 Frequency	GSS 2014 Percent
Class Attitudes				
If every individual would carry his/her own weight, there would be no poverty				
Strongly Disagree	111	66.9	-	-
Somewhat Disagree	35	21.1	-	-
Neither	8	4.8	-	-
Somewhat Agree	10	6.0	-	-
Strongly Agree	2	1.2	-	-
Those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others				
Strongly Disagree	63	38.4*	46	3.6
Somewhat Disagree	53	32.3*	240	19.0
Neither	19	11.6*	303	24.0
Somewhat Agree	24	14.6*	519	41.0
Strongly Agree	5	3.1*	156	12.3
Gender and Sexuality Attitudes				
Women's requests in terms of equality between the sexes are simply exaggerated				
Strongly Disagree	106	64.6	-	-
Somewhat Disagree	29	17.7	-	-
Neither	16	9.8	-	-
Somewhat Agree	10	6.1	-	-
Strongly Agree	3	1.8	-	-
I welcome new friends who are gay				
Strongly Disagree	4	2.4	-	-
Somewhat Disagree	3	1.8	-	-
Neither	17	10.4	-	-
Somewhat Agree	19	11.6	-	-
Strongly Agree	121	73.8	-	-
Other Attitudes				
Disasters such as floods are the work of nature and cannot be prevented				
Strongly Disagree	30	18.2	-	-
Somewhat Disagree	37	22.4	-	-
Neither	16	9.7	-	-
Somewhat Agree	59	35.8	-	-
Strongly Agree	23	13.9	-	-
Personally assisting people in trouble is very important to me				
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	11	0.9
Somewhat Disagree	3	1.8	41	3.3
Neither	8	4.9*	179	14.2
Somewhat Agree	44	26.6*	706	55.9
Strongly Agree	110	66.7*	326	25.8
People should be willing to help others who are less fortunate				
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0	10	0.8
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.0	19	1.5
Neither	3	1.8*	77	6.1
Somewhat Agree	26	15.7*	549	43.4
Strongly Agree	137	82.5*	609	48.2

* Comparing my sample to GSS, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

trouble is very important to me," a significantly higher percentage of my respondents strongly agree (67 percent compared to 26 percent), and a significantly lower percentage somewhat agree (27 percent compared to 56 percent) or neither agree nor disagree (5 percent compared to 14 percent). Regarding the statement, "people should be willing to help others who are less fortunate," a significantly higher percentage of my respondents strongly agree (83 percent compared to 48 percent), and a significantly lower percentage somewhat agree (16 percent compared to 43 percent) or neither agree nor disagree (2 percent compared to 6 percent). Unsurprisingly, this trend carries over into other social attitudes.

Volunteers also tend to hold progressive views on race. With regard to race, most strongly disagree or somewhat agree with the following statements: "if a racial minority family with about the same income and education as I have moved in next door, I would mind a great deal" (86 percent and 5 percent; MOFRS measure); "racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations" (67 percent and 23 percent; CoBRAS measure of blatant racial issues); and "social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people" (51 percent and 19 percent; CoBRAS measure of institutional discrimination). Similarly, most strongly agree with the statement "white people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin" (61 percent and 21 percent; CoBRAS measure of racial privilege).

Volunteers tend to hold progressive views regarding class relative to the general population. Regarding the statement, "those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others," a significantly higher percentage of my

respondents, when compared to the general population, strongly disagree (38 percent compared to 4 percent) or somewhat disagree (32 percent compared to 19 percent), and a significantly lower percentage neither agree nor disagree (12 percent compared to 24 percent), somewhat agree (15 percent compared to 41 percent), or strongly agree (3 percent compared to 12 percent). The majority of my respondents also strongly disagree or somewhat disagree with the statement "if every individual would carry his/her own weight, there would be no poverty" (67 percent and 21 percent; MEBS measure).

Volunteers also hold progressive view on sex/gender and sexuality. Regarding sex/gender, most strongly disagree or somewhat disagree with the statement "women's requests in terms of equality between the sexes are simply exaggerated" (65 percent and 18 percent; NS measure). Regarding sexuality, most strongly agree or somewhat agree with the statement "I welcome new friends who are gay" (74 percent and 12 percent; MHS measure). In summary, volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans are disproportionately liberal and altruistic relative to the general population and hold what appear to be strongly liberal attitudes regarding race, class, gender, and sexuality.

Interviews with Volunteers

To get more in-depth data directly from the volunteer perspective, I conducted 31 interviews with volunteers not in leadership positions. At the end of the survey discussed above, I asked volunteers if they would be willing to participate in a follow up interview and, if so, asked them to provide their email address. Of the 176 survey respondents, 73 indicated they were willing to participate in a follow up interview. Following an initial

analysis of the volunteer coordinator interviews as well as the volunteer survey data, I revised my interview script to better address my initial findings from the various volunteer perspectives (see Appendix 6 for the final iteration). These interviews were conducted over a four month period in 2016. Interviews lasted between forty minutes and two hours, with an average interview time of about one hour. All interviews were conducted by phone, were digitally recorded, and later transcribed.

OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

In Chapter 1, I examine the Katrina disaster through the lens of anti-black genocide in the United States. I argue that the outcomes of Katrina for black New Orleanians fulfill each dimension of Churchill's (1997) definition of genocide: killing, dispersal and evisceration, and social death. Existing studies establish the disproportionate death of black New Orleanians and the unequal challenges they faced to return to the city. To understand the experience of cultural genocide, I draw on oral histories with residents of the Lower Ninth Ward. This chapter contributes to the literature by highlighting the Lower Ninth Ward's experience of cultural erasure (and their resistance to it) and the longer term loss both for this group and for broader society.

In Chapter 2, I combine insights from scholarship on volunteers and social movements with my findings from a survey of and interviews with volunteers and volunteer coordinators to develop a typology of nonlocal disaster recovery volunteers: Servants (service-oriented), Activists (justice-oriented), and Tourists (travel-oriented). My category of Servants is nearly identical to Wolensky's category of altruistic

volunteers. They are motivated by situational charity-based altruism, they think of Katrina as a natural disaster, and they perform non-contentious service provision. My category of Activists, however, is a hybrid of Wolenky's categories of altruistic and decionalistic (private interest social movement). These nonlocal volunteer Activists are motivated by mutual aid, they think of Katrina as a sociopolitical disaster and therefore connect private and public interests, and they combine protest, advocacy and service provision. Finally, my category of Tourists again modifies Wolensky's altruistic volunteers by identifying the ways in which their seemingly public interest may be shaped by their private interests. Tourists are largely motivated by a desire to travel, think of Katrina as a natural disaster, and engage in tourist activities in combination with non-contentious service delivery. Many Activists arrived shortly after the disaster, while most Servants and Tourists were drawn to New Orleans as a disaster volunteer metaspace further away from Katrina. Tourists are less dedicated to volunteer work and less sensitive to disaster trauma than Servants or Activists. Finally, I examine how volunteers are impacted by their experiences in New Orleans and how it sometimes leads to their becoming more liberal, highlighting that these volunteer types exist on a spectrum where individuals do not have a necessarily fixed position.

In Chapter 3, I address the mixed outcomes of volunteer recovery efforts through examination of the (re)production of social inequalities on the part of volunteers. I do so through analysis of their positive contributions to rebuilding as well as their negative impacts, such as their stereotyping of service beneficiaries, which led to outcomes ranging from unintentionally shoddy labor to outright punishment. I find that volunteers

reproduce race, class and gender inequalities through insensitivity towards recipients and communities with regard to disaster trauma and cultural differences, poor quality of labor due to assumptions about "free" services, condescension and judgment of recipients' decisions, identification of recipients as (un)worthy of services, and punishment of recipients deemed unworthy. These findings shed light on the not so pleasant underbelly of the largely celebrated bastion of whiteness that is volunteerism, which has implications not only for scholarship but for the policies and practices of volunteer based organizations.

In Chapter 4, I examine the ways in which volunteers "do gender" and its consequent negative outcomes, which have received little scholarly scrutiny despite past research that documents pervasive gender inequality within organizations (Acker 2006). I find that both volunteer coordinators and volunteers report a mix of positive and negative impacts of volunteerism on female participants regarding women's empowerment and gender equality. The opportunity to gut flooded homes and engage in traditionally masculine construction tasks was empowering for many female volunteers because it enabled them to use their bodies and to learn new skills that break with gender norms. However, these positive outcomes were dampened by "inequality regimes" (Acker 2006) in the form of normalized gender harassment. Female volunteers were often confronted by men who didn't think that women should carry heavy objects and assumed women were less knowledgeable than men about using tools. Female volunteer coordinators often had their legitimacy challenged by male volunteers (particularly if they were older)

and therefore shared a sense that their actions were under greater scrutiny than male crew leaders.

In my concluding chapter, I argue that that the outcomes of service provision are shaped not only be *what* is done but by *how* it is done. While the nonprofit industrial complex (NPIC) may be a flawed, it is the dominant conduit for service provision in the contemporary United States. Therefore, we would be wise to identify ways to navigate this system to best provide needed services to oppressed peoples while also raising the consciousness of volunteers to diminish the impacts of their racism, classism, and sexism on those they serve as well as on each other.

If we can better understand the different types of volunteers that respond to disaster, we may be able to better predict who will respond in future disaster events, what the consequences will be for participants, for local residents, and for community recovery. This understanding may even help us to intervene to improve those outcomes. This is the only study to look at multiple types of disaster recovery organizations in New Orleans and therefore provides the most comprehensive typology of disaster recovery volunteerism to date. Previous studies instead provide case studies of particular organizations or focus on more narrow subsets of disaster volunteers (Danielson 2010; Dass-Brailsford et al. 2011; Erdely 2011; Heldman and Israel-Trummel 2012; Hilderbrand et al. 2007; Kim and Dutta 2009; Luft 2008, 2009; Phillips and Jenkins 2010; Phillips 2009, 2014). With the increased magnitude and frequency of disasters due to climate change, disaster recovery volunteerism is likely to become a more important part of civil society that begs deeper understanding.

Likewise, if we understand that volunteers are embedded within a white supremacist heteropatriarchal society, it is crucial to examine the larger social structures in which disaster occurs, which helps us to understand the ways in which volunteerism both challenges and reproduces race, class, and gender inequalities. Indeed, if we understand the Katrina disaster as an extension of the racial state and anti-black genocide, and we wish to resist such injustice and oppression more generally, it is crucial to critically examine the outcomes of volunteer service provision.

Chapter 1

Hurricane Katrina as Anti-Black Genocide

Hurricane Katrina is well established as a social disaster that exposed and exacerbated deep race, class, and gender inequalities in the city of New Orleans and in society more broadly. For this chapter, I initially set out to understand how outside volunteers and volunteer activists in post-Katrina recovery efforts aided and/or resisted genocidal neoliberal disaster recovery policies, assuming that the Katrina disaster had already been established as an extension of anti-black genocide. However, I was surprised to find few scholarly mentions of Hurricane Katrina as genocidal, which were largely in passing and did not couch themselves within the broader scholarly literature on racial genocide. While other frameworks, such as human rights, state crime, biopolitics and racism have been employed, these paradigms emphasize the role of the perpetrator in order to explain why the disaster occurred. A focus on genocide, however, highlights the physical and cultural erasure of the target group and the longer term loss both for the target group itself and for broader society.

In this chapter, therefore, I turn my attention to the establishment of the Katrina disaster in New Orleans as a particular and telling moment in a broader and continuous history of anti-black genocide in the United States. I begin by addressing how genocide is defined by the United Nations Genocide Convention (UNCG), why it is politically compromised, and how genocide has been defined by scholars. I then examine how scholars and activists have interpreted the actions of the United States government as genocidal towards its black citizens. Turning to the Katrina disaster, I show that its

outcomes fit within Churchill's (1997) three part definition of genocide: killing, evisceration, and cultural erasure. While I rely primarily on the existing literature to establish the first of these two components, I draw from oral histories with current and former residents of New Orleans' Lower Ninth Ward to establish their experience of and resistance to cultural genocide.

Genocide

If the debate around what counts as genocide reveals anything, it is that no one universal definition has or is likely to emerge. Article II of the United Nations Genocide Convention, which has generally been considered the international legal standard since its creation in 1948, defines genocide using the following language:

> In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:
> (a) Killing members of the group;
> (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
> (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
> (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
> (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.
> (General Assembly of the United Nations 1948)

However, the UNGC definition is widely recognized as a politically compromised version of Lemkin's (1944) initial conceptualization of genocide because the state representatives (including those from the U.S.) who participated in its passage actively ensured that their nation would not be defined as a perpetrator based on their previous or ongoing actions (Lippman 2002). Scholars have grappled with the analytic and political

strengths and limitations of using the UNGC definition, redefined the term along a spectrum of more inclusive or exclusive definitions, and produced various typologies and subcategories of genocide or genocidal action (Chalk and Jonassohn 1990; Churchill 1997; Jones 2000; Kuper 1982; Levene 2008; Shaw 2007; Totten and Bartrop 2009; Totten, Parsons, and Hitchcock 2002; Van Schaack 1997). Scholars are compelled to choose from a laundry list of possible definitions or forge an iteration of their own.

For the purposes of this chapter, I will employ Churchill's (1997) definition of genocide. Reworking the language of the UNGC, Churchill (1997: 431-433) puts forward the following definition, which I truncate somewhat in order to highlight those components applicable to the Katrina disaster:

> Genocide means the destruction, entirely or in part, of any racial, ethnic, national, religious, cultural, linguistic, political, economic, gender or other human group, however such group may be defined by the perpetrator. It is understood that, historically, genocide has taken three (3) primary forms, usually, but not always, functioning in combination with one another.
> (a) Physical Genocide, by which is meant killing members of the targeted group(s) either directly, by indirect means, or some combination. Indirect means are understood to include, but are not restricted to, the imposition of slave labor conditions upon the target group(s), denial of fundamental medical attention to group members, and forms of systematic economic deprivation leading to starvation and other deteriorations in the physical well-being of group members…
> (c) Cultural Genocide, by which is meant the destruction of the specific character of the targeted group(s) through destruction or expropriation of its means of economic perpetuation; prohibition or curtailment of its language; suppression of its religious, social, or political practices...; forced dislocation, expulsion or dispersal of its members.

While controversially inclusive compared to other definitions, I am most compelled by this definition because Churchill (1997) reworks the UNGC definition to put teeth back into it so that it may be applicable to those powerful nations that actively worked to shield themselves from accountability, and reflects Lemkin's (1944) conceptualization of

the term before it became politically compromised (Vargas 2008). While the case I make in the chapter may not be permissible in international law and is therefore less than ideal from a pragmatic perspective, it more honestly addresses how the U.S. has and continues to engage in various forms of genocide against its black citizens.

Anti-Black Genocide

While still controversial in the scholarly literature on genocide, the charge of genocide against the government of the United States against its black citizens is not new. The text *We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of The United States Government Against the Negro People* serves as a keystone for this paradigm (Civil Rights Congress 1951). The Civil Rights Congress (1951: XI) published this case against the U.S. for anti-black genocide in 1951 using the UNGC's definition of genocide:

> The oppressed Negro citizens of the United States, segregated, discriminated against and long the target of violence, suffer from genocide as the result of the consistent, conscious, unified policies of every branch of government.

Going back to the nation's founding, this document provides an extensive catalogue of racially driven murder, violence, terrorism, and political and economic suppression at the hands of the state or non-state actors with the state's explicit or implicit approval. While the petition failed to produce action on the part of the UN, it moved scholars and activists to understand and/or elaborate black experiences within the framework of racial genocide.

A number of scholars have followed in the tradition of *We Charge Genocide* by analyzing popular sentiments regarding anti-black genocide or by providing their own indictment of the United States government. These elaborations have ranged from the genocide of all or specific groups of black people (e.g., men, women), through broad or specific means (e.g. AIDS, birth control, biomedicine), and throughout US history or during specific eras (e.g., pre- or post-enslavement, Jim Crow, contemporary) (Bogart and Thorburn 2006; Caron 1998; Cooper 2012; Epstein 1997; Farrell, Dawkins, and Oliver 1983; Gamble 1997; James 2009; Johnson and Leighton 1995; Rodríguez 2011; Staples 1987; Thomas and Quinn 1991; Turner and Darity 1973; Vargas 2008; Weisbord 1973; Willhelm 1986; Wolfe 2008). Challenging understandings of anti-black genocide as confined to a specific era, Rodriguez (2011: 17) argues that "the historical social logics of racial chattel slavery cannot be historically compartmentalized and temporally isolated into a discrete 'past' because they are genocidal in their structuring and are thus central to the constitution of our existing social and cultural systems." Further, Vargas (2008: 11) specifies that the:

> Dimensions of anti-Black genocide in the contemporary United States include mass imprisonment, police brutality, high infant mortality, early death (of children, men, women, and the elderly), deficient medical treatment, lack of competitive education and economic opportunities, everyday violence in the inner cities, chronic depression, and self-hatred.

While contested within mainstream genocide studies, many scholars have argued that genocide, both within the UNGC framework as well as within more inclusive scholarly definitions, may be applied to the collective experience of black people in the United States.

Hurricane Katrina as Anti-Black Genocide

Many scholars have understood the events surrounding Hurricane Katrina as a raced, classed, and gendered human-made disaster (Brinkley 2007; David and Enarson 2012; Espinoza 2006; Faust and Kauzlarich 2008; Gotham and Greenberg 2008; Sharkey 2007; Stephens et al. 2007). Others have contextualized it as a particular (and perhaps acute) moment within continuous state condoned and perpetrated racial violence against African Americans in particular and people of color generally (David and Enarson 2012; Dyson 2006; Giroux 2006; Hartman and Squires 2006; South End Press 2007). However, just as "much of the academic and popular literature on Hurricane Katrina addresses environmental and social implications while ignoring the state criminality," it also largely ignores genocide (Faust and Kauzlarich 2008:99). As notable exceptions, Rodríguez (2007:152) describes Katrina as "protogenocidal," and Muhammad (2006:8) asserts that Katrina is an extension of an ongoing anti-black genocide:

> With the exception of the post-Reconstruction period of the late 19th century, the Katrina disaster represents the clearest expression of the US federal government's outright complicity with acts of mass murder and genocide against Black people.

Some popular writings grapple with Katrina as ethnic cleansing, yet they do so without engaging the broader academic discussion of what constitutes genocide and how Katrina fits within that concept (Davis 2005; Enzi 2005; Jackson 2005; Younge 2006). In short, Katrina's relation to anti-black genocide remains undertheorized.

The events surrounding Hurricane Katrina fulfill multiple dimensions of Churchill's definition of genocide. Building on Rodriguez (2007) and Muhammad's

(2006) claims, I argue that black New Orleanians were subject to (1) the "killing members of the targeted group(s) either directly, by indirect means, or some combination," (2) "forced dislocation, expulsion or dispersal of its members" and "systematic economic deprivation leading to starvation and other deteriorations in the physical well-being of group members," and (3) "the destruction of the specific character of the targeted group(s)" (Churchill 1997: 431-433).

While Rodriguez (2007: 152) describes the Katrina disaster as "intentional and institutional without a doubt," I will focus on the institutional aspects because proof of intent is largely immaterial to the genocidal impacts of Hurricane Katrina. Moses (2008:7) asserts that "genocide is to be explained as the outcome of complex processes rather than ascribable solely to the evil intentions of wicked men." Vargas (2008) further argues that within highly bureaucratized white supremacist structures, intent is obscured, cohesive patterns appear disparate, and seemingly neutral policies and procedures become genocidal. He concludes that "we do not have to dwell upon the intent of policies, everyday practices, symbolic forms of violence – or the intent behind the absence of redressive policies and practices – to comprehend that what really matters are the results of such (in)actions" (Vargas 2008: 12). Hurricane Katrina produced a heterogeneous body of tragedies that highlight these manifest and latent forms of active and passive genocide. In what follows, I address the Katrina disaster in New Orleans as genocide through this three-part definition: killing, dispersal and evisceration, and cultural erasure.

Killing

As a result of preventable flooding and state encouraged police and vigilante violence, black New Orleanians were subject to the "killing [of] members of the targeted group(s) either directly, by indirect means, or some combination" (Churchill 1997: 432) during the Hurricane Katrina disaster and its aftermath. The primary culprit was flooding due to levee failures, which was predicted and preventable. While Katrina's hurricane winds and rain severely affected other parts of the Mississippi Gulf Coast, they did only nominal damage in New Orleans before levee breaches resulted in catastrophic flooding in several neighborhoods, including Lakeview, New Orleans East, and the Lower Ninth Ward. Giroux (2006) finds that underfunding for levee upkeep combined with depleted state revenues due to tax cuts for the wealthy undermined state and local governments' abilities to protect citizens despite disastrous flooding foreseen by computer modeling during the Hurricane Pam exercise in 2004. In short, Katrina's predicted, preventable, and genocidal flooding was facilitated by informed policy decisions (Parker et al. 2009).

Combining direct and indirect causes, Katrina's estimated death toll is 4,081. Official reports count 1,836 confirmed deaths and 705 missing people as a direct result of Katrina (Watson 2008). A study of death notices in New Orleans newspapers estimates that 2,358 died as a result of collateral trauma caused by Katrina, including mental disorders, physical stress, contamination, deeper impoverishment, and the collapse of the health care system (Stephens et al. 2007). Further, Sharkey (2007: 484) finds that the dead and missing were disproportionately black, heavily concentrated in black neighborhoods, and that these resulted from heightened disaster vulnerability produced

by “the legacy of racial and economic segregation [that] has left specific segments of urban communities isolated from institutional resources, economic opportunity, and political influence.” In other words, Katrina was a racialized catastrophe.

Black New Orleanians who survived the flooding found themselves the targets of racially charged military, police, and vigilante killings falsely justified as defense of private property. Giroux (2006: 176) recounts that “politicians such as Louisiana Governor Kathleen Blanco issued an order allowing soldiers to shoot to kill looters [read black] in an effort to restore calm. Later inquiries revealed that almost all of these crimes did not take place.” These false charges, however, produced very real consequences. In post-Katrina New Orleans, many accounts emerged of police shooting and sometimes killing black people without warning and without cause, including the shooting of Keenan McCann, the murders of Danny Brumfield and Henry Glover, and the murders of James Brissette and Ronald Madison along with the shooting of four other civilians at the Danziger Bridge. The officers involved in the shooting of McCann and murder of Brumfield were never held accountable (Nolan and Grimm 2015; Thompson 2009). Five officers were involved in Glover’s murder and its cover up, but only two were ultimately disciplined after years of inaction and delay (Daley and Lane 2016). After an internal NOPD investigation, a grand jury investigation, a dismissal of charges based on prosecutorial misconduct, and finally an FBI probe, the officers involved in the Danziger Bridge shooting received reduced sentences of three to twelve years in prison (Thompson, McCarthy, and Maggi 2009). Further, police ignored “self-deputized posses [of] white citizens” concentrated in the Algiers Point neighborhood, who grinned as they

"describe to Spike Lee, on tape, their stockpiled weapons for shooting (black) people in order to protect their property" (James 2007:161). Investigative journalism in 2008 brought to light evidence of at least eleven shootings of black men by white vigilantes in Algiers Point, which prompted an FBI probe. While journalists found evidence suggesting that dozens participated in the militia, only one vigilante has been convicted (McCarthy and Thompson 2010).

In many ways, the justification for shooting looters [read black people, men in particular] fits within Moses' (2008: 34) logic that "Nazism was intra-European colonialism." Only one of the shooting victims above was a woman, suggesting that tired tropes of black men as "hoodlums" and criminals contributed to the violence they suffered. Through this lens, police and vigilantes justified preemptive strikes against black men they saw as a threat to their private property and (white) sovereignty. Their logic parallels the Nazi's perception of themselves as a national liberation movement against their (supposed, and fantastically so) Jewish colonizers. These immediate killings, however, are only the tip of the iceberg.

Dispersal and Evisceration

While the "physical" component of genocide is strongest in the popular imagination, black New Orleanians faced and continue to grapple with "forced dislocation, expulsion or dispersal" (Churchill 1997: 433). The forced relocation of black people has a strong historical precedent. The slave trade, colonization, and imperial military occupations are central aspects of European and Euro-American displacement of

indigenous peoples of color (South End Press 2007). Given this history, the logical connection to Katrina is immediate.

There is little controversy over whether Katrina caused the disproportionate relocation of black residents. In their study of the demographic consequences of Katrina, Swanson et al. (2009:36) find that "the black population was reduced both absolutely and relatively more than the white population (loss of 150,032 blacks v. 107,845 whites, or 32.7% v. 19.8%)…Katrina's demographic effects are profound, and may persist well beyond the 2010 U.S. Census." In order to examine whether or not this diaspora was "forced," I now turn to the mechanisms that produced these unequal outcomes.

Many of the barriers faced by black New Orleanians to their return were preventable or manufactured. Fussell and Elliott (2009:390) summarize a body of research indicating that "African American residents of New Orleans were disproportionately likely to suffer prolonged displacement because their homes and neighborhoods were more likely than their White counterparts' to suffer severe flooding as a result of historic patterns of racial segregation within the city." While white residents from heavily damaged areas were able to relocate to less affected white neighborhoods within the city, racial boundaries discouraged black residents from relocating to these "immediate opportunity areas," causing race to play an important role in the early recovery of the city. Further, Kromm and Sturgis (2008:5) find that "the U.S. government…effectively fail[ed] to address the need for affordable housing, health care access, and adequate employment that would enable displaced persons [disproportionately black] to come home." Those unable to return home quickly were

then more likely to give up hope of returning to New Orleans, whether they wanted to or not (Fussell and Elliott 2009). While many displaced New Orleanians retained the feeling that there "is no place like New Orleans," Chamlee-Wright and Storr (2009:631) also find that "in order for a strong sense of place to be effective in fostering community rebound, key logistical problems (such as schools and hospitals reopening) are critical if this potential is to be tapped."

Spread across the United States, black New Orleanians were subject to "systematic economic deprivation leading to starvation and other deteriorations in the physical well-being of group members" (Churchill 1997: 432). Poor New Orleanians, disproportionately black, found their troubles compounded by Katrina such that they were "thrown into deeper poverty during prolonged displacement—a problem that could not be adequately addressed by either disaster assistance programs or local social assistance programs alone" (Fussell and Elliot 2009: 386). Further, Kromm and Sturgis (2008: 5) report that "the U.S. government did not adequately protect the rights of Gulf Coast residents during displacement, failing in many cases to prevent discrimination against the poor, immigrants and people of color." This experience fits within the larger logic of evisceration, which involves not just killing but the neutralization of the "other" by bringing them closer to death without extermination (Rodriguez 2011, 2012).

Gender intersects with race and class to shape experiences of disaster. Following Katrina, David and Enarson (2012: 11-12) assert that "the finely balanced networks of support poor [disproportionately black] women develop to survive in our economy…were ripped apart after this storm. Low-wage women…will not be helped

back on their feet by the economic recovery plans geared to major employers in the formal sector." Prior to Katrina, women were more likely to live in public housing or to rent. Following Katrina, large public housing projects were closed, demolished, and replaced with mixed income housing with substantially fewer Section 8 units available. Rebuilding policies focused on owners, leading to a shortage of rental units and therefore a spike in the cost to rent. These housing crises disproportionately affected poor black women. Shaped by the intersections of race, class, and gender, this evisceration of black men and women hindered their successful return home to New Orleans.

Residents of the Lower Ninth Ward, a heavily black neighborhood with high rates of home ownership, faced particularly steep challenges to their return and their quality of life if they did manage to get home. Only a fraction of Lower Ninth Ward residents have been able to return home, and only a fraction of the neighborhood has been rebuilt. According to Census data, 14,008 people lived 4,820 households in the Lower Ninth Ward dropped in 2000 (GNOCDC 2015). By 2010, that number had fallen to 2842 people living in 1,061 households, suggesting that only twenty percent of people and 22 percent of households had been able to return. Families with children were particularly unlikely to return. The total number housing units fell 64 percent from 5,601 to 2,039, and the percentage of vacant housing units rose from fourteen to 48 percent. This agrees with my personal observations at recently as 2016 that about one-third of houses are renovated or newly built and another third remain blighted from flooding. The remaining third are empty grass lots or concrete foundations; the ghosts of now bulldozed homes. While Census data is a bit dated as of 2016, more recent data on active postal addresses

shows growth but a still fractional return (GNOCDC 2016). In June 2005, 5,363 households received mail. By June 2016, this number had fallen to 1,970, showing a return of only 37 percent .

The return of Ninth Ward residents has been obstructed by prolonged denial of access to property (exacerbating mold and termite damage and theft), prolonged absence of water and electrical service, concern over adequate levee repairs, and proposals to redevelop their neighborhoods as green space and rainwater storage (Chamlee-Wright and Storr 2009; Colten, Kates, and Laska 2008). Under military curfew enforced by the National Guard, residents of the neighborhood were given only restricted access to their property for months after the flooding, well after it had been lifted for other parts of the city (Rodes 2014). Eminent domain laws put "nuisance properties" under threat of government seizure if homes were not gutted or lawns were above eighteen inches (NORA 2009; Sheets 2007). A number of houses were prematurely demolished by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) without proper inspection and notification (and then without compensation) (Kromm and Sturgis 2008). Disaster capitalists almost immediately bought up properties, taking advantage of residents whose focus was on short-term survival (Brown and Williams 2007). Under these conditions, "risk reduction" measures have been alternatively perceived as attempts to hinder the return of displaced black residents of the Lower Ninth Ward (Colten et al. 2008).

The false depiction of the Lower Ninth Ward as somehow "naturally" more at risk than other New Orleans neighborhoods frames blacks as savages, unable to choose a proper and safe place to live, and therefore it is the white man's burden to implement

these “risk reduction” measures for their own good (Hinton 2002; Moses and Hinton 2008; Schaller and Zimmerer 2008). Within this framework, the death of black residents of the Lower Ninth Ward may be seen as “the price of civilization” and “human progress” (Moses 2008: 4-5). This fits within Levene's (2008:13) understanding of “modernity’s positivist meta-narrative of progress…[and] those allegedly problematic human individuals or groups, who fail to fit, or are insufficient to the demands of, or, indeed, are surplus to the requirements of that ordering.” Similar to the portrayal of indigenous peoples as dying races, the inevitability of the flooding of the Lower Ninth Ward undermines residents’ rightful ownership over the land and mitigates responsibility of the state for their decline and displacement and diverts attention away from the preventability of the Katrina disaster and who might be found culpable (Finzsch 2008).

Cultural Erasure

The killing, dispersal and evisceration of black residents of the Lower Ninth Ward combine in the “the destruction of the specific character of the targeted group(s)” or what Churchill (1997: 433) refers to as “cultural genocide.” Moses (2008: 12) argues that Lemkin’s early work exhibited greater concern “with loss of culture than the loss of life” because he valued groups for their contribution to world community rather than for their own intrinsic value or internally defined value. “Social death,” a term developed to describe the experience of decimated European Jewish peoples in the wake of the Holocaust, takes place “[w]hen a group with its own cultural identity is destroyed, its survivors lose their cultural heritage and may even lose their intergenerational

connections," which renders descendents "natally alienated" or "no longer able to pass along and build upon the traditions, cultural developments…, and projects of earlier generations" (Card 2003:73). While not without its pitfalls (e.g., who decides what cultural contributions to the collective are valuable), this framework begs to be applied to the attempted and partial erasure of the Lower Ninth Ward. In what follows, I draw from the Lower Ninth Ward Living Museum's archive of 70 oral histories with residents of the Lower Ninth Ward, as described in the introductory chapter.

The Lower Ninth Ward has a rich and unique cultural history going back to its originals as a cypress swamp that housed runaway slaves in the late 1700s. It was later ground zero for school desegregation in the Deep South, and home to over 200 renowned musicians, including Fats Domino. With approximately at least two out of three its previous residents dead or displaced, its economic and physical infrastructure gutted, and nearly half of its housing units vacant (many of which remain blighted from Katrina), the Lower Ninth Ward exists in a liminal space between "social death" and survival. Lower Ninth Ward residents have undoubtedly suffered some extent of cultural genocide and social death.

Many people associate the Lower Ninth Ward with images of nearly submerged houses and people trapped on rooftops in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. What people don't often think about is the neighborhood it was before Katrina – a family-oriented community with a unique heritage and one of the highest rates of black home ownership in the nation, often multi-generational (Wagner and Edwards 2006). According to data from the 2000 Census, 57 percent of black Lower Ninth Ward residents owned their

homes compared to 53 percent of black people in Louisiana and 49 percent of black people nationally. Robert Richardson, a middle-aged black man and resident of the Lower Ninth Ward, notes that:

> We owned the land. It's handed down. Most of us here are second, third, probably fourth generation land owners.

These rates of homeownership coincide with a strong sense of place such that many residents have lived their whole lives in the Lower Ninth Ward. In the Lower Ninth Ward, 92 percent of people were born in Louisiana, compared to 77 percent of New Orleanians and 79 percent of people in Louisiana (60 percent of Americans were born in the state they currently lived in). Further, 74 percent of Lower Ninth Ward residents lived in the same house five years prior, compared to 57 percent in New Orleans, 59 percent in Louisiana, and 54 percent nationally (Wagner and Edwards 2006). Carmel Howard, an elder black woman and Lower Ninth Ward resident, leads a chorus of voices echoing this sentiment when she asserts that:

> What is important to me about this neighborhood is I was born and raised here, 83 years in this neighborhood.

Robert Wilson, an elder black man and resident of the Lower Ninth Ward, states:

> I've been down here so long, and, dang it, I love this Ninth Ward. You understand?

When Lower Ninth Ward residents were displaced, they were not just displaced from the place they lived at the time. For many, they were removed from a place that they had been since their childhood and that their family had lived for generations. "Roots run deep" here.

In addition to ties based on time, many residents celebrate the unique spirit of the area. While New Orleans as a whole prides itself on Southern hospitality, many residents of the Lower Ninth Ward take particular pride in the neighborhood's sense of interconnection. Jon Chenau, a middle-aged black man and resident of the Lower Ninth Ward, notes that:

> Though these streets are barren, everybody will wave at you…They will stop in your driveway and talk. People you ain't never met in your life will literally stop in front of your house and have a conversation with you…The soul of the people here, you're not going to find that nowhere else.

Celestine Walker, an elder black woman and resident of the Lower Ninth Ward, asserts that:

> And we still have that feeling, that this is family. You can't walk away from the family. You know? Sure I could have went and bought a house anywhere I wanted to, but I choose to live here.

This sense of place helps to explain why, despite more advanced infrastructures and economic opportunities in other places, many of those displaced by Katrina would prefer to live in New Orleans (Chamlee-Wright and Storr 2009). The late Ward "Mack" McClendon, an elder black man and resident of the Lower Ninth Ward, states:

> It's heartbreaking, knowing they wanted to be here, and that they had their choice they would be here.

These oral histories echo Chamlee-Wright and Storr's (2009: 615) finding that the Lower Ninth Ward possesses "a unique bundle of characteristics that, when taken together, constitute a sense of place that cannot be found or replicated elsewhere."

Residents routinely report that the Lower Ninth Ward is changed since the levees broke, and some voice a concern that the history and culture of the neighborhood are irreversibly damaged. Chamlee-Wright and Storr (2009: 631) find that "in order to foster community rebound, a strong sense of place must be complemented by an ability to imagine how one can play an active role in recreating the sense of place that disaster destroys." For some who have returned, too much has been taken from the Lower Ninth Ward for the neighborhood to return to what it was before Katrina. Jason Freeman, a middle-aged black man and resident of the Lower Ninth Ward, asserts that:

> A lot of the people that's coming here now, they really don't know the heritage of the Lower Ninth Ward. They really don't, you know? And I'm just afraid that it's going to get lost…And I think our story is never really gonna be told because basically all our people, the heart of our people, are not here.

For those who survive, Card (2003: 75) argues, "[t]he question…should not simply be whether the traditions survived but whether individual[s]…were able to sustain their connections to those traditions." For the current and former residents of the Lower Ninth Ward and their children, as it was Jewish survivors of the Holocaust, "[s]ustaining the connections meaningfully requires a family or community setting for observance…But many survivors were unable to do so" (Card 2003: 75). Percy Robinson, an elder black man and resident of the Lower Ninth Ward, states:

> It's history. It's the place where I grew up. It's a community that I knew really, really well, and I don't know it anymore. It's gone. The community I grew up in is gone.

As former residents grow deeper roots in their new communities, lifelong elders of the neighborhood pass away, and gentrification creeps into the more socioeconomically

advantaged Holy Cross section of the Lower Ninth Ward and the surrounding neighborhoods, the Lower Ninth Ward endures some degree of social death as a result of the Katrina disaster.

In the face of all this, Lower Ninth Ward residents continue to fight for their home. For some, the shared experience of social death has bolstered struggles against racism and poverty, and the fight for preservation and restoration (Luft 2009). However, Moses (2008: 7) argues that "investing agency in the colonized does not mean empire need to be seen as a symmetrically structured opportunity for cultural exchange." While at times politically expedient to highlight our agency in the face of systems of power, it can also be dishonest and, at worst, insulting to those who have come before us to understate their strength and resiliency. The battle against death-dealing (both physical and cultural) white supremacist neoliberalism has no end in sight. However, those who remain in the Lower Ninth Ward, where their "roots run deep," must and do resist, and it is at the peril of our own humanity should we fail to work alongside them in solidarity.

Volunteers and the Neoliberal Racial State

Indeed, millions of Americans from across the country have travelled to the Gulf Coast to engage in volunteer recovery efforts and/or activist organizing. However, Eliasoph (2013:3) argues, this "seemingly harmless aid…can sometimes cause great harm." While we tend to conceive of volunteer labor as free, it comes with costs. Volunteers need to be transported, housed, and fed, and these costs are particularly high when volunteers travel from long distances in order to reach the affected area (Phillips

2009). While these costs tend to be covered by the volunteers themselves or by the institutions or organizations through whom they are volunteering, they represent funds that could have been used in other ways, such as hiring local professionals. In the case of long-term AmeriCorps volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans, Danielson (2010) argues that poorly compensated volunteers themselves become reliant upon, and therefore a drain on, already strained public social services desperately needed by those who they serve. Of course, every funding decision has its complications. Beyond monetary expenses, volunteers require time investment. Volunteer managers (often long-term volunteers themselves) need to coordinate, train, and oversee volunteers (depending on the skill level of the job and skill level of the volunteers) while also arranging logistics like supplies and permits (Phillips 2009). Both the monetary and time costs of volunteers are often overlooked.

Disaster voluntary organizations are also embedded within a neoliberal state and the "nonprofit industrial complex." Post-Katrina volunteer recovery organizations have largely been nonprofit (and therefore state sanctioned) and many have received volunteers placed and financially sponsored by extensions of the state itself (e.g., AmeriCorps) (Danielson 2010). These organizations are integrated into federal government efforts through the "voluntary agency liaison" and various committees (Phillips 2009:440).

Rodriguez (2004) defines the non-profit industrial complex (NPIC) as a "set of symbiotic relationships that link together political and financial technologies of state and owning-class proctorship and surveillance over public political intercourse, including and

especially emergent progressive and leftist social movements, since about the mid-1970s" (quoted from Mananzala and Spade 2008:56). In part, the NPIC was a response to the gutting of government social services under Reaganomics. Key concerns regarding the NPIC include the erosion of radical social justice work and expansion of policy and service-based work, the transfer of agenda setting from the people into the hands of wealthy funders, a cultural shift in social justice organizing towards professionalization, corporatization, and intergroup competition for resources, and legalized tax evasion for the wealthy (Incite! Women of Color Against Violence 2007; Mananzala and Spade 2008).

Activists and scholars are divided on whether direct service provision resists or complies with oppressive structures like the racial state and neoliberalism. The first camp, which views volunteers as having the potential to resist the racial state, emerged from the Black Panther Party, global justice and environmental movements, and anarchist networks with a do-it-yourself (DIY) orientation. They perceive service provision (which they mixed with political action) as "improv[ing] the daily lives of constituents, as well as to build solidarity, political analysis, self-determination, and loyalty" (Luft 2009:509).

The second camp, which draws primarily from Black Liberationism, views volunteers as complicit with the neoliberal racial state. They perceive service provision as an extension of a nonprofit industrial complex. Therefore, they eschew direct aid and instead engage exclusively in "building political consciousness, furthering self-determination and state accountability, and fomenting specific actions" (Luft 2009:511).

Whether or not disaster recovery organizations resist or are complicit with the neoliberal racial state may depend upon the type of organization. Cress (1997:343) identifies "six pathways to adoption or nonadoption of nonprofit form and find[s] that [political] moderation, when it occurs, is not a function of nonprofit incorporation per se but of the particular pathway by which an SMO [social movement organization] came to adopt nonprofit form." Resistance and complicity with systems of power are often bound up with one another. While Western thinking encourages "either/or" thinking, Pyke (2010) argues that resistance and complicity are better understood though a "both/and" framework. Further, she argues that, in addition to the meaning of an action for the individual, we must be attentive to how those actions fit within larger power structures. What exactly volunteerism is meant to resist, if anything, seems to vary greatly depending on the volunteer and the organization. Further, Pyke (2010:83) asserts that "we need to consider how structures of power direct and co-opt resistance, rendering it ineffective, or worse, obscuring how it reproduces the very structures it intends to oppose."

Conclusion

In this chapter, I argue that the Katrina disaster was an event within a continuous history of anti-black geocide shaped by the structure of the neoliberal racial state. The Lower Ninth Ward, in particular, has been the victim of and continues to suffer from cultural genocide, despite the resilience and resistance of its people. Further, the neoliberal racial state shapes the demand for volunteers. The extent to which and how

volunteers resist or are complicit with the neoliberal racial state partly depends on their type (i.e., their motivations, consciousness, and activities). In the following chapter, I examine in greater depth the various types of volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans and their respective impacts.

Chapter 2

Servants, Activists, and Tourists: Volunteerism(s) in Post-Katrina New Orleans

> Now, with a lot of them, they come down, they'll work a few hours, but then they're ready to go party in the French Quarter.
> *-Randy, volunteer coordinator, New Orleans resident, and black man in his fifties*

Volunteers are diverse in their orientations and actions, and the heterogeneity of disaster recovery volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans provides an excellent opportunity to examine this variation. By blending disparate literatures and interviewing volunteer coordinators from over two dozen organizations, I identify three major disaster recovery volunteer types – Servants, Activists, and Tourists. These categories are based on the collective identities with which volunteers self-identify or are identified with by others. Collective identity refers to "an individual's cognitive, moral, and emotional connection with a broader community. It is a perception of shared status or relation, which may be imagined rather than experienced directly" (Polletta and Jasper 2001:285). Churches and universities are often identified as the largest institutional supports for volunteerism in post-Katrina New Orleans. I argue that church groups tend to fall under the Servant category, while students vary in their orientations such that they are spread across or subsumed within each group. I then analyze these volunteer types across three dimensions: motivations, issue framing, and activities. Motivation refers to why people decide to volunteer, issue framing refers to how people interpret why the Katrina disaster

happened, and activities refers to what actions they engage in. I also examine the timing of the three volunteer types in post-disaster zones.

I find that the three volunteer types vary across the three dimensions, but with some overlap. All three types engage in service provision activities, but of the three, Tourists are less dedicated to volunteer work and less sensitive to disaster trauma than Servants or Activists. I also find that Activists are more driven by issues of justice and engage in more contentious activities than Servants and Tourists. When it comes to framing, Servants and Tourists see the flooding of New Orleans as a natural disaster, whereas Activists see it as a sociopolitical disaster. Activists distance themselves from Tourists and Servants, whom they perceive as harmful to residents. Finally, I find that timing is important. Activists tend to be drawn to disasters right after they occur, whereas Servants come a bit later but keep coming for an extended time period. Tourists tend to come to disaster areas long after the event, and only to disaster areas with well-developed disaster volunteer metaspaces. While church groups tend to be clustered in the Servant category, students tend to be more diverse and spread across the volunteer categories. These findings will help us to better understand who will respond in future disaster events, and how their work will impact other volunteers, local residents, and community recovery.

LITERATURE REVIEW

My research combines insights from the literatures on volunteerism, disaster volunteerism, activism, and volunteer tourism. I begin with an assessment of existing

literature on the three volunteer types, which I seek to further refine. I then present the literature on the three dimensions along which volunteer types vary.

Volunteer Types

Existing studies of volunteerism have not adequately identified the typology of primary volunteer types. Most studies treat volunteers as a monolith, although some use different variations of two categories. Poppendieck (1999) identifies the contrast between charity and activist oriented volunteers. Luft (2008) highlights the differences between mainstream volunteers, service-oriented activists and advocacy-oriented activists. For volunteer tourists, Keese (2011) develops a spectrum from altruism to travel to describe the emerging volunteer tourist industry, and some studies have noted that volunteer tourists may have an activist orientation (Butcher 2006; Butcher and Smith 2010; Crabtree 1998; Guttentag 2009; Higgins-Desbiolles 2003, 2008; McGehee 2012; Raymond and Hall 2008; Wearing and McGehee 2013). On their own, these existing typologies are too limited. In this chapter, however, I combine their insights and develop my own typology to better understand the variation in volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans.

In the context of disaster, Wolensky (1979) provides the only existing typology of disaster response and recovery volunteers, of which I focus on the latter. His study examines variation in types of disaster response and recovery volunteerism in the wake of the flooding caused by Tropical Storm Agnes in the Wyoming Valley area of Northeast Pennsylvania in 1972, and is driven primarily by an analysis of four emergent volunteer

Figure 1 – Wolensky's Types of Volunteerism in the Recovery Stage

Motivation	***Social Form***	
	Social Movement	**Organizational**
Public Interests	ALTRUISTIC	DECISIONALISITIC
Private Interests	DECISIONALISTIC	OPPORTUNISTIC

committees. In doing so, he relies primarily on the axes of motivation (public interest and private interest) and "social form" (social movement and organizational).

Counterintuitively, Wolensky's two by two cross tabulation of motivation with social form produces not four but three "types" of recovery volunteerism: altruistic, opportunistic, and decisionalistic (which has two variations, so he ends up really having the intuitive four types; see Figure 1). Altruistic volunteerism (public interest social movement), which fits most neatly into traditional volunteer service framework, is characterized by "an army of volunteers [mostly from local and state-wide religious denominations] having their high priority value the spiritual, social, and physical restoration of the community" (Wolensky 1979:36). Opportunistic volunteerism (private interest organizational), in contrast, is characterized by business owners primarily concerned with economic development, which makes its relationship to volunteerism marginal at best. Both forms of decisionalistic volunteerism (public interest organizational and private interest social movement) are characterized by concern with state policy regarding the allocation of recovery resources. Public interest organizational volunteerism, however, is engaged in legislative reform at the federal level. In contrast,

private interest social movement volunteerism is engaged in grassroots activism aimed at everyday injustices embodied in individual struggles.

Despite its merits, Wolensky's typology is problematic because it relies on poorly defined axes that are not mutually exclusive or exhaustive. For instance, while public and private often refer to governmental and non-governmental (e.g., public and private sector), Wolensky instead uses these terms to jump from individual level to group level motives. In doing so, he reinforces the divide between private sphere and public sphere, something feminist theories have challenged for decades (Brown 1992; Pateman 1988). Further, Wolensky conflates the social movement form with "emergent" behavior, though emergent movements are often extensions of older movements that have been in varying forms of stasis (Meyer and Whittier 1994). The dimensions of organizational versus emergent behavior and contentious versus non-contentious behavior need to be unpacked and treated as distinct (though perhaps related) dimensions in any analysis of disaster recovery volunteerism and of volunteerism more broadly. Despite these critques, Wolensky provides an admirable first attempt to understand the multiple facets of disaster recovery. This has, however, been lost on most ensuing studies, which tend to focus on particular types of disaster recovery volunteerism and do not take the step back necessary to grapple with its diversity. My dissertation seeks to fill this gap in the scholarship.

This is the first study to bring these disparate literatures together to create a more complete picture of different types of nonlocal disaster recovery volunteers by comparing Servants (service-oriented), Activists (justice-oriented), and Tourists (travel-oriented). I

argue that volunteers' collective identities shape their motivations, perspectives on disaster, and the type of work undertaken. I address each in turn.

Motivation

Existing literature on volunteers delineates different motivations for volunteering. The idea that volunteers are driven by altruism, or the intent to selflessly help others, is such a dominant paradigm that it is the foundation for most definitions of volunteering. Phillips (2014:22) notes that "American culture socializes people to serve. Having been raised to be altruistic, people give their 'time, money, and energy' to those in need." Such altruistic motives fit primarily within human capital perspectives (Phillips 2009) and fall under Wolenky's category of "public interest" motivations. Most existing research gives readers the sense that disaster recovery volunteers are driven by pure altruism (Phillips 2009, 2014; Phillips and Jenkins 2010).

However, altruistic motives to volunteer tend to be bound up with not-so-selfless motives. It is a truism that volunteers "get more than they give," which is reflected in a large body of research analyzing how volunteerism affects the volunteer, largely for the better (Wilson 2000). Self-improvement, religious self-sacrifice, and other egoistic motives that benefit the volunteer fit primarily within exchange perspectives on volunteerism (Wilson 2000) and fall under Wolenksy's category of "private interest" motivations. One way volunteering can be self-serving is by reinforcing the hierarchy between giver and receiver.

In this vein, scholars differentiate between charity and mutual aid forms of altruism. Poppendieck (1999:231) defines charity as "a gift, offered with condescension and accepted in desperation that is necessitated by incapacity and failure." Similarly, Reitan (2007:51)argues that charity work is performed by those who have "*sympathy* with the suffering of others who are deemed worthy of one's support." This work is characterized by low risk activities that are largely apolitical and non-contentious and that reproduce social inequalities among giver and receiver of services (Poppendieck 1999; Reitan 2007). Poppendieck (1999:9) argues that charitably-oriented altruism not only ignores structural social problems, but acts as a "moral safety valve…relieving the discomfort of the privileged and thus the pressure for more fundamental action." In other words, charity-driven altruism actually works against needed structural reforms to address inequality.

The mutual aid type of altruism, or what Reitan (2007:51) calls reciprocal solidarity, is defined by "perceived connection between one's own problems or struggle and that of others [which] tends to lead to empathy with another's suffering and a sense that its source is at least *remotely threatening* to oneself." Reciprocal solidarity is characterized by pluralism and mutual cooperation between beneficiary constituents and conscience constituents (i.e., those directly threatened and those who are not) in pursuit of structural change (McCarthy and Zald 1977). In her study of the organization Mennonite Disaster Services (MDS), Phillips (2014) describes mutual aid work from the Mennonites who "seek ways to live more simply and share their resources. Yet sharing does not connote charity. Rather, directly helping others is seen as a matter of justice and

a way to extend sixteenth century practices of mutual aid" (p. 32). Poppendieck (1999) finds a similar form of mutual aid altruism in her study of food bank volunteers who challenge class privilege through communal meals where volunteers and clients eat together and arrangements that enable clients to participate as volunteers.

In post-Katrina New Orleans, Erdely (2011)conducted interviews with "volunteer tourists" from two faith-based volunteer organizations and concluded that their motivations were altruistic. As the term itself suggests, volunteer tourists combine volunteer motives, like altruism, self-improvement, and sacrifice, with travel motives, like recreation, new experiences, and cultural immersion (Wearing and McGehee 2013). Like self-improvement, these travel-related motives fall within Wolenky's category of "private interest" motivations. A small subset of volunteer tourists are oriented toward social change and engage in reconciliation tourism or justice tourism (Butcher 2006; Butcher and Smith 2010; Crabtree 1998; Guttentag 2009; Higgins-Desbiolles 2003, 2008; McGehee 2012; Raymond and Hall 2008; Wearing and McGehee 2013). Generally, this doesn't take the form of traditional protest, but manifests as volunteer tourists attempting to work horizontally with beneficiaries and to spend their travel dollars in socially conscious ways.

Along with church groups, students were one of the larger subsets of volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans (Luft 2008). The assumed motivation for this subgroup of largely college and high school students is learning as a form of self-improvement, which is a common theme in the literature. However, the ways in which students come to volunteer varies. Students may be part of a service-learning or community based learning

(CBL) course, which combine traditional academic learning environments with volunteerism outside of the classroom (Endres and Gould 2009; Heldman 2011; Marullo and Edwards 2000) (Endres and Gould 2009; Heldman and Israel-Trummel 2012; Marullo and Edwards 2000). On the other hand, students may volunteer as a part of an extracurricular organization, such as an alternative break club, a sorority, or a fraternity. As these types of student groups are not tied directly to an academic experience, it is plausible that they focus less on learning and more on other volunteer motivations, such as altruism and travel.

Drawing from the literature on volunteer motivations, I expect to find that most Activists will generally have a mutual aid orientation, while most Servants will have a charity orientation. With interviews of volunteer coordinators instead of self-reports from Tourists, I expect to find that most Tourists approach their work with a charity orientation.

Ideology and Political Consciousness

How we understand and respond to disaster is shaped by ideology. Disaster events are almost always the result of some constellation of natural, technological, and social forces (Walsh 1988). Our ideology, however, provides a lens through which we interpret reality and therefore how we understand and respond to the disaster event. Ideology refers to "a fairly broad, coherent, and relatively durable set of beliefs that affect one's orientation not only to politics but to everyday life more generally" (Benford and Snow

2000: 631). It is not surprising, therefore, that existing research finds that different volunteer types view the causes of disasters in different ways and respond differently.

The dominant understanding of most disaster events is that they are natural, inevitable, and unavoidable, and therefore their victims are worthy of unconditional help. Disaster zones see an influx of volunteers with this perspective, drawn by "situational altruism" or the perception that "newly desperate people need help" (Phillips 2014:22). "Situational" suggests that the disaster was not linked to existing social problems and that African American losses were simply due to the chance location of the heavy flooding. This perspective prompts disaster volunteers to engage in standard service provision.

In contrast, disaster victims tend to engage in protest when they perceive the event to have been technologically or socially preventable (Blocker, Rochford, and Sherkat 1991; Carroll et al. 2011; Rochford and Blocker 1991; Walsh 1988). In the case of Hurricane Katrina, many scholars and activists view the flooding of New Orleans to be just the latest event in an ongoing experience of oppression that produces continuous social disaster for marginalized groups, which is laid out in greater depth in the preceding chapter (Adams 2013; David and Enarson 2012; Dyson 2006; Freudenburg et al. 2011; Giroux 2006; Hartman and Squires 2006; Johnson 2011; Luft 2009; South End Press 2007; Walsh 1988). Therefore, I expect to find that Activists attribute the devastation of New Orleans to human-made causes, while Servants and Tourists attribute it to natural causes.

Activities

Existing research finds that different volunteer types vary in the kinds of work they perform, although there is great overlap. According to Wilson (2000: 216-7), "social activists are oriented to social change while volunteers focus more on the amelioration of individual problems." In other words, Activists are more likely to target institutions and systems (e.g., a discriminatory law), while Servants focus more on addressing individual experiences (e.g., poverty produced by that discriminatory law). However, Servants will also engage in activities resembling activism but often deny that they are activists because they "care about people, not about politics" and do not want their reputations damaged by association with activists they see as extreme or radical (Blackstone 2004, 2007; Greenebaum 2009; Wilson 2000). Activists, on the other hand, openly use service provision as a tactic in their larger repertoire aimed at social change (Fisher 2006; Heynen 2010; Luft 2008, 2009). Given this overlap, I expect to find Servants to perform mostly service delivery (and perhaps some advocacy) and Activists to engage in both service delivery and structural work.

When it comes to work, Tourists are influenced by place, altruism, and social justice concerns. Volunteer tourism generally takes place at the international level, where it has grown tremendously in the last decade (Keese 2011; Tourism Research and Marketing 2008; Wearing and McGehee 2013). Volunteer tourists are typically 18-25 year olds from Western countries who pay NGOs for one to four weeks of on-site support in developing countries to engage in work ranging from construction projects to public

health and environmental advocacy to social service provision. Volunteer tourism, however, does not emerge just anywhere.

METHODS

Interviews with Volunteers and Volunteer Coordinators

In this chapter, I draw on 56 interviews with volunteers and volunteer coordinators in post-Katrina New Orleans. The interview instruments included questions about volunteer motivations, perceptions, work, and other questions about the volunteer experience in New Orleans. Codes were created to highlight perceptions of collective goals, participation in protest and other noninstitutional tactics, conceptions of volunteer work within larger social conflict, calls for institutional change, perception of self as an activist or volunteer tourist, shifts in personal identity, and gaining group identity. The importance of place and tourism was not initially a point of inquiry, but it quickly emerged as a core theme and was included in later interviews.

Survey of Volunteers

I also draw on my findings from my online survey of 176 post-Katrina volunteers. In addition to basic demographic data, I gathered information about respondents' organizational affiliations, volunteer activities, motives for engaging in disaster recovery volunteerism, experiences on the volunteer worksite, and attitudes towards altruism and social inequalities. I also asked two open-ended qualitative questions about how their volunteer work in post-Katrina New Orleans impacted their life goals and how volunteers affected people who live in New Orleans.

FINDINGS

Many of my findings corroborate existing literature on volunteers and activists, and are summarized in Figure 2. Servants are mostly motivated by situational charity-based altruism, they think of Katrina as a natural disaster, and they mostly engage in non-contentious service provision work. Activists are motivated by mutual aid, they think of Katrina as a sociopolitical disaster, and they combine protest, advocacy and service provision work. As Luft (2008) notes, Activist service provision parallels non-contentious service provision by mainstream and faith-based Servant organizations. However, Activist service provision was sometimes contentious (e.g., illegally gutting homes in areas deemed off limits by the government). Tourists are mostly motivated by travel, believe that the devastation of New Orleans was a natural disaster, and primarily engage in tourist activities in combination with non-contentious service delivery.

A few of my findings contradict existing literature. First, in contrast to Erdely's (2011) findings, I find that the volunteer component for Tourists is little more than an afterthought, and that Tourists display a relaxed work ethic and insensitivity to disaster trauma. Also in contrast to previous findings (Blackstone 2004, 2007; Greenebaum 2009; Wilson 2000), I did not find that Servants distanced themselves from Activists and more contentious work. However, I did find that Activists distanced themselves from Servants and Tourists due to a perception that these groups enacted charity-based altruism with all of its attendant negative connotations. I present a more detailed picture of my major findings here.

Figure 2 – Volunteer Typology: Servants, Activists, and Tourists

	Motivations	**Issue Framing**	**Activities**	**Collective Identity**
Servants	Situational charity-based altruism	Natural disaster	Non-contentious service provision	Conspicuous altruism
Activists	Mutual aid	Sociopolitical disaster	Protest, advocacy and (non)contentious service provision	Social justice and othering of Servants and Tourists
Tourists	Travel	Natural disaster	Tourism and non-contentious service provision	Conspicuous altruism

Organization Type as Proxy for Volunteer Type

For my survey data, organizational affiliations are used as a proxy for volunteer type because volunteers are likely to choose organizations that align with their beliefs and are likely to facilitate the actions they wish to engage in. The types of organizations survey respondents chose to volunteer with in post-Katrina New Orleans, as well as their history before this and who they volunteered with afterwards, are summarized in Table 5a. In post-Katrina New Orleans, respondents most commonly reported volunteering with disaster response and recovery organizations (51 percent). Faith-based organizations (45 percent) are likely the best proxy for Servants, activist organizations (31 percent) for Activists, and volunteer tourist organizations for Tourists (10 percent). As seen in Table 3a, the median number of types of organizations a respondent participated in is two, suggesting that there is substantial overlap across organization types.

Table 5a - Survey Respondents – Volunteer Participation in Organization Types Before, During, and After Volunteering in Post-Katrina New Orleans†

	Before Post-Katrina	Post-Katrina	After Post-Katrina
Disaster response/recovery	7.4% (13)*	50.6% (89)	32.4% (57)*
Faith-based or religious	46.6% (82)	45.5% (80)	46.0% (81)
Advocacy/activism	29.6% (52)	31.3% (55)	36.9% (65)
Service learning course	18.2% (32)	23.9% (42)	18.2% (32)
College organization	36.4% (64)*	22.7% (40)	26.1% (46)
Volunteer tourism	8.5% (15)	9.7% (17)	8.0% (14)
General voluntary club	22.7% (40)*	6.8% (12)	14.2% (25)*
Professional association	8.5% (15)	6.3% (11)	14.8% (26)*
Government program	1.7% (3)*	5.7% (10)	12.5% (22)*
High school organization	40.3% (71)*	4.0% (7)	6.3% (11)
Corporate sponsor	4.0% (7)	4.0% (6)	6.3% (11)

†Ordered by Post-Katrina percentage
*Comparing during to before or after post-Katrina New Orleans, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

The only statistically significant relationships regarding participation in two different organizational types, however, is between activist organizations, college courses, and college organizations. The rates at which respondents participated in more than one type of organization are summarized in Table 5b. Of respondents who engaged in a college course, 74 percent also participated in an activist organization. Of respondents who participated in a college organization, 73 percent also participated in an activist organization. This concentration of college students in activist organizations was not a theme in the qualitative data, suggesting that this finding could be an artifact of the sample, as many of my personal contacts were college students who engaged in activist organizations. However, it could also reflect a greater proclivity towards activism among younger people. That college students rarely were identified as a group distinct from Servants, Activists, or Tourists suggests that they were spread across these groups or subsumed within them.

Table 5b – Survey Respondents – Organizational Types Crosstabulated With Organizational Types

	Disaster	Faith-based	Activist	College Course	College Org	Tourism
Organization type overlap (column percentages)						
Disaster	*100% (89)*	62.5% (50)	61.8% (34)	59.5% (25)	62.5% (25)	58.8% (10)
Faith-based	56.2% (50)	*100% (80)*	23.6% (13)	21.4% (9)	25.0% (10)	47.1% (8)
Activist	38.2% (34)	16.3% (13)	*100% (55)*	73.8% (31)*	72.5% (29)*	47.1% (8)
College Course	28.1% (25)	11.3% (9)	56.4% (31)*	*100% (42)*	55.0% (22)*	41.2% (7)
College Org	28.1% (25)	12.5% (10)	52.7% (29)*	52.4% (22)*	*100% (40)*	41.2% (7)
Tourism	11.2% (10)	10.0% (8)	14.6% (8)	16.7% (7)	17.5% (7)	*100% (17)*

* Phi coefficient greater than .3 but less than .6, indicating weak to moderate association

If we use faith-based and activist organizations as rough proxies for Servants and Activists, there appears to be some overlap between these groups. Of respondents who engaged in a faith-based organization, only 16 percent also participated in an activist organization. Conversely, 24 percent of respondents who engaged in an activist organization also participated in a faith-based organization. These overlaps suggest that there is not an empirically clear delineation between people who participate in these types of organizations. In short, some Servants are Activists, and some Activists are also Servants.

However, it is not feasible to use volunteer tourist organizations as a proxy for Tourists. While volunteer coordinators report that they are common, only 17 respondents (10 percent) report participation with a volunteer tourist organization. Most likely, Tourists were embedded within many kinds of organizations, but had a distinct orientation relative their peers. Second, Tourists are the volunteer type least likely to fill out my survey because their connection to post-Katrina volunteerism was weak to begin with, let along so many years later. Either way, such as small sample of this subgroup does not enable particularly meaningful quantitative analysis. I will provide statistical comparisons, but only when it is directly building on qualitative data.

Motivations

I find that motivation to volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans varied from general and situational charity-based altruism, a desire for social justice, and tourism, with some overlap. While my survey data suggests that almost all volunteers are driven

somewhat by situational altruism, interviews suggest that this is particularly true for Servants. Survey data on self-reported respondent motivations is summarized in Table 6a and Table 6b. Most respondents report that they volunteered because it was very important (82 percent) or somewhat important (16 percent) to them to help victims of disaster, which suggests that situational altruism as a motive applies not just to Servants but to nearly all volunteers. While this will be complicated when I look more closely at Activists and Tourists, Servants' primary motive was, unsurprisingly, to serve. As can be seen in Table 7a, a higher percent of participants who volunteered with a faith-based organization report that wanting to help victims of disaster was very important in their decision to volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans (90 percent compared to 76 percent), though a chi-squared test for independence finds no significant relationship between these variables overall. Unsurprisingly, there is a significant relationship between volunteering with a faith-based organization and being driven to volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans due to religious values. Participants who volunteered with a faith-based organization are much more likely to report that their religious values were very important in their decision to volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans (69 percent compared to 26 percent). As Dan, a volunteer coordinator and white man in his mid-thirties, recalls:

> Most of the working men and women who came…were
> just trying to help out somebody with their free time.

Dan's comment reflects a sense that regular folks (e.g., not college students or Activists) primarily driven by a desire to "just" help people who needed help, and that direct service

Table 6a – Survey Respondents –Motivations for Volunteering in Post-Katrina New Orleans

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
How important were the following to your decision to volunteer in New Orleans following Katrina?			
I wanted to help victims of disaster			
Not at All Important	1	0.6	0.6
Not Very Important	1	0.6	0.6
Somewhat Important	27	16.3	16.4
Very Important	136	81.9	82.4
Don't Know	1	0.6	-
Not Applicable	0	0.0	-
I wanted to help victims of social injustice			
Not at All Important	7	4.5	4.8
Not Very Important	15	9.6	10.3
Somewhat Important	38	24.4	26.0
Very Important	86	55.1	58.9
Don't Know	0	0.0	-
Not Applicable	10	6.4	-
My religious values			
Not at All Important	40	24.7	27.6
Not Very Important	14	8.6	16.5
Somewhat Important	17	10.5	26.0
Very Important	67	41.4	29.9
Don't Know	0	0.0	-
Not Applicable	24	14.8	-
I wanted to visit New Orleans			
Not at All Important	42	26.1	28.6
Not Very Important	38	23.6	25.9
Somewhat Important	52	32.3	35.4
Very Important	15	9.3	10.2
Don't Know	1	0.6	-
Not Applicable	13	8.1	-

Table 6b – Survey Respondents –Motivations for Volunteering in Post-Katrina New Orleans (Cont.)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
How important were the following to your decision to volunteer in New Orleans following Katrina?			
My education (for example, taking a service-learning course)			
Not at All Important	35	22.2	27.6
Not Very Important	21	13.3	16.5
Somewhat Important	33	20.9	26.0
Very Important	38	24.1	29.9
Don't Know	0	0.0	-
Not Applicable	31	19.6	-
My professional development			
Not at All Important	47	29.2	33.6
Not Very Important	34	21.1	24.3
Somewhat Important	34	21.1	24.3
Very Important	25	15.5	17.9
Don't Know	1	0.6	-
Not Applicable	20	12.4	-
I was asked by a friend or family member			
Not at All Important	32	19.9	28.3
Not Very Important	22	13.7	19.5
Somewhat Important	34	21.1	30.1
Very Important	25	15.5	22.1
Don't Know	1	0.6	-
Not Applicable	47	29.2	-
I was offered the opportunity by an organization to which I belong			
Not at All Important	15	9.3	12.9
Not Very Important	19	11.8	16.4
Somewhat Important	40	24.8	34.5
Very Important	42	26.1	36.2
Don't Know	2	1.2	-
Not Applicable	43	26.7	-

Table 7a – Survey –Faith-Based Org. Crosstabulated with Motives

	Participation with faith-based organization	
	Yes	**No**
How important were the following to your decision to volunteer in New Orleans following Katrina?		
I wanted to help victims of disaster		
Not at All Important	0.0% (0)	1.1% (1)
Not Very Important	0.0% (0)	1.1% (1)
Somewhat Important	10.5% (8)	21.4% (19)
Very Important	89.5% (68)	76.4% (68)
I wanted to help victims of social injustice		
Not at All Important	6.5% (4)	3.6% (3)
Not Very Important	14.5% (9)	7.1% (6)
Somewhat Important	27.4% (17)	25.0% (21)
Very Important	51.6% (32)	64.3% (54)
My religious values*		
Not at All Important	12.5% (9)	47.0% (31)
Not Very Important	5.6% (4)	15.2% (10)
Somewhat Important	12.5% (9)	12.1% (8)
Very Important	69.4% (50)	25.8% (17)
I wanted to visit New Orleans		
Not at All Important	35.4% (23)	23.2% (19)
Not Very Important	24.6% (16)	26.8% (22)
Somewhat Important	32.3% (21)	37.8% (31)
Very Important	7.7% (5)	12.2% (10)
My education (for example, taking a service-learning course)		
Not at All Important	35.7% (20)	21.1% (15)
Not Very Important	17.9% (10)	15.5% (11)
Somewhat Important	28.6% (16)	23.9% (17)
Very Important	17.9% (10)	39.9% (28)
My professional development		
Not at All Important	36.7% (22)	36.3% (25)
Not Very Important	28.3% (17)	21.3% (17)
Somewhat Important	21.7% (13)	26.3% (21)
Very Important	13.3% (8)	21.3% (17)
I was asked by a friend or family member		
Not at All Important	34.0% (18)	23.3% (14)
Not Very Important	18.9% (10)	20.0% (12)
Somewhat Important	30.2% (16)	30.0% (18)
Very Important	17.0% (9)	26.7% (16)
I was offered the opportunity by an organization to which I belong		
Not at All Important	11.1% (7)	15.1% (8)
Not Very Important	12.7% (8)	20.8% (11)
Somewhat Important	38.1% (24)	30.2% (16)
Very Important	38.1% (24)	34.0% (18)

* Significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

Table 7b – Survey –Activist Org. Crosstabulated with Motives

	Participation with activist organization	
	Yes	**No**
How important were the following to your decision to volunteer in New Orleans following Katrina?		
I wanted to help victims of disaster*		
Not at All Important	1.9% (1)	0.0% (0)
Not Very Important	0.0% (0)	0.9% (1)
Somewhat Important	30.8% (16)	9.7% (11)
Very Important	67.3% (35)	89.4% (101)
I wanted to help victims of social injustice*		
Not at All Important	2.0% (1)	6.3% (6)
Not Very Important	3.9% (2)	13.7% (13)
Somewhat Important	17.7% (9)	30.5% (29)
Very Important	76.5% (39)	49.5% (47)
My religious values*		
Not at All Important	55.6% (20)	19.6% (20)
Not Very Important	16.7% (6)	7.8% (8)
Somewhat Important	8.3% (3)	13.7% (14)
Very Important	19.4% (7)	58.8% (60)
I wanted to visit New Orleans		
Not at All Important	25.5% (13)	30.2% (29)
Not Very Important	25.5% (13)	26.0% (25)
Somewhat Important	39.2% (20)	33.3% (32)
Very Important	9.8% (5)	10.4% (10)
My education (for example, taking a service-learning course)		
Not at All Important	20.8% (10)	31.7% (25)
Not Very Important	16.7% (8)	16.5% (13)
Somewhat Important	29.2% (14)	24.1% (19)
Very Important	33.3% (16)	27.9% (22)
My professional development		
Not at All Important	37.3% (19)	31.5% (28)
Not Very Important	25.5% (13)	23.6% (21)
Somewhat Important	23.5% (12)	24.7% (22)
Very Important	13.7% (7)	20.2% (18)
I was asked by a friend or family member		
Not at All Important	30.8% (12)	27.0% (20)
Not Very Important	23.1% (9)	17.6% (13)
Somewhat Important	33.3% (13)	28.4% (21)
Very Important	12.8% (5)	27.0% (20)
I was offered the opportunity by an organization to which I belong		
Not at All Important	15.2% (5)	12.1% (10)
Not Very Important	21.2% (7)	14.5% (12)
Somewhat Important	33.3% (11)	34.9% (29)
Very Important	30.3% (10)	38.6% (32)

* Significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

encompassed the entirely of their agenda. Jane, a volunteer and white woman in her sixties, notes that:

> It was kind of a sense of, hey, I can go and show them there are people that still think about them and people who still care about them and people want them to rebuild their lives.

While similar to Dan's comment, Jane's words highlight the desire to directly help individuals or communities, both materially and symbolically, through a specific rough patch caused by disaster. Situational altruism as a primary motivation is apparent in Leslie's observation, a volunteer and multiracial woman in her early twenties, that:

> I think it was common sense, 'Of course we are going to help and volunteer our time.'… In these times of disasters, people are like, 'Oh, we have to help Haiti,' but Haiti has always been in crisis even before the earthquake… but when there's a time to say it's not their fault, like it was nature…then it's OK to act on that, and it's OK to give money, it's your personal responsibility to volunteer your time… I think that Katrina is very similar… People were like, 'We need to do something for this for these people in New Orleans that had no control over what happened.'

Leslie's words underscore that Servants wanted to help victims of a natural disaster and had no interest in addressing political issues or systems of power.

Faith-based volunteers (probably mostly Servants) are more conservative than other volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans but are still more likely to be liberal than the general population. As can be seen in Table 8a, chi-squared tests for independence indicate that there are significant relationships between participating with a faith-based organization and political views. Like my sample as a whole, a significantly higher percentage of my respondents who participated in faith-based organizations, when

Table 8a – Survey Respondents – Participation with Faith-based Organization and Activist Organization Crosstabulated with Political Views

	Participation with faith-based organization		
	Yes	**No**	**GSS 2014**
Political Ideology (Before volunteering in New Orleans)*			
Ext. Lib.	16.2% (12)˜	20.7% (18)	3.8% (94)
Lib.	27.0% (20)˜	41.4% (36)	12.4% (304)
Slightly Lib.	12.2% (9)	18.4% (16)	10.7% (263)
Moderate	13.5% (10)˜	9.2% (8)	40.4% (989)
Slighly Cons.	6.8% (5)	2.3% (2)	13.6% (334)
Cons.	21.6% (16)	6.9% (6)	14.6% (358)
Ext. Cons.	2.7% (2)	1.2% (1)	4.4% (107)
Political Ideology (After volunteering in New Orleans)*			
Ext. Lib.	21.6% (16)	37.8% (34)	-
Lib.	25.7% (19)	31.1% (28)	-
Slightly Lib.	8.1% (6)	14.4% (13)	-
Moderate	16.2% (12)	7.8% (7)	-
Slighly Cons.	5.4% (4)	2.2% (2)	-
Cons.	18.9% (14)	5.6% (5)	-
Ext. Cons.	4.1% (3)	1.1% (1)	-
Shift in Political Ideology			
Lib. shift	16.2% (12)	31.0% (27)	-
No shift	79.7% (59)	64.4% (56)	-
Cons. shift	4.1% (3)	4.6% (4)	-
	Participation with activist organization		
	Yes	**No**	**GSS 2014**
Political Ideology (Before volunteering in New Orleans)*			
Ext. Lib.	26.0% (13)˜	15.3% (17)	3.8% (94)
Lib.	56.0% (28)˜	25.2% (28)	12.4% (304)
Slightly Lib.	14.0% (7)	16.2% (18)	10.7% (263)
Moderate	2.0% (1)˜	15.3% (17)	40.4% (989)
Slighly Cons.	2.0% (1)˜	5.4% (6)	13.6% (334)
Cons.	0.0% (0)˜	19.8% (22)	14.6% (358)
Ext. Cons.	0.0% (0)	2.7% (3)	4.4% (107)
Political Ideology (After volunteering in New Orleans)*			
Ext. Lib.	56.6% (30)	18.0% (20)	-
Lib.	30.2% (16)	27.9% (31)	-
Slightly Lib.	11.3% (6)	11.7% (13)	-
Moderate	0.0% (0)	17.1% (19)	-
Slighly Cons.	0.0% (0)	5.4% (6)	-
Cons.	1. 9% (1)	16.2% (18)	-
Ext. Cons.	0.0% (0)	3.6% (4)	-
Shift in Political Ideology*			
Liberal shift	40.0% (20)	17.1% (19)	-
No shift	56.0% (28)	78.4% (87)	-
Cons. shift	4.0% (2)	4.5% (5)	-

*Significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

˜ Org. type compared to GSS on specific response category, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

Table 8b – Survey Respondents – Participation with Volunteer Tourist Organization and College Course Crosstabulated with Political Views

	Participation with volunteer tourist organization		
	Yes	**No**	**GSS 2014**
Political Ideology (Before volunteering in New Orleans)			
Ext. Lib.	18.8% (3)˜	18.6% (27)	3.8% (94)
Lib.	50.0% (8)˜	33.1% (48)	12.4% (304)
Slightly Lib.	18.8% (3)	15.2% (22)	10.7% (263)
Moderate	12.5% (2)˜	11.0% (16)	40.4% (989)
Slighly Cons.	0.0% (0)	4.8% (7)	13.6% (334)
Cons.	0.0% (0)	15.2% (22)	14.6% (358)
Ext. Cons.	0.0% (0)	2.1% (3)	4.4% (107)
Political Ideology (After volunteering in New Orleans)			
Ext. Lib.	43.8% (7)	29.1% (43)	-
Lib.	31.3% (5)	28.4% (42)	-
Slightly Lib.	12.5% (2)	11.5% (17)	-
Moderate	12.5% (2)	11.5% (17)	-
Slighly Cons.	0.0% (0)	4.1% (6)	-
Cons.	0.0% (0)	12.8% (19)	-
Ext. Cons.	0.0% (0)	2.7% (4)	-
Shift in Political Ideology			
Liberal shift	37.5% (6)	22.8% (33)	-
No shift	56.3% (9)	73.1% (106)	-
Cons. shift	6.3% (1)	4.1% (6)	-
	Participation with college course		
	Yes	**No**	**GSS 2014**
Political Ideology (Before volunteering in New Orleans)*			
Ext. Lib.	28.2% (11)˜	15.6% (19)	3.8% (94)
Lib.	48.7% (19)˜	30.3% (37)	12.4% (304)
Slightly Lib.	12.8% (5)	16.4% (20)	10.7% (263)
Moderate	5.1% (2)˜	13.1% (16)	40.4% (989)
Slighly Cons.	2.6% (1)˜	4.9% (6)	13.6% (334)
Cons.	2.6% (1)˜	17.2% (21)	14.6% (358)
Ext. Cons.	0.0% (0)	2.5% (3)	4.4% (107)
Political Ideology (After volunteering in New Orleans)*			
Ext. Lib.	63.4% (26)	19.5% (24)	-
Lib.	24.4% (10)	30.1% (37)	-
Slightly Lib.	7.3% (3)	13.0% (16)	-
Moderate	2.4% (1)	14.6% (18)	-
Slighly Cons.	2.4% (1)	4.1% (5)	-
Cons.	0.0% (0)	15.5% (19)	-
Ext. Cons.	0.0% (0)	3.3% (4)	-
Shift in Political Ideology*			
Liberal shift	53.9% (21)	14.8% (18)	-
No shift	43.6% (17)	80.3% (98)	-
Cons. Shift	2.6% (1)	4.9% (6)	-

*Significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

˜ Org. type compared to GSS on specific response category, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

Table 8c – Survey Respondents – Participation with College Organization Crosstabulated with Political Views

	Participation with college organization		
	Yes	**No**	**GSS 2014**
Political Ideology (Before volunteering in New Orleans)			
Ext. Lib.	22.5% (9)˜	17.4% (21)	3.8% (94)
Lib.	42.5% (17)˜	32.2% (39)	12.4% (304)
Slightly Lib.	22.5% (9)˜	13.2% (16)	10.7% (263)
Moderate	5.0% (2)˜	13.2% (16)	40.4% (989)
Slighly Cons.	0.0% (0)˜	5.8% (7)	13.6% (334)
Cons.	7.5% (3)	15.7% (19)	14.6% (358)
Ext. Cons.	0.0% (0)	2.5% (3)	4.4% (107)
Political Ideology (After volunteering in New Orleans)			
Ext. Lib.	47.5% (19)	25.0% (31)	-
Lib.	25.0% (10)	29.9% (37)	-
Slightly Lib.	12.5% (5)	11.3% (14)	-
Moderate	5.0% (2)	13.7% (17)	-
Slighly Cons.	2.5% (1)	4.0% (5)	-
Cons.	7.5% (3)	12.9% (16)	-
Ext. Cons.	0.0% (0)	3.2% (4)	-
Shift in Political Ideology			
Liberal shift	35.0% (14)	20.7% (25)	-
No shift	60.0% (24)	75.2% (91)	-
Cons. shift	5.0% (2)	4.1% (5)	-

*Significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

˜ Org. type compared to GSS on specific response category, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

compared with the general population, are extremely liberal (16 percent compared to 4 percent) or liberal (27 percent compared to 12 percent). However, a chi-squared test for independence indicates that there is a significant relationship between political views and participating with a religious organization.

Respondents who participated in a faith-based organization are less likely than other volunteers to be extremely liberal (16 percent compared to 21 percent), liberal (27 percent compared to 41 percent), or slightly liberal (12 percent compared to 18 percent), and are more likely to be moderate (14 percent compared to 9 percent), slightly conservative (7 percent compared to 2 percent), conservative (22 percent compared to 7

percent), or extremely conservative (3 percent compared to 1 percent). In short, faith-based volunteers (probably mostly Servants) are relatively conservative compared to other volunteers and driven to help those in need due to what they perceive to be factors outside of their individual control to change.

Faith-based volunteers (probably mostly Servants) also tend to hold more conservative social attitudes than other volunteers regarding race and sexuality. As can be seen in Table 9a and Table 9b, chi-squared tests for independence indicate that there are significant relationships between participating with a faith-based organization and attitudes toward race, class, gender, and sexuality. With regard to the statement, "social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people," they are more likely than other volunteers to somewhat agree (14 percent compared to 7 percent) and to neither agree nor disagree (26 percent compared to 9 percent), and they are less likely to strongly disagree (38 percent compared to 62 percent). With regard to the statement, "Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations," they are more likely than other volunteers to somewhat agree (7 percent compared to 1 percent), neither agree nor disagree (8 percent compared to 1 percent), or somewhat agree (31 percent compared to 17 percent), and are less likely to strongly agree (54 percent compared to 77 percent). With regard to the statement, "white people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin," they are more likely than other volunteers to neither agree nor disagree (16 percent compared to 7 percent) or somewhat agree (29 percent compared to 13 percent), and are less likely to strongly agree (45 percent compared to 74 percent). With regard to the statement, "I welcome new friends who are gay," they are more likely

Table 9a – Survey Respondents –Faith-Based Org. Crosstabulated with Attitudes

	Participation with faith-based organization		
	Yes	**No**	**GSS 2014**
Altruism			
People should be willing to help others who are less fortunate			
Strongly Disagree	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.8% (10)
Somewhat Disagree	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.5% (19)
Neither	0.0% (0)	3.3% (3)	6.1% (77)
Somewhat Agree	10.7% (8)	19.8% (18)	43.4% (549)
Strongly Agree	89.3% (67)˜	76.9% (70)	48.2% (609)
Personally assisting people in trouble is very important to me			
Strongly Disagree	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.9% (11)
Somewhat Disagree	1.4% (1)	2.2% (2)	3.3% (41)
Neither	2.7% (2)	6.6% (6)	14.2% (179)
Somewhat Agree	18.9% (14)	33.0% (30)	55.9% (706)
Strongly Agree	77.0% (57)˜	58.2% (53)	25.8% (326)
Class			
If every individual would carry his/her own weight, there would be no poverty			
Strongly Disagree	64.0% (48)	69.2% (63)	-
Somewhat Disagree	24.0% (18)	18.7% (17)	-
Neither	5.3% (4)	4.4% (4)	-
Somewhat Agree	6.7% (5)	5.5% (5)	-
Strongly Agree	0.0% (0)	2.2% (2)	-
Those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others			
Strongly Disagree	35.6% (26)˜	40.7% (37)	3.6% (46)
Somewhat Disagree	31.5% (23)	33.0% (30)	19.0% (240)
Neither	15.1% (11)	8.8% (8)	24.0% (303)
Somewhat Agree	15.1% (11)	14.3% (13)	41.1% (519)
Strongly Agree	2.7% (2)	3.3% (3)	12.3% (156)
Race			
Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people*			
Strongly Disagree	38.36% (28)	61.5% (56)	-
Somewhat Disagree	17.81% (13)	19.8% (18)	-
Neither	26.03% (19)	8.8% (8)	-
Somewhat Agree	13.70% (10)	6.6% (6)	-
Strongly Agree	4.11% (3)	3.3% (3)	-
White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin*			
Strongly Disagree	2.67% (2)	3.3% (3)	-
Somewhat Disagree	6.67% (5)	3.3% (3)	-
Neither	16.00% (12)	6.6% (6)	-
Somewhat Agree	29.33% (22)	13.2% (12)	-
Strongly Agree	45.33% (34)	73.6% (67)	-

* Org. type compared to all respondents, significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

˜ Org. type compared to GSS on specific response category, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

Table 9b – Survey Respondents –Faith-Based Org. Crosstabulated with Attitudes (Cont.)

	Participation with faith-based organization		
	Yes	**No**	**GSS 2014**
Race (cont.)			
Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations*			
Strongly Disagree	54.1% (40)	76.9% (70)	-
Somewhat Disagree	31.1% (23)	16.5% (15)	-
Neither	8.1% (6)	1.1% (1)	-
Somewhat Agree	6.8% (5)	1.1% (1)	-
Strongly Agree	0.0% (0)	4.4% (4)	-
If a racial minority family with about the same income and education as I have moved in next door, I would mind a great deal			
Strongly Disagree	88.0% (66)	84.6% (77)	-
Somewhat Disagree	4.0% (3)	6.6% (6)	-
Neither	6.7% (5)	6.6% (6)	-
Somewhat Agree	1.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	-
Strongly Agree	0.0% (0)	2.2% (2)	-
Sex/Gender and Sexuality			
Women's requests in terms of equality between the sexes are simply exaggerated			
Strongly Disagree	55.4% (41)	72.2% (65)	-
Somewhat Disagree	21.6% (16)	14.4% (13)	-
Neither	12.2% (9)	7.8% (7)	-
Somewhat Agree	9.5% (7)	3.3% (3)	-
Strongly Agree	1.4% (1)	2.2% (2)	-
I welcome new friends who are gay*			
Strongly Disagree	0.0% (0)	4.4% (4)	-
Somewhat Disagree	1.4% (1)	2.2% (2)	-
Neither	17.8% (13)	4.4% (4)	-
Somewhat Agree	20.6% (15)	4.4% (4)	-
Strongly Agree	60.3% (44)	84.6% (77)	-
Misc.			
Disasters such as floods are the work of nature and cannot be prevented			
Strongly Disagree	13.3% (10)	22.2% (20)	-
Somewhat Disagree	21.3% (16)	23.3% (21)	-
Neither	8.0% (6)	11.1% (10)	-
Somewhat Agree	40.0% (30)	32.2% (29)	-
Strongly Agree	17.3% (13)	11.1% (10)	-

***** Org. type compared to all respondents, significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

˜ Org. type compared to GSS on specific response category, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

Table 10a – Survey Respondents –Activist Org. Crosstabulated with Attitudes

	Participation with activist organization		
	Yes	**No**	**GSS 2014**
Altruism			
People should be willing to help others who are less fortunate			
Strongly Disagree	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.8% (10)
Somewhat Disagree	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.5% (19)
Neither	1.9% (1)	1.8% (2)	6.1% (77)
Somewhat Agree	11.3% (6)	17.7% (20)	43.4% (549)
Strongly Agree	86.8% (46)˜	80.5% (91)	48.2% (609)
Personally assisting people in trouble is very important to me			
Strongly Disagree	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.9% (11)
Somewhat Disagree	1.9% (1)	1.8% (2)	3.3% (41)
Neither	9.4% (5)	2.7% (3)	14.2% (179)
Somewhat Agree	28.3% (15)	25.9% (29)	55.9% (706)
Strongly Agree	60.4% (32)˜	69.6% (78)	25.8% (326)
Class			
If every individual would carry his/her own weight, there would be no poverty*			
Strongly Disagree	83.0% (44)	59.3% (67)	-
Somewhat Disagree	15.1% (8)	23.9% (27)	-
Neither	1.9% (1)	6.2% (7)	-
Somewhat Agree	0.0% (0)	8.9% (10)	-
Strongly Agree	0.0% (0)	1.8% (2)	-
Those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others*			
Strongly Disagree	53.9% (28)˜	31.3% (35)	3.6% (46)
Somewhat Disagree	32.7% (17)	32.1% (36)	19.0% (240)
Neither	5.8% (3)	14.3% (16)	24.0% (303)
Somewhat Agree	5.8% (3)	18.8% (21)	41.1% (519)
Strongly Agree	1.9% (1)	3.6% (4)	12.3% (156)
Race			
Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people*			
Strongly Disagree	83.0% (44)	36.0% (40)	-
Somewhat Disagree	11.3% (6)	22.5% (25)	-
Neither	3.8% (2)	22.5% (25)	-
Somewhat Agree	0.0% (0)	14.4% (16)	-
Strongly Agree	1.9% (1)	4.5% (5)	-
White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin			
Strongly Disagree	3.8% (2)	2.7% (3)	-
Somewhat Disagree	1.9% (1)	6.2% (7)	-
Neither	3.8% (2)	14.2% (16)	-
Somewhat Agree	3.8% (2)	28.3% (32)	-
Strongly Agree	86.8% (46)	48.7% (55)	-

* Org. type compared to all respondents, significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

˜ Org. type compared to GSS on specific response category, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

Table 10b – Survey Respondents –Activist Org. Crosstabulated with Attitudes (Cont.)

	Participation with activist organization		
	Yes	**No**	**GSS 2014**
Race (cont.)			
Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations*			
Strongly Disagree	92.5% (49)	54.5% (61)	-
Somewhat Disagree	3.8% (2)	32.1% (36)	-
Neither	1.9% (1)	5.4% (6)	-
Somewhat Agree	0.0% (0)	5.4% (6)	-
Strongly Agree	1.9% (1)	2.7% (3)	-
If a racial minority family with about the same income and education as I have moved in next door, I would mind a great deal*			
Strongly Disagree	100.0% (53)	79.7% (90)	-
Somewhat Disagree	0.0% (0)	8.0% (9)	-
Neither	0.0% (0)	9.7% (11)	-
Somewhat Agree	0.0% (0)	0.9% (1)	-
Strongly Agree	0.0% (0)	1.8% (2)	-
Sex/Gender and Sexuality			
Women's requests in terms of equality between the sexes are simply exaggerated*			
Strongly Disagree	90.6% (48)	52.3% (58)	-
Somewhat Disagree	7.6% (4)	22.5% (25)	-
Neither	1.9% (1)	13.5% (15)	-
Somewhat Agree	0.0% (0)	9.0% (10)	-
Strongly Agree	0.0% (0)	2.7% (3)	-
I welcome new friends who are gay*			
Strongly Disagree	3.8% (2)	1.8% (2)	-
Somewhat Disagree	0.0% (0)	2.7% (3)	-
Neither	0.0% (0)	15.3% (17)	-
Somewhat Agree	3.8% (2)	15.3% (17)	-
Strongly Agree	92.5% (49)	64.9% (72)	-
Misc.			
Disasters such as floods are the work of nature and cannot be prevented*			
Strongly Disagree	34.0% (18)	10.7% (12)	-
Somewhat Disagree	20.8% (11)	23.2% (26)	-
Neither	11.3% (6)	8.9% (10)	-
Somewhat Agree	26.4% (14)	40.2% (45)	-
Strongly Agree	7.6% (4)	17.0% (19)	-

***** Org. type compared to all respondents, significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

˜ Org. type compared to GSS on specific response category, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

to neither agree nor disagree (18 percent compared to 4 percent) or somewhat agree (21 percent compared to 4 percent), and less likely to strongly agree (60 percent compared to 85 percent).

On the other hand, Activists who perceived Katrina as a social disaster were driven to help those directly affected in addition to addressing oppression and promoting social justice goals such as equitable rebuilding and human rights. Many Activists either supported the Right to Return Movement (which consisted of New Orleanians advocating for their right to return home and for the resources necessary for them to do so) or independently organized protests around issues such as the seizure of private property and bulldozing of homes under eminent domain, curfew in the Lower Ninth Ward, closure of public housing, displacement of homeless encampments, cuts to homeless and mental health services, the closing of Charity Hospital, and police brutality. Leslie notes that:

> I didn't just come to Katrina because I was like, 'I'm going to volunteer and help people.' I came to learn more about the situation that to me is inherently very political.

Similarly, Peter, a middle-aged white man and part-time New Orleans transplant, notes that:

> A lot of people came down here because of the racism and the police brutality and just the lack of response from the local government to meet any of the immediate needs of anyone here.

Most survey respondents report that they volunteered because it was very important (55 percent) or somewhat important (24 percent) to help victims of social injustice, while just 14 percent said this was not very or not at all important and 6 percent said that it was not

applicable. As can be seen in Table 7b, chi squared tests for independence reveal significant relationships between volunteering with an activist organization and being driven to volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans because participants wanted to help victims of disaster, because they wanted to help victims of social injustice, and because of their religious values. Participants who volunteered with an activist organization were more likely than other volunteers to report that wanting to help victims of injustice was very important in their decision to volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans (77 percent compared to 50 percent). However, they were less likely to report that wanting to help victims of disaster was very important in their decision to volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans (67 percent compared to 89 percent), or to report that their religious values were very important in their decision to volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans (19 percent compared to 59 percent). To say that Activists came down "because" of these injustices implies that these volunteers were motivated by a desire to mitigate the impact of these injustices and to put a stop to them in the future.

Unsurprisingly, Activists tend to be more liberal and social justice oriented than other volunteers. As can be seen in Table 8a, a chi-square test for independence indicate that there are significant relationships between participating with an activist organization and political views. Unsurprisingly, respondents who participated with an activist organization are more likely than other volunteers to be liberal (56 percent compared to 25 percent) or extremely liberal (26 percent compared to 15 percent) and are less likely to be slightly liberal (14 percent compared to 16 percent), moderate (2 percent compared to 15 percent), slightly conservative (2 percent compared to 5 percent), conservative (0

percent compared to 20 percent), or extremely conservative (0 percent compared to 3 percent).

As can be seen in Table 10a and Table 10b, chi-square tests for independence indicate that there are significant relationships between participating with an activist organization and attitudes toward race, class, gender, and sexuality. Respondents who volunteered with activist organizations are more likely than other volunteers to strongly agree with the following statements: "white people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin" (87 percent compared to 49 percent); and "I welcome new friends who are gay" (93 percent compared to 65 percent). Further, they are more likely than other volunteers to strongly disagree with the following statements: "if every individual would carry his/her own weight, there would be no poverty" (83 percent compared to 59 percent); "those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others" (54 percent compared to 31 percent); "social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people" (83 percent compared to 36 percent); "racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations" (93 percent compared to 55 percent); "if a racial minority family with about the same income and education as I have moved in next door, I would mind a great deal" (100 percent compared to 80 percent); and "women's requests in terms of equality between the sexes are simply exaggerated" (91 percent compared to 52 percent). The distinction between Servants and Activists is not a novel contribution, but expanding this dichotomy to include Tourists moves the literature forward.

The motivation of Tourists to travel to New Orleans was also a theme in interviews. With a unique colonial history marked by Spanish and French periods of occupation and deep involvement in the slave trade, New Orleans is well known as the birthplace of jazz and the home of *Mardi Gras*, second lines, jazz funerals, costumed Indian krewes, and Creole cuisine. The people are famously friendly and the climate tropical. For the more consumer-oriented tourist, Bourbon Street and the French Quarter offer a strong draw. On the other hand, New Orleans is as a relatively small urban center that enables both a sense of immediate community along with the diversity and adventure of a big city for all volunteers, not just those pulled by tourist traps. As one of the 23 percent of survey respondents who had visited the city prior to volunteering post Katrina, Jane recalls her lingering impression of New Orleans:

> I had been to New Orleans way back when in 1978 on my senior high school trip and thought it was a blast. And then I had been there… a few months before Katrina hit. We went there for vacation, and then we sailed out of New Orleans for a cruise to the Caribbean… New Orleans just seems like a very fun, energetic place… It wasn't just to go down there to do the work, but it was also to see the community, see what it had to offer… just sight-see too.

As one of the majority of volunteers who had never been to the city prior to volunteering post-Katrina, Anna, a volunteer and white woman in her mid-twenties, recalls why she was drawn to volunteer in New Orleans specifically:

> If it was the same thing happening in like Idaho or something, I might not have been as gung-ho… I never thought about it before, but I guess it did play a role 'cause there was also relief efforts in Mississippi and Alabama coast too, and I didn't really feel drawn to go there at all… I was looking for that experience too. It was somewhat selfish, with the idea of getting the opportunity to travel

> and see different things… You just get this picture of voodoo and… there's a lot of mystery around it… You hear a lot about Marti Gras and jazz and stuff like that… It seems like a city with a lot of character and culture.

Similarly, Peter asserts that:

> Culturally, New Orleans is unique to the country…If Hurricane Katrina had hit Pascagoula, Mississippi, nobody'd be here…It's New Orleans itself…that has fostered, I think, this continued movement of people coming down here to volunteer.

The draw of New Orleans seems especially strong for the young and mobile, particularly college students and recent graduates. Mac, a volunteer coordinator and white woman in her early twenties, recalls that:

> New Orleans is a great place to be young and aimless…Then you come back, then you come back, and then you come back.

One third of respondents (32 percent) report that they volunteered because wanting to visit New Orleans was somewhat important, while 24 percent said it was not very important, 26 percent said it was not at all important, and 8 percent said it was not applicable. Only 9 percent said visiting New Orleans was very important. Further, the prominence of tourism is likely deflated when self-reported due to social desirability, which I will discuss further below. As Stephen, a volunteer coordinator and white man in his late-twenties, asserts:

> In a de facto sense, yes, [I was a volunteer tourist], although I recoil at the phrase of the idea of that, but I think it's almost impossible to [not be]… I could say no, I don't consider myself of having been that way, but I was there and did engage in the sort of tourist economy, not heavily… So it is a little tricky, but my gut would be to say, 'No of course not, I wasn't one of those.'

The mass influx of volunteers to New Orleans post-Katrina underscores that "place matters" for disaster recovery volunteerism. This may be primary for Tourists, but, as Stephen notes, applies to varying degrees to all volunteers.

Volunteer Metaspaces

To produce a volunteer metaspace, researchers suggest that a place has to be sufficiently safe but retain a sense of danger and continued need. However, this equation is different for volunteers of different mindsets. New Orleans's pull was stronger for Activists immediately following the storm. Dan notes that:

> I think that most of the white activist crowd tends to go wherever, whatever is trendy, you know. Like, one year they're in Palestine, one year they're in New Orleans, and the next year they're in Chiapas, you know. And so I think that they've mostly moved on.

The early arrival of Activists, and their decline as the dominant volunteer type, is perhaps best explained by rising and then falling or nonexistent protest. More cynically, it could be explained by heightened and then reduced social validation, what one interviewee called "getting your activist card punched." It may also simply be due to the influx of other types of volunteers. Chris, a white woman in her early twenties and New Orleans transplant, notes that:

> You're not sort of, you know, hit over the head with what Katrina looks like if you choose to stay in certain places in the city, and if you want to be a "look at New Orleans and help people" kind of volunteer, you can be.

Dan adds that:

> It was months before the [mainstream organizations were] in the Ninth Ward because…nobody would go in an unsafe situation…Once the thing became safe and legal to help and it became trendy, then everyone began to send people to help.

Activists engaged in actions that mainstream relief organizations, Servants, and Tourists were unwilling to hazard. In the first six months following Katrina, Activists blatantly violated military curfew of the Lower Ninth Ward (out by 4:30 p.m.), gutted houses without the proper construction permits, and put their bodies in front of city bulldozers to prevent the demolition of homes tagged under eminent domain (sometimes improperly) without their owners' knowledge. Unfortunately, an error in my survey data collection (failing to include 2005 as a year in which respondents could report volunteering) does not allow me to compare quantitative data to these qualitative findings for early volunteers.

Organizations also determined when different types of volunteers came to the city. New Orleans had to be perceived as sufficiently safe before mainstream organizations like colleges and universities were willing to send mostly Servants *en masse*, and Tourists did not come to the city until it was considered "safe" to do so.

Disaster zones often exist outside the bounds of normal civil society and the basic standards of living prior to the disaster vent. In New Orleans, this included the establishment of martial law and the delayed return of basic utilities in certain parts of the city. Further, tropes about dangerous poor black communities (like the Lower Ninth Ward) add a layer of perceived danger to privileged white volunteers that may exist even outside the context of disaster. While the idea of a volunteer metaspace was

conceptualized around international volunteer tourism, my analysis suggests that a disaster event may produce volunteer metaspaces that draw differently oriented volunteers at different phases of recovery based on motivations to volunteer and corresponding perceptions of disaster.

Ideology and Political Consciousness

As anticipated, Servants generally interpreted the devastation of New Orleans as a natural disaster while Activists perceived it as human-made. Many Servants understood Katrina as a natural disaster. Mac recalls coming down with a "natural" framing:

> I came to New Orleans because there was a really big storm here and people needed help…We would expect people to come if a tornado hit Ohio…There's that just sort of national community feeling of just "it could happen to you."

Similarly, Jane asserts that:

> I see it as a natural disaster because for millennia hurricanes have been happening… A hurricane is a hurricane. You can't control that… It seems foolish to me to rebuild in a place that you know is going to be flooded again… I don't think that the hurricane was just an unfortunate dead hit on to the city.

Of volunteers who participated in faith-based organizations, 57 percent strongly or somewhat agree with the statement "disasters such as floods are the work of nature and cannot be prevented," though they are not significantly different from all other respondents according to a chi-squared test for independence (see Table 9b).

On the other hand, Activists perceived Katrina as a sociopolitical disaster. Hilary, a volunteer coordinator and white woman in her late-thirties, notes that, for Activists, post-Katrina New Orleans:

> …was framed as kind of the ground zero of racial injustice or social injustice in the U.S.

Further, Dan remembers a call that went out through Activist networks stating that:

> Low income communities of color are getting their private property seized in the largest effort to use eminent domain for private commercial development in the U.S. history.

As can be seen in Table 10b, a chi-squared test for independence reveals a significant relationship between participation in activist organizations and perspectives on the preventability of "natural disaster." Referring to the statement, "disasters such as floods are the work of nature and cannot be prevented," respondents who participated in activist organizations are more likely than other volunteers to strongly disagree (34 percent compared to 11 percent) and less likely to somewhat agree (26 percent compared to 40 percent) or strongly agree (8 percent compared to 17 percent). While the technical disaster of the levee system failure was certainly a part of the human-made disaster, interviewees report that Activist volunteers mostly focused on racial and class-based injustices surrounding the storm.

Activities

Despite differences in motivations and framing, different types of volunteers engaged in very similar direct service provision to disaster victims, sometimes together. Volunteers were used in all manner of service provision ranging from immediate relief to

longer range efforts, including food, clothing, and water distribution, healthcare, public cleanup, supporting homeless shelters and subsidized housing, assistance with Road Home Program applications, legal services, job retraining and placement, and wetlands restoration. Servants, however, engaged primarily in physical rebuilding as the manifestation of charity-based altruism. Jane asserts that:

> I'm not one to sit and preach or knock on doors and ask people whatever, but I consider myself more the hands and feet of Christ. I'm out there. I'm happy to nail a nail… That's something that I'm supposed to be doing as a Christian, and I'm also supposed to be doing it without waving my hand around saying, 'Look at me look at me.' I'm just supposed to be doing it.

Vickie, a volunteer coordinator and white woman in her early twenties, notes that:

> Most religious groups worked in hands-on, labor-oriented positions…This was necessary to be a good Christian to them.

As can be seen in Table 11a, chi-squared tests for significance reveal a number of significant relationships between organization type and activities. Respondents who volunteered with faith-based organizations were more likely than all other volunteers to engage in low skilled construction (93 percent compared 70 percent) and skilled construction (41 percent compared to 24 percent). Regarding conventionally nonpolitical activities, they were less likely to engage in neighborhood clean-up (40 percent compared to 64 percent), tutor children (13 percent compared to 32 percent), or use online technologies (8 percent compared to 22 percent). Regarding conventionally political activities, they were less likely to attend city meetings (6 percent compared to 18 percent), engage in consciousness raising (6 percent compared to 40 percent), sign a

Table 11a – Survey Respondents – Faith-Based Organization Crosstabulated with Actions

	Participation with faith-based org.	
	Yes	**No**
Average hours worked	8.2	8.3
Years volunteered		
2005	-	-
2006	38.8% (31)	32.2% (31)
2007*	53.8% (43)	36.5% (35)
2008	50.0% (40)	35.4% (34)
2009*	52.5% (42)	28.1% (27)
2010*	50.0% (40)	29.2% (28)
2011	46.3% (37)	37.5% (36)
2012	35.0% (28)	28.1% (27)
2013	23.8% (19)	20.8% (20)
2014	20.0% (16)	17.7% (17)
Activities		
Gutted flooded home	65.0% (52)	52.1% (50)
Low skilled construction*	92.5% (74)	69.8% (67)
Skilled construction*	41.3% (33)	24.0% (23)
Neighborhood clean-up*	40.0% (32)	63.5% (61)
Served meals	27.5% (22)	38.5% (37)
Tutored children*	12.5% (10)	32.3% (31)
Provided shelter	3.8% (3)	7.3% (7)
Connected to services	22.5% (18)	32.3% (31)
Provided counseling	11.3% (9)	7.3% (7)
Used online technologies*	7.5% (6)	21.9% (21)
Gave money to vol. org.	47.5% (38)	42.7% (41)
Gave money to pol. org.	6.3% (5)	13.5% (13)
Contacted gov. official	10.0% (8)	17.7% (17)
Attended city meetings*	6.3% (5)	17.7% (17)
Spoke at city meetings	2.5% (2)	1.0% (1)
Consciousness raising*	6.3% (5)	39.6% (38)
Signed a petition*	12.5% (10)	32.3% (31)
Boycotted products	8.8% (7)	10.4% (10)
Buycotted products	12.5% (10)	12.5% (12)
Wore campaign badge*	6.3% (5)	18.8% (18)
Joined a strike	0.0% (0)	3.1% (3)
Rally, demonstration*	13.8% (11)	43.8% (42)
Direct action*	2.5% (2)	12.5% (12)
Illegal forms of action	1.3% (1)	3.1% (3)

*Significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

Table 11b – Survey Respondents – Activist Organization Crosstabulated with Actions

	Participation with activist org.	
	Yes	**No**
Average hours worked	8.0	8.4
Years volunteered		
2006	32.7% (18)	36.4% (44)
2007	41.8% (23)	45.5% (55)
2008	49.1% (27)	38.8% (47)
2009	40.0% (22)	38.8% (47)
2010	36.4% (20)	39.7% (48)
2011	38.2% (21)	43.0% (52)
2012	30.9% (17)	31.4% (38)
2013	23.6% (13)	21.5% (26)
2014	18.2% (10)	19.0% (23)
Activities		
Gutted flooded home	58.2% (32)	57.9% (70)
Low skilled construction*	70.9% (39)	84.3% (102)
Skilled construction	25.5% (14)	34.7% (42)
Neighborhood clean-up*	69.1% (38)	45.5% (55)
Served meals	38.2% (21)	31.4% (38)
Tutored children*	40.0% (22)	15.7% (19)
Provided shelter*	12.7% (7)	2.5% (3)
Connected to services*	43.6% (24)	20.7% (25)
Provided counseling	9.1% (5)	9.1% (11)
Used online technologies*	36.4% (20)	5.8% (7)
Gave money to vol. org.*	56.4% (31)	39.7% (48)
Gave money to pol. org.	14.6% (8)	8.3% (10)
Contacted gov. official*	32.7% (18)	5.8% (7)
Attended city meetings*	23.6% (13)	7.4% (9)
Spoke at city meetings	3.6% (2)	0.8% (1)
Consciousness raising*	58.2% (32)	9.1% (11)
Signed a petition*	45.5% (25)	13.2% (16)
Boycotted products	14.6% (8)	7.4% (9)
Buycotted products*	20.0% (11)	9.1% (11)
Wore campaign badge*	25.5% (14)	7.4% (9)
Joined a strike	3.6% (2)	0.8% (1)
Rally, demonstration*	65.5% (36)	14.1% (17)
Direct action*	23.6% (13)	0.8% (1)
Illegal forms of action*	7.3% (4)	0.0% (0)

*Significant at the $p < .05$ using chi-square or Fisher's exact test

petition (13 percent compared to 32 percent), wear a campaign badge or sticker (6 percent compared to 19 percent), attend a rally or demonstration (14 percent compared to 44 percent), or engage in a direct action (3 percent compared to 13 percent).

Concerned with both physical and social destruction, Activists blended service provision with protest and advocacy. For example, Activists resisted government seizure of resident's private property under eminent domain policy through contentious service provision. Dan recalls that:

> It was a protest. We called it "service-oriented direct action." We didn't hold up a sign. Held up a hammer, you know.

In the Lower Ninth Ward, activists gutted flooded properties as an act of resistance against government erasure of this historically black neighborhood amid early gestures towards risk "right sizing" and developing a smaller footprint for the city by transforming the area into a green space. From the perspective of many residents and these Activists, "right sizing" was a euphemism for the erasure of a working class black community and a signal that black evacuees were not welcome back in New Orleans. In this context, the concept of service-oriented direct action blurs the distinction between the constructs of activism and volunteerism.

This also seems to have translated into Activists engaging in a broader range of social service provision. As can be seen in Table 11b, respondents who volunteered with activist organizations are less likely than other volunteers to engage in low skilled construction (71 percent compared to 84 percent). However, they are more likely to engage neighborhood clean-up (69 percent compared to 46 percent), tutor children (40

percent compared to 16 percent), provide shelter (13 percent compared to 3 percent), connect beneficiaries to services (44 percent compared to 21 percent), use online technologies (36 percent compared to 6 percent), or give money to a volunteer organization (56 percent compared to 40 percent).

Activists also engaged in an array of more explicit protest activity. Georgia, a volunteer coordinator and middle-aged black woman, recalls:

> Not only did they come to volunteer to work, they actually got involved in some of the civil actions we had to make the elected officials do what it was they were supposed to do.

Respondents who participated with activist organizations are more likely to contact government officials (33 percent compared to 6 percent), attend city meetings (24 percent compared to 7 percent), engage in consciousness raising (58 percent compared to 9 percent), sign a petition (46 percent compared to 13 percent), intentionally purchase or "buycott" certain products (20 percent compared to 9 percent), participated in a rally or demonstration (66 percent compared to 14 percent), engage in a direct action (24 percent compared to 1 percent), or engage in illegal forms of action (7 percent compared to 0 percent). Randy, a volunteer coordinator and middle-aged black man, argues that volunteers contributed to:

> The exposure of vigilantes in Algiers Point, the destruction of public housing, the city of Gretna not allowin' African Americans to enter its borders. These type of injustice wouldn't have been exposed if it wouldn't have been for the social conscious [sic] of those early volunteers, the ones that didn't believe…individuals had to be denied the social justice that was awarded to them simply because they was white.

These findings corroborate previous research finding that perceptions of a natural disaster encourage situational altruism manifested as non-contentious service provision while perceptions of a human-made disaster encourage a desire for social justice manifested as protest coupled with sometimes contentious service provision.

Like Activists, Tourists engaged in much of the same service provision as Servants, but used this work as a vessel to engage in tourist-oriented activities. Interviewees reported a generally lax approach to work in terms of working few hours and not getting much done. Jane recalls that:

> Of course, you have to go down to Bourbon street, so we did that a couple of nights while we were there, so that was fun too.

Certainly, volunteers cannot work all day, every day, so it seems harmless to participate in the local tourist economy, which may actually support the city. However, Stephen remembers that:

> There was a very particular kind of voluntourism that was short term, college vacation, spring break-oriented… If you're only there for two weeks… [for volunteers that] were not particularly skilled… the amount of time that is spent logistically catering to those needs and organizing around their work was often equal to or greater than the amount of value that they provided… You don't ever want to be accused of being ungrateful for help that people are offering… There was just a diminishing margin of return or utility on some of that work.

While Stephen challenges the premise that Tourists give as much as Servants do, Randy is also concerned with how the ideological gap between Tourists and Activists can lead to a lack of productivity:

> They're no longer addressing the social elements…It's totally different…Now, with a lot of them, they come down they'll work a few hours, but then they're ready to go party in the French Quarter.

The survey data reveals that respondents who participated through volunteer tourist organizations and college courses worked significantly fewer hours than all other respondents. A reasonable interpretation of this is that students in service-learning courses sacrifice volunteer hours to focus on academics. Similarly, Tourists spend more time on tourist activities and less on work. The optimistic interpretation here is that at least Tourists are volunteering a little bit, even if they are less dedicated to the work. A more cynical interpretation is that, as the rate of Activists declines and the rate of Tourists increases, less recovery work is getting accomplished.

However, Tourists are not so cleanly distinguished from Servants and Activists given the ubiquity of New Orleans's tourism industry, especially when everyone who visits the city patronizes the city's restaurants and bars to some degree. As Stephen notes that:

> I didn't stay in hotels and I didn't go on alligator tours or anything, but I suppose that I could have not gone to New Orleans, I could have donated money from afar, I could have participated in a lot of other ways, but I did go, and I think, in some sense, there is a way [in] which that kind of action is a form of voluntourism… It's a complicated question because I think I became implicated in those things and behaved occasionally as that kind of person, but my goal was to avoid being only that kind of thing.

These volunteer types may also manifest as different consumer identities or market niches. For example, the stereotypical Tourist treks the French Quarter and Bourbon Street, or lines up for an obligatory meal at Mother's on Poydras, while the "hipper,"

more seasoned Activists head to Frenchmen Street, or perhaps out into the neighborhood haunts of Uptown, the Tremé or Algiers in search of a more "authentic" experience of the city. Servants may largely eschew anything other than work, but might occasionally be a part of group excursion to dine out at one of New Orleans' many famous restaurants. Therefore, the distinction I draw between Tourists and other groups is a matter of degree and relative emphasis on mainstream tourist activities within the volunteer experience.

Tourists may also have a more detrimental impact on beneficiaries due to their voyeurism. Interview participants report this manifesting as insensitively taking photographs of New Orleans residents and their neighborhoods without thought given to how it could make residents feel like they are in a zoo or a fish bowl. This is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Collective Identity

All three volunteer types had shared experiences in post-Katrina recovery efforts and developed a sense of collective identity with people like themselves. Activists, however, had a distinctly negative form of collective identity that relied on the othering of Servants or Tourists. Prior to moving to New Orleans, Mac notes that a sense of shared group identity:

> Was definitely in my college experience. There was a group with a name, and it was part to organize service trips and part support group. And there was a definite sense of having experienced something that you couldn't really explain to someone who hadn't experienced it.

Once back home, the shared experience of hard manual labor in a disaster zone produced social distance between volunteers and others. While not an instrumental rallying point invoked for political purposes, their sense of shared experience and differentiation from others resulted in a distinct collective identity.

Servants and Tourists also exhibited a sense of collective identity, distinct from Activists. Anna recalls that wearing the same t-shirt as other volunteers in her organization:

> ...made us feel a little bit more connected or more official… Not only are we together but now other people know that we're a part of the same group… Anytime everyone's wearing the same color or doing something in unison makes you feel more bonded.

While Anna nostalgically recalls such markers of volunteer solidarity, perceptions varied across volunteer and volunteer types. Mary, a volunteer coordinator and white woman in her mid-twenties, notes that some organizations had:

> These awful shirts, T-shirts. I hate them, but I think they are sort of indicative of what it is. It says…"I helped rebuild New Orleans, have you?"…They buy them and they wear them around, so you know, that's a thing. "I went to New Orleans and worked on the ground," and if you did too you probably have something to bond over.

To sum up, Servants might proudly wear the "awful shirts" mentioned in the above quote, while Tourists might be the most likely to sport a shirt saying, "I Stayed in New Orleans For KATRINA and all I got was This Lousy T-Shirt, A New Cadillac and 'A Plasma TV.' Bourbon Street- New Orleans – 2005."1 On the other hand, Activists might wear t-

1 http://www.foodmessalert.com/katrina-tshirt-200w.jpg

shirts cursing the federal government (e.g., "FEMA Evacuation Plan: Run Mother Fucker Run"2) or understated organizational shirts that proclaim "solidarity, not charity," but they would be unlikely to wear a shirt loudly proclaiming their rebuilding work.

Interviewees noted that Activists went through great lengths to distance themselves from Servants and Tourists. Danielle notes that:

> For a while I wanted to exclusively identify with the social justice people, and then I realized that I had to organize my own people, which were a lot of the service providers…which is so hard and scary because I see so many fucked up things that we collectively do. But the much stronger sense is of this small beautiful community of social justice activists.

Similarly, Stephen observes that:

> There's a whole hierarchy that developed between and among people who are recent New Orleans travelers… Once you get there, you look down on anyone who comes after you, and I think a lot of us transplants had a particularly sneering attitude at people who showed up even just a few weeks after us, knowing nothing and not being particularly savvy about the city. Meanwhile, of course, people who had been there before Katrina felt that way about all of us.

Activists' othering of Servants inverts previous findings of Servants distancing themselves from Activists (Blackstone 2004, 2007; Greenebaum 2009; Wilson 2000). From an Activist perspective, Servants and Tourists were perceived as self-serving, ignorant, and damaging due to their lack of a social justice perspective.

2 https://c1.staticflickr.com/1/73/163647324_3e8833d98c.jpg

Interestingly, while Activists shared a collective identity around post-Katrina recovery efforts in New Orleans, they generally did not perceive their shared efforts to be part of a larger social movement. Dan argues that post-Katrina volunteerism:

> constitutes a social movement that most of the participants aren't aware that they are participating in…They see what happened in New Orleans as being a struggle in *their* social movement.

Despite hundreds of thousands of people's engagement in contentious collective actions around a shared issue, volunteers generally did not identify what Heldman and Israel-Trummel (2012) call the "New Orleans Rebirth Movement" as an independent social movement. Instead, Activists saw themselves as constituents of anarchist, anticlassist, antiracist, environmental justice, feminist, global justice, or other social movements whose agendas encompassed the just recovery of New Orleans and neighborhoods like the Ninth Ward in particular.

Impacts of Volunteering

Individual orientations are similarly unfixed and may shift as volunteers experience identity transformation through processes of politicization or depoliticization. In Table 12a, we see that most respondents report no shift in political ideology after volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans (71 percent). Of those that do report a shift in political ideology, 74 percent experience a weak liberal shift, or moving one category to the left on a seven point scale of political ideology. Of those that experienced a weak liberal shift, 56 percent began as liberal and moved to extremely liberal, and 24 percent began as slightly liberal and moved to liberal. In short, those who were already slightly

Table 12a – Survey Respondents – Changes in Political Views

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Change in Political Ideology		
Strong liberal shift (-3+)	1	0.6
Moderate liberal shift (-2)	4	2.5
Weak liberal shift (-1)	34	21.1
No shift (0)	115	71.4
Weak conservative shift (1)	4	2.5
Moderate conservative shift (2)	2	1.2
Strong conservative shift (3+)	1	0.6
Change in Political Ideology, Truncated		
Liberal shift	39	24.2
No shift	115	71.4
Conservative shift	7	4.3
Political Ideology before volunteering, if respondent had a weak liberal shift		
Liberal	19	55.9
Slightly liberal	8	23.5
Moderate	3	8.8
Slighly conservative	2	5.9
Conservative	2	5.9
Extremely conservative	0	0.0

liberal or liberal were the most likely candidates to have a left-ward shift in political ideology.

Generally, these liberal shifts were tied to perception of social problems around race and class. In Table 12b, we see that most respondents report an increase in their desire to help others (62 percent), their desire to be active in issues of social justice (56 percent), their belief that racism is a major issue in the U.S. (53 percent), and their belief that classism is a major issue in the U.S. (63 percent). Chris notes that:

> I learned a lot about being a thoughtful white person…Someone who isn't paternalistic and trying to change things for people.

Volunteering raised Chris' consciousness around race and encouraged a shift from altruistic to reciprocal solidarity. Penny also recalls that:

Table 12b – Survey Respondents – Effects of Volunteering on Participants

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Have you experienced an increase or decrease in any of the following attitudes, beliefs, or desires as a result of your volunteer experience in New Orleans?		
Desire to help others		
Decreased	3	1.8
Stayed the Same	59	35.8
Increased	103	62.4
Desire to be active in politics		
Decreased	12	7.3
Stayed the Same	89	54.3
Increased	63	38.4
Desire to be active in issues of social justice		
Decreased	5	3.0
Stayed the Same	67	40.6
Increased	93	56.4
Belief that racism is a major issue in the United States		
Decreased	3	1.8
Stayed the Same	75	45.5
Increased	88	53.3
Belief that classism is a major issue in the United States		
Decreased	3	1.8
Stayed the Same	57	34.8
Increased	104	63.4
Belief that sexism is a major issue in the United States		
Decreased	5	3.0
Stayed the Same	111	67.3
Increased	49	29.7
Belief that homophobia is a major issue in the United States		
Decreased	6	3.7
Stayed the Same	120	73.2
Increased	38	23.2
Trust in government		
Decreased	102	61.8
Stayed the Same	55	33.3
Increased	8	4.9
Belief that volunteer recovery efforts in New Orleans will generally benefit the interests of local residents		
Decreased	44	27.0
Stayed the Same	41	25.2
Increased	78	47.9

> I still thought that it was, 'Damn, New Orleans got hit by a hurricane.' I didn't realize the political nature, how man-made the disaster really was… I just didn't know enough to care enough at that time. And my understanding of race, class, and gender and social inequalities in general didn't really develop until the end of my junior and beginning of my senior year in college.

As noted earlier, volunteers in college courses had significant overlap with activist organizations. Despite having the highest percentage to identify as most extremely liberal prior to volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans, they were more likely than other volunteers and even other activists to have a shift from liberal to extremely liberal ideology (see Table 8b). As Penny reflects above, this seems a reasonable given the early and transitional life stage of being a college student. With regard to becoming mobilized around protest, Anna recalls that:

> I learned a lot about activism while I was there. One of the things we did was a protest… against the homelessness and the lack of affordable housing and the lack of the government's response… It kind of opened the doors to that, to learning more about different avenues for activism and what it meant and what you could do… Meeting people that I guess were more liberal than I was, more radically liberal. I met people who were socialists, and I had never really thought about those things before, so definitely a shift to the left as far as being more liberal and more open minded and cared more about other people, even more than I had before.

Peter saw similar changes take place in some of those around him:

> People who stayed longer and saw the interaction of volunteers with the local population…their consciousness expanded…Then you could have people here for a month and that never happens.

Organizations likely play an important role in shaping volunteer ideologies as well. As seen in Table 8a, chi-squared tests for independence reveal significant relationships between participation in an activist organization or college course with a change in political views. Respondents who volunteered with activist organizations are more likely than other volunteers to experience a liberal shift (40 percent compared to 17 percent), as are those who did so through a college course (54 percent compared to 15 percent). These findings suggest that not all volunteers were equally primed to experience a political shift to the left.

Volunteer coordinators did not explicitly discuss depoliticization or shifts toward conservatism. However, it is possible to interpret depoliticization in acts such as the purposeful leaving of the spoiled refrigerator because they reflect reinforcement of stereotypes of the (un)deserving poor and difference between volunteers and local residents, which are discussed in greater depth in the next chapter (Guttentag 2009; McGehee 2012).

For those volunteers who relocated to New Orleans full-time, their choice of communities may have been politically transformative as well. One in five (21 percent) respondents report relocating full-time to New Orleans, of whom 53 percent still live in New Orleans (see Table 3b). Georgia notes that:

> Some of us complain about gentrification in some of our neighborhoods, you know, but that's a given. It's sort of like a double-edged sword…Those who have decided to make it their home have come in, started non-profits, started businesses, gotten involved in the movement because they live in the neighborhoods now…so they have a vested interest.

Table 13 – Survey Respondents – Relocation to New Orleans and Change in Political Views

	Relocated to New Orleans?	
	No	**Yes**
Liberal shift	73.0% / 21.6% (27)	27.0% / 30.3% (10)
No shift	80.7% / 73.6% (92)	19.3% / 66.7% (22)
Conservative shift	85.7% / 4.8% (6)	14.3% / 3.0% (1)

As seen in Table 13, a significantly higher percentage of survey respondents who relocate to New Orleans have a liberal shift than volunteers who do not (30 percent compared to 22 percent), but this difference is not statistically significant. While some volunteer transplants chose to live in less affected communities, many chose to become a part of increasingly mixed-race communities such as the Bywater, the Upper Ninth Ward, the Holy Cross and (less commonly) the Lower Ninth Ward lakeside of St. Claude Avenue. Though this trend is likely encouraged by relatively low rent or property value and broader processes of gentrification, many of these former or current volunteers became stakeholders in the communities they initially set out to serve, which may have encouraged in them a deeper reciprocal solidarity with local residents. Of course, the causal arrow may go the other way. It seems reasonable that if one is more affected by their volunteering in New Orleans, they would be more likely to move to the city. As also seen in Table 13, respondents who had a liberal shift were more likely to relocate to New Orleans than those who had no shift or a conservative shift (27 percent compared to 19 percent and 14 percent), but this differences is not statistically significant either.

CONCLUSION

This study furthers our understanding of nonlocal disaster recovery volunteers by bringing together literatures on disaster, volunteerism, activism, and volunteer tourism and through empirical research. Through a review of the literature and interviews with volunteer coordinators, I develop three nonlocal disaster recovery volunteer archetypes: Servants, Activists, and Tourists. I also go beyond existing literature by interrogating the heterogeneity of disaster recovery volunteers across a number of organizations instead of focusing on one type of volunteer or one volunteer organization.

I find that Servants, Activists, and Tourists differ in their motivations, framing of the disaster, and work activities in New Orleans. Furthermore, I find that the collective identities of Servants and Activists are reinforced by their experience, and that Activist identity is entrenched by "othering" Servants and Tourists whom Activists perceive as charity-oriented and harmful to residents. This contradicts previous findings that Servants distance themselves from Activists, despite their engagement in much of the same work (Blackstone 2004, 2007; Greenebaum 2009; Wilson 2000).

These findings have implications for other kinds of volunteer service provision that may be performed in more or less activist ways. As Poppendieck (1999) suggests, non-contentious and contentious interpretations may apply to many forms of service provision (e.g., anti-rape, child-abuse and mythopoetic men's movements, The Black Panthers, Hamas, Hezbollah, Food Not Bombs, etc.). The case of post-Katrina New Orleans volunteerism highlights the fact that different groups may engage in the same actual work for very different reasons, suggesting that service provision itself may

become conflated with social movement participation, or vice versa. Building on Blackstone (2004, 2007) and Greenebaum (2009), this suggests that Servants and Tourists may be roped into service provision by Activists that furthers their cause without these volunteers being aware of it. Just as the professionalization of social movement organizations may produce opportunities for contention through institutional arenas (Landriscina 2006), contentious service provision may be strategically cloaked in the guise of mainstream volunteerism. But including Servants and Tourists in activist work to expand resources may come at the cost of dampening an organization's more radical tendencies. Location in these categoreies may also change over time. Perhaps encouraged through trainings or organizational culture, some individuals were politicized, generally beginning as either slightly liberal or liberal and moving moderately further left. These findings provide empirical support for McGehee's (2012) proposition that volunteer tourism may encourage social movement participation through consciousness-raising. My findings also challenge the categorical distinctions of post-disaster volunteer convergence, volunteer tourism, and post-disaster social movements, as well as volunteerism and activism more broadly. These empirical concepts are understood as ideal types on a continuum rather than as cleanly divided categories.

I also build on Erdely's (2011) work on the influence of location and find that Tourist volunteers tend to be less dedicated to the volunteerism itself and less sensitive to disaster trauma, which builds on an expanding body of critical volunteer tourist studies outside of the context of disaster (Guttentag 2009; McGehee 2012; Wearing and McGehee 2013). Further, this study is the first to identify the emergence of what I term a

"disaster volunteer metaspace," building on Keese's (2011) conceptualization of volunteer metaspaces. Through different phases of recovery, perceptions of danger in disaster zones change, affecting who is willing to volunteer there. With the exception of short-term disaster responders (sometimes volunteers) and high-risk activists, disaster zones must reach an in-between state that feels both safe and unsafe before most risk-averse Servants and Tourists are willing to come in large numbers and produce a disaster volunteer metaspace. The draw of a disaster volunteer metaspace may quickly fade or continue depending on the tourist draw and endemic social problems of that area. Such dynamics are likely at play wherever disaster recovery volunteers are present.

My findings suggest that we need a more sophisticated understanding of the various dimensions that shape volunteer response to disasters. With this knowledge, we can better predict who will respond in future disaster events, and maximize the effectiveness of their work by type while minimizing potential negative consequences. Understandings of post-Katrina recovery volunteerism must take into consideration how motivation, framing, and actions are dependent on collective volunteer identities that evolve with certain experiences. Being able to predict this variation will improve the effectiveness of volunteering.

While my research takes advantage of the depth of experience among volunteer coordinators, it cannot be taken for granted that their understandings match with volunteers' self-perceptions with regard to motivation, framing, activities, and identity. Likewise, the perceptions of New Orleans residents themselves of these nonlocal volunteers and their characteristics may also differ from those of volunteer coordinators

in significant ways. Further research is needed on the role, impact, and character of outside volunteers from these other groups' perspectives. And while my sampling of volunteer coordinators involved in many different volunteer organizations moves beyond the studies limited to a particular organization, my focus on New Orleans as a case study does not allow for comparison with a disaster zone without a pre-existing tourist industry.

As climate change may increase the frequency and severity of "natural" disasters (O'Brien et al. 2006), future research should continue to investigate the emergence of disaster volunteerism and the varying orientations of volunteers in the wake of other disasters such as the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami that hit Indonesia, the 2010 Haiti earthquake, the 2011 Japan nuclear facility failure, Hurricane Sandy's wrecking of the U.S. eastern seaboard in 2012, and Typhoon Haiyan's devastation of the Philippines in 2013. How might variations in the context of disaster (e.g. urban vs. rural, pre-existing tourism industry, pre-existing social inequalities, level of political stability, imperialist links between countries) shape volunteer orientations? However, just as local post-Katrina activists reject disaster exceptionalism, scholars should also take these variant orientations into consideration when studying volunteerism and activism, both in and out of disaster zones and in the presence or absence of volunteer tourism, to better understand the heterogeneity of these phenomena. Further research is also needed on the role of host and sending organizations and how their orientations shape volunteers. Do certain combinations of sending and host organizations have different outcomes for volunteers? Understanding this dynamic could help guide how sending organizations select host organizations or how host organizations reach out to sending organizations.

Chapter 3

Aiding Victims and Enacting Privilege: The Impacts of Volunteers on Beneficiaries and Host Communities

> A lot of people have a lot of resentment… I heard it a lot from my homeowners, who were like, 'Wow, it's really nice to see a brown face, cause you look like me and so I know you not gonna give me a bunch of the bullshit that these other people are giving me.'
>
> *-Sarah, volunteer coordinator and black woman in her mid-twenties*

In the context of disaster, volunteers often provide needed labor and material resources to impacted communities, without which "many people would fall through the cracks and never get home" (Phillips 2014:22). However, Phillips (2014:27) asserts that "researchers have not investigated the intangible effects that volunteers have on beneficiaries. Organizations typically enumerate the hours spent, debris cleaned up, and houses rebuilt but share only anecdotal evidence of the effects on beneficiaries." Luft (2008:24) similarly argues that "the new emphasis on social vulnerability and recovery reveals that recovery aid is stratified…Recovery literature does not focus, however, on the deleterious consequences of assistance that *has* been received." In other words, we know little about the intangible outcomes of volunteer work, and the downsides of this labor have yet to be systematically examined. The benefits may be overstated, and the drawbacks are underresearched. This is a rather large hole in the volunteer literature, a body of work that typically assumes volunteer labor has confirmed benefits.

This chapter addresses the potential downsides of volunteer work through examination of the (re)production of class and racial inequalities on the part of mostly white and middle-class post-Katrina volunteers through their interactions with mostly black and disadvantaged service recipients and the communities they claim to serve. This chapter draws on interviews with 15 residents of New Orleans' Lower Ninth Ward as well as 31 interviews with volunteers and an online survey of 176 volunteers, but relies primarily on 25 interviews with volunteer coordinators in post-Katrina New Orleans who have supervised a large number of volunteers over an extended period of time.[1]

I first discuss my theoretical perspective rooted in foundational theory on issues of power, privilege, and intersectionality. Bonilla-Silva (2010:9) asserts that "the task of analysts interested in studying racial structures is to uncover the particular social, economic, political, social control, and ideological mechanisms responsible for the reproduction of racial privilege in a society." While I foreground race due to the particularities of this context, feminist intersectionality theory demands attention to the simultaneity of race with other axes of inequality such as class and gender.

I find that volunteers provided needed labor and resources but also reproduced race, class and gender inequalities through insensitivity towards recipients and communities with regard to disaster trauma and cultural differences, poor quality of labor due to assumptions about "free" services, condescension and judgment of recipients'

1 As a nonlocal white who tends to be perceived as a volunteer (and rightfully so), it has proven difficult for me to elicit mixed or negative perceptions of volunteers among black residents of New Orleans' Lower Ninth Ward.

decisions, identification of recipients as (un)worthy of services, and punishment of recipients deemed unworthy. These findings shed light on the not so pleasant underbelly of the largely celebrated bastion of whiteness that is volunteerism, which has implications not only for scholarship but for the policies and practices of volunteer based organizations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Whiteness and Volunteerism

This chapter begins from the position that race (along with other systems of power) is a social construct that produces social realities (Bonilla-Silva 2010). This social constructionist approach posits that social interactions and structures are not biologically determined, but instead are driven by the social interplay of individuals and institutions in specific times and places. Racial formation is a foundational theoretical approach for social constructionist race scholars. Omi and Winant (1994:55) define racial formation as "the sociohistorical process by which racial categories [that signify and symbolize social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies] are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed."

The continual and dynamic process of socially constructing race proceeds along two primary paths: racial projects and hegemony. Omi and Winant (1994:56) define a racial project as "simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines." Racial projects ideologically connect the discursive meaning of race and social

structure. With regard to racial projects, Bonilla-Silva (2010:9) asserts that, since "members of the dominant race receive material benefits from the racial order, they struggle (or passively receive the manifold wages of whiteness) to maintain their privileges. In contrast, those defined as belonging to the subordinate race or races struggle to change the status quo (or become resigned to their position)." On the other hand, hegemony enables the racial order to become normalized and perpetuated through not only coercion but consent via racial "common sense." What makes hegemonic ideologies particularly powerful are their "loose-jointed, flexible application" of "common frames, style, and racial stories" that enable "accommodation of contradictions, exceptions, and new information" (Bonilla-Silva 2010:10). An example of this is the historic shift from codified or Jim Crow racism (largely prior to the civil rights movement of the 1960s) to contemporary colorblind racism, which obscures and perpetuates existing racial inequalities by claiming they do not exist.

While the black/white binary oversimplifies the complex hierarchy between nonwhite racial groups (Feliciano, Robnett, and Komaie 2009; Mirande 2006; Morales 2012; Reese and Ramirez 2002; Roth 2004) as well as within those groups based upon skin color and phenotype (Hunter 2010; Hurtado 1997; Perea 1997), it can be useful for understanding how white Americans interact with black Americans, which is the dominant dynamic in the context of post-Katrina volunteerism in New Orleans. Lopez (1994:28) asserts that "races are constructed relationally, against one another, rather than in isolation." Further, Bonilla-Silva (2010:9) argues that "when race emerged in human history, it formed a social structure (a racialized social system) that awarded systematic

privileges to Europeans (the peoples who became 'white') over non-Europeans (the peoples who became 'nonwhite')." Lopez (1994:38) notes that "slavery oppressed a group of people marked in comparison with their oppressors by a common morphology. African Americans remain linked by the legacy of that oppression and its current incarnation." Painter (2010:x–xi) also finds that "American history offers up a large bounty of commentary on what it means to be nonwhite…always associating the idea of blackness with slavery."

In post-Katrina New Orleans, largely nonlocal white volunteers interacted mostly with local black service recipients. Despite a concentrated Vietnamese community in the New Orleans East neighborhood (2.9% of city population is categorized as Asian) and a sharp rise in the city's Latino population due largely to an influx of immigrant laborers following Hurricane Katrina (5.2%, which undercounts undocumented immigrants), New Orleans remains a largely black (60.2%) and white (33.0%) city (Donato et al. 2007; Leong et al. 2007; U.S. Census Bureau 2014). As Painter (2010:396) argues, "a multicultural middle class may diversify the suburbs and college campuses, but the face of poor, segregated inner cities remains black…the opposite of whiteness, driven by an age-old social yearning to characterize the poor as permanently other and inherently inferior." Given the overwhelming whiteness and socioeconomic privilege of volunteers and the blackness of largely working-class or precariously middle class residents, it is crucial that we look at the role of whiteness in post-Katrina volunteerism in New Orleans.

Whiteness exists primarily in its juxtaposition to blackness. Painter (2010:x–xi) finds that the "statutory and biological definitions of the white race remain notoriously

vague – the leavings of what is not black." A partial explanation for this is the whiteness is the dominant and therefore unmarked racial category whose membership is largely unaware of their racial privilege (Frankenberg 2008; McIntosh 2007). Further, the boundaries of whiteness have been incredibly fluid and yet consistently exclusionary to those deemed "black" throughout history. At its origins, whiteness was a much narrower category than it is today. Initially the exclusive domain of landowning Anglo-Saxon men, (Painter 2010:389–390) asserts that American whiteness has undergone four historical enlargements: 1) the inclusion of poor Anglo-Saxon men; 2) the absorption of Irish and Germans (breaking the monopoly held by Teutonic/Saxon/Anglo-Saxons) following their support of the Union during the Civil War and the influx of Italian, Jewish, and other white ethnic immigrants in the late 1800s; 3) the inclusion of Italians and Jews, who particularly benefited from the post-war economic boom, as well as Mexicans and Mexican Americans as whites in military ranks during World War II (though this oversimplifies the heterogeneous racial experience of Mexicans and Mexican Americans); and, more speculatively, 4) "the dark of skin who also happen to be rich…and the light of skin (from anywhere) who are beautiful, are now well on their way to inclusion." Indeed, these historic shifts in the boundaries of whiteness are well documented, although the last two appear more contested in the research (Almaguer 1975, 1987; Barrera 1989; Foner 2010; Frankenberg 2008; Lee and Bean 2008; Lopez 1994; Padín 2010; Roediger 2006). Given the fluidity of whiteness, some have begged the question, as Painter does, of whether those boundaries might move again to accommodate races that challenge the simplicity of the black/white binary, including

Asians and Latinos (Alba and Nee 1997; Bonilla-Silva 2010; Bradley 2010; Espiritu 2003; Gans 1999; Kim 2007; Louis 2009; Ong 1999; Wu 2003; Xie and Goyette n.d.; Zhou 2004).

Whiteness is not always characterized by overt racial hatred and exclusion, but may manifest in more subtle and insidious ways (Baldwin 2010; Bonilla-Silva 2010; Du Bois 1920; Lopez 1994). For instance, Lipsitz (2006:vii–viii) proposes that whites reinforce their privilege through daily decisions, what he terms a "possessive investment in whiteness":

> The term 'investment' denotes time spent on a given end…[S]ocial and cultural forces encourage white people to expend time and energy on the creation and re-creation of whiteness…I use the term "possessive" to stress the relationship between whiteness and asset accumulation in our society, to connect attitudes and interests, to demonstrate that white supremacy is usually less a matter of direct, referential, and snarling contempt than a system for protecting the privileges of whites by denying communities of color opportunities for asset accumulation and upward mobility.

Nowhere is this investment in whiteness more apparent than in some forms of volunteer work. As exemplified by missionary work during colonialism (Warren and Hytten 2004), the "altruistic White" has long acted as a pressure release for white guilt without challenging structural inequalities and to "invest" in the racial hierarchy between giver (white) and receiver (black) (Delpit 2006; Endres and Gould 2009; Marty 1998; McIntyre 1997; Warren and Hytten 2004). White volunteers invest in their whiteness by assuming a superior role, one for which they receive social benefits that obscure their participation in protecting the supremacy of whiteness, as some researchers have noted.

Some scholars and activists critique charity work as a means to (re)produce difference and hierarchy between giver and receiver, which may be understood as a

manifestation of the "possessive investment in whiteness." While volunteerism is commonly perceived as a mode of resistance to social inequality, some scholars have also identified it as an arena in which volunteers reproduce inequality (Endres and Gould 2009; Flaherty 2007; Heldman 2011; Hilderbrand, Crow, and Fithian 2007; Marullo and Edwards 2000; McClure 2006; Poppendieck 1999).

Volunteerism can be a means of reproducing race and class difference, and therefore protecting one's interests and investing in one's own supremacy. Endres and Gould (2009:421–422) argue that "[t]his hierarchical relationship has the potential to reinforce racial stereotypes, thus allowing students [volunteers] to position themselves as superior and view the communities with which they work as having deficits" in work ethic or morality. Linking post-Katrina volunteerism in New Orleans to the legacies of neoliberalism and colonialism (and to the nonprofit industrial complex), Luft (2008:26) argues that "the American politics of assistance in its many forms usually has at its core a racial project of social control. This racial project is not the result of error, of projects poorly enacted, but rather is intrinsic to the projects themselves" (Luft 2008, 2009).

Reflecting on a recurring community based learning (CBL) course at two Southern California liberal arts colleges that took undergraduate students to New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina, Heldman (2011:4) concludes that "many students unwittingly bring white privilege and class privilege to the CBL experience. Some instances involved insensitive encounters with residents directly, while others involved a general disrespect for the community." In this vein, volunteer tourism scholars who employ a critical lens raise concerns about the potential reinforcement of colonial

difference by "othering" (i.e., the [re]production of social difference and hierarchy), the reinforcement of deserving versus undeserving poor, the rationalization and romanticization of poverty, the conflation of underdevelopment and foreign, and the assumption of expert roles and instigation of cultural changes by outsiders in host communities (Guttentag 2009; McGehee 2012). Unlike most empirical academic research on volunteerism, activists tend to acknowledge their privilege and the inevitability of its impact on their ally work and have reported oppressive behavior on the part of post-Katrina volunteers in New Orleans that led to calls by both local and nonlocal activists for trainings around race (Flaherty 2007; Hilderbrand et al. 2007).

Not all scholars are critical of the racial dynamics of volunteers in disaster settings. In her study of Mennonite Disaster Services' (MDS) response to Hurricane Katrina on the Gulf Coast, Phillips (2014) finds that volunteers and disaster victims may develop meaningful relationships across geographic, cultural, religious, racial and class divides that provide hope and a sense that victims are not alone in their struggle. While Phillips (2014:81) raises concerns about the role of race in volunteerism, she finds that, "when asked whether outsiders…brought harmful attitudes, homeowner clients responded with an emphatic 'no!'"

While Phillips (2014) makes an earnest effort to address the question of whether racial power dynamics are at play, I believe her data may be skewed due to the identities of both her respondents and the Mennonite volunteers themselves. First, Mennonite Disaster Services volunteers are not representative of post-Katrina volunteers more broadly in that they tend to be more polite and invested in mutual aid than other

volunteers. Mennonites, as a denomination of Anabaptism (like the Amish), are "a counter-cultural alternative to the dominant society" for whom "sharing does not connote charity. Rather, directly helping others is seen as a matter of justice" (Phillips 2014:32). Mennonite Disaster Services has a long history and reputation of coming in without fanfare to quietly and respectfully engage with the local community to effectively rebuild. "When asked about cross-cultural interactions, one Louisiana respondent became visibly upset at the question and insisted…'Some individuals had to be taught better or asked to leave, but never with MDS'" (Phillips 2014:69). In short, resident interactions with MDS volunteers are likely more positive and respectful than typical resident-volunteer interactions.

Secondly, Phillips is a white outsider asking Southern black homeowners about the enactment of privilege on the part of outsider white volunteers, and therefore more negative or mixed interactions may have been obscured by interviewer effects (on the latter, see Allen 2006; McCorkel and Myers 2003; Merriam et al. 2001; Shope 2006; Villenas 1996; Zavella 1987; Zinn 1979). Given the South's long and violent racial history and present, local black residents with strongly negative impressions of volunteers may be less likely to agree to do an interview in the first place and those with mixed opinions may be reluctant to voice their critical thoughts and experiences. Despite previous research suggesting that the "new South" had reached parity in racial attitudes with the rest of the U.S., Kuklinski, Cobb, and Gilens (1997) implement questions designed to overcome social desirability and find that racial prejudice continues to be more pronounced in the South, particularly among white men. Further research on

potential racial drawbacks of volunteerism is in order given the constraints of Phillip's study and disagreement in the literature.

But how can the benefits of volunteers for residents coexist with these drawbacks? Pyke (2010) argues that resistance and complicity with systems of power are often bound up with one another. While Western thinking encourages either/or thinking, resistance and complicity are better understood though a both/and framework. We must be attentive to how our actions fit within larger power structures, not just our individual or collective intentions. What exactly volunteerism is meant to resist, if anything, seems to vary greatly depending on the volunteer and the organization. In this case, the benefits of volunteers may coexist with and obscure their costs.

Feminist Intersectionality and the (Un)Worthy Poor

In combination with race and class, gender may also affect the relationship between volunteers and residents by shaping which residents are perceived as deserving of help. An understanding of intersectional theory is in order to better understand this gendered dynamic. The concept of intersectionality comes out of a long line of theoretical practice addressing the complexity of overlapping axes of power. Du Bois (1933) criticizes Marx's failure to capture the power of racial dynamics in the U.S. context and argues that distinct relationships exist between the black proletariat, white proletariat, the black bourgeois, and the white bourgeois. Implicitly providing an intersectional analysis, he argues that class and race cannot be understood in isolation from one another. Further, socialist feminists built on Engels' (1892) early critique of Marx's gender-blindness and

argue that class and gender are similarly intertwined (Hartmann 1979; MacKinnon 1982). Intersectionality was introduced as a specific term by Crenshaw (1989), though this conceptualization was heavily informed by scholars and activists challenging the monolithic construction of social categories with particular emphasis on gender, race, and class (Combahee River Collective 1997; hooks 1981). Taken together to their logical end, these critiques suggest not just the intersection of two or three but any number of axes of power.

Intersectionality posits that all individuals experience the world through a specific constellation of identities formed by many intersecting axes of power that construct what Collins (1990) refers to as the "matrix of domination." These constellations are not additive (i.e., experienced distinctly) but multiplicative (i.e., experienced simultaneously in ways that are not simply the accumulation of single systems of oppression). Axes of power are "interlocking," and, therefore, cannot be analytically disentangled. There is dissent among intersectional scholars regarding whether intersectionality should be universally employed and whether certain axes should be prioritized when it is. Risman (2009) argues that single axes of power should at times be centered and therefore not all analyses need be intersectional. On the other hand, Zinn and Dill (1996) argue for contextual hierarchies of axes of power and specify race and gender as the primary forces shaping contemporary social relations. Others reject such hierarchies as oversimplified and claim that any one axis cannot be ignored without causing obfuscation (Choo and Ferree 2010; McCall 2005).

I am most compelled by Zinn and Dill's position that the salience of particular axes is contextual, whether at the macro, mezzo, or micro level. I also am persuaded by arguments that salience of axes is influenced by the relationship under examination. Therefore, I highlight the impact of race and class on beneficiary-volunteer relations and and the impact of gender on volunteer-volunteer relations. This is not to say that other axes of power do not matter or are not at play. For instance, Luft (2008) examines the sexual assault of white women volunteers by white men volunteers and how local black men were blamed and criminalized. This highlights that race matters even in relations between groups of the same racial category. In this study, I analytically focus on the contrasting race and class identities of volunteers and beneficiaries, and the contrasting gender identities of women and men who volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans.

Intersectionality makes visible all groups formed by specific identity constellations including groups of mixed privilege and oppression, such as black men and white women, as well as multiply privileged and oppressed groups, such as white men and black women. Intersectionality then seeks to understand the relationships across these groups (Choo and Ferree 2010; Crenshaw 1991; McCall 2005; Zinn and Dill 1996). McCall (2005:1787) suggests that intersectionality primarily captures what she calls intercategorical complexity:

> Whereas the intracategorical approach begins with a unified intersectional core…and works its way outward to analytically unravel one by one the influences of gender, race, class, and so on, the [inter]categorical approach begins with an analysis of the elements first…[and] focuses on the complexity of relationships among multiple social groups within and across analytical categories. The subject is multigroup, and the method is systematically comparative.

Intersectionality's structural perspective lends itself to comparison across categories, but as certain axes are prioritized to draw lines between groups for comparison, variation within categories may be obfuscated (Crenshaw 1991; McCall 2005). I have not seen a prescribed way around this give and take, nor do I see one myself, but it is worth acknowledging these limitations, as is the case with any theoretical approach.

Race, class, and gender may be understood as simultaneous interactional accomplishments that produce, result from, and reproduce institutional inequalities. Earlier studies of the interactional dynamics analyzed gender and race separately (Lopez 1994; Omi and Winant 1994; West and Zimmerman 1987). However, Fenstermaker and West (2002:206) argue that we "do" each of these differences simultaneously:

> [E]ach of us, specifically located within groups, institutions, relationships, and human activities, is held accountable – in varying ways and to differing degrees – to particular 'classed,' 'raced,' and 'gendered' expectations. These expectations are informed by the past outcomes of interactions, which, in turn, resulted in historical and institutional practices. Through these means, we not only produce 'natural' differences among human beings, but also reaffirm inequality based on such differences as an 'only natural' state of affairs.

This theoretical framework facilitates an understanding of the "dynamic, adaptable, [and] mutable" mechanisms of intersecting axes of inequality that manifest in different ways across varying social contexts. One manifestation of "doing difference" are "microagressions," which Pierce (1995:281) defines as "subtle, innocuous, preconscious, or unconscious degradations, and putdowns…In and of itself a microaggression may seem harmless, but the cumulative burden of a lifetime of microaggressions can theoretically contribute to diminished mortality, augmented morbidity, and flattened confidence" (Dovidio and Gaertner 2004; Sue et al. 2007). In this vein, my analysis of

volunteerism in New Orleans centers on micro-dynamics as both the product of and as a means of (re)producing macro-level social structures and systems of power.

Historically, there are specific ideas about the "worthy" and "unworthy" poor that are steeped in intersecting tropes of class, race, and gender. Du Bois (1920:18) asserts that:

> So long, then, as humble black folk, voluble with thanks, receive barrels of old clothes from lordly and generous whites, there is much mental peace and moral satisfaction. But when the black man [sic] begins to dispute the white man's [sic] title to certain alleged bequests of the Fathers in wage and position, authority and training; and when his [sic] attitude toward charity is sullen anger rather than humble jollity; when he [sic] insists on his [sic] human right to swagger and swear and waste,—then the spell is suddenly broken and the philanthropist is ready to believe that Negroes are impudent, that the South is right, and that Japan wants to fight America.

In her study of antiwelfare backlashes in the early and late 20th century, Reese (2005) finds that such patterns emerged during the civil rights movement, as white support for black activism declined as black activism became more radical and militant. Combined with racist media coverage and conservative political rhetoric, "growing associations between poverty, welfare, and blacks were linked to increasing skepticism about the worthiness of welfare recipients" (Reese 2005:117–118). Reese (2005:27) asserts that:

> The classist belief that one's economic status is largely due to individual merit and effort denigrates the poor in American society. This belief, along with the strong Protestant work ethic, fosters the view that people are poor because they are lazy, inept, lack traditional family values, and cannot delay immediate gratification. Such individualistic analyses of poverty direct attention away from structural factors that contribute to poverty, such as the shortage of living wage jobs or racial discrimination.

Further, this mindset celebrates the white middle- and upper-class as having earned their social position and therefore grants them moral authority.

While Du Bois' analysis centers the intersection of class and race, Reese highlights the intersection of these systems with gender as central to tropes of the black, sexually promiscuous and irresponsible "deadbeat dad" and the black "welfare queen" who manipulates the system to extract resources well beyond her needs from the state (and therefore from white taxpayers' pockets). This framework has resulted in increasingly punitive workfare programs undergirded by what Lakoff (1996) calls the "strict father" model of morality that "presents people as naturally weak and in need of paternal protection from external threats and of strict punishment to reinforce self-discipline and self-reliance" (Reese 2005:138).

While not (always) an extension of the state, volunteerism and its recipients are subject to similar tropes. Instead of manifesting at the policy level, as it does with the welfare state, it shows its face when volunteers interact with recipients. I now turn to interviews with volunteer coordinators in post-Katrina New Orleans to examine how volunteers invest in whiteness and class privilege, and, in doing so, seek out the most "worthy" recipients of their aid. I find that who is most considered worthy is not determined solely by race, class, or gender but by the intersection of all three axes of power. This manifests in volunteers' very different expectations of "little old black ladies" and able-bodied, working age black men who receive volunteer services.

METHODS

Interviews with Volunteers, Volunteer Coordinators, and Residents

This chapter draws on interviews with Lower Ninth Ward residents (15), volunteers (31), and volunteer coordinators (25). The interview instrument included questions about how race, class, gender, sexuality, age, and religion have affected volunteer actions and experiences. Codes were developed in ATLAS.ti to extract data from the interviews such as perceptions or stories about how volunteers impact residents through their interactions and how those interactions are shaped by multiple intersecting axes of power such as race, class, and gender.

Survey of Volunteers

This chapter also draws on survey data from 176 volunteers. In addition to basic demographic data, I gathered information about respondents political and social ideologies with regard to race, class, gender, and sexuality. I borrow from Aosved, Long, and Voller's (2009) Intolerant Schema Measure, from which I draw items derived from the Modified Economic Beliefs Scale (MEBS) and the Modern and Old-Fashioned Racism Scale (MOFRS). I also draw several items from the Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) that specifically measure attitudes toward racial privilege, institutional discrimination, and blatant racial attitudes (Neville et al. 2000). Further I borrow items from the 2012 General Social Survey (GSS) that measure class-based attitudes. Finally, I borrow items from Heldman and Israel-Trummel (2012) that measure how volunteers perspectives of race, class, and gender shifted based on their experiences as volunteers.

FINDINGS

Good People Doing Good Work

As discussed in the introduction, volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans tend to be disproportionately young, white, socioeconomically privileged, liberal, and altruistic relative to the general population, and they also appear to hold progressive attitudes with regard to race, class, gender, and sexuality. Further, the majority of respondents report that wanting to help victims of social injustice was very important (55 percent) or somewhat important (24 percent) in their decision to volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans (see Table 6a). In short, these disproportionately young, white, and privileged volunteers likely had the best of conscious intentions when coming to New Orleans to help largely black and socioeconomically disadvantaged black Katrina survivors. Yet intentions and actions are not the same, as actions can reflect unconscious attitudes.

Moving from attitudes to actions, interview participants who were residents, volunteers, and volunteer coordinators generally reported that volunteers played an important role in helping many people in post-Katrina New Orleans return to their homes after their houses had been devastated by the flooding. The typical survey respondent volunteered over the course of two years, returned more than once, spent one week at a time in New Orleans, worked 8 per day, and contributed in four different ways, which most often included gutting flooded homes (58 percent), low skilled construction (80 percent), neighborhood cleanup (53 percent), and giving money to a volunteer

organization (45 percent) (see Table 3a and Table 3b). These contributions were acknowledged by residents of the Lower Ninth Ward.

Local black volunteer coordinators and residents reported almost exclusively positive volunteer impacts. While volunteers served, and continue to serve, neighborhood across the city, the epicenter for volunteerism in post-Katrina New Orleans is the Lower Ninth Ward, where 96 percent of residents are black (GNOCDC 2012). Tony, a Lower Ninth Ward resident and black man in his mid-twenties, says that:

> I always see the volunteers fixing houses, cutting grass, painting, and they're not getting paid…They was sensitive…They cared. They wanted to hear stories…They took the time out to listen…I think they gave people hope. They make people want to come back home… They're good people to be around…I don't think [race] played a role at all because, at the end of the day, they're still people. I'm not racist, so, me, personally, I think there should be more volunteers because they're doing so good.

Geraldine, a Lower Ninth Ward resident and black woman in her mid-fifties, similarly asserts that:

> The presence of volunteers helped a lot of people down here. They really did 'cause the people didn't have money…They be glad to talk to you and you'll be glad to talk to them…You on spring break, you on vacation, and you could be enjoying yourself but yet, you want to come and do hard labor…They are not getting paid, and they was okay with it…The people are so glad to be helped and blessed. And whether its black, white, Japanese, or whatever, these people are just coming in here and showing them love and helping them out. They are not even looking at skin color.

These reports of exclusively positive and colorblind interactions between beneficiaries and volunteers are similar to Phillips' findings in her study of Mennonite Disaster Services following Hurricane Katrina (2014).

On the other hand, interview participants from places other than New Orleans were more mixed in their evaluation of volunteer-resident interactions. Leslie, a volunteer and multiracial woman in her early twenties, asserts that:

> You can just sense the hostility and almost resentment for [volunteers] being here…We have had very little interaction with the neighbors around here… It's definitely because of race… because some people obviously do have an issue with white kids coming into their neighborhood occupying space.

Sarah, a twenty-something black woman and transplant to New Orleans, provides a bit more detail:

> I don't know if you talked to anyone yet who's from here about volunteerism here, but a lot of people have a lot of resentment towards the idea…that that whole idealing of these people is problematic for them and for me as well cause I came in and start[ed] working with a lot of people who are from here, so I have a lot of their bitterness…And like I heard it a lot from my homeowners who were like, 'Wow, it's really nice to see a brown face, cause like, you look like me and so I know you not gonna give me a bunch of the bullshit that these other people are giving me.'

Miranda, a volunteer coordinator and white woman in her mid-twenties, put it bluntly,

> The residents were pretty nice about it, but the volunteers were assholes sometimes.

In this section, I will explore the ways in which volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans reproduced race, class, and gender inequality through interactions with residents and communities. I find that volunteers do so through insensitivity towards recipients and

communities with regard to disaster trauma and cultural differences, poor quality of labor due to assumptions about "free" services, condescension and judgment of recipients' decisions, identification of recipients as (un)worthy of services, and punishment of recipients deemed unworthy. I discuss each of these themes in turn.

Insensitivity to Disaster Trauma and Cultural Difference

On the worksite, volunteers sometimes showed a lack of sensitivity to the trauma of losing one's home and possessions to disaster. Hilary, a white woman in her late-thirties and part time New Orleans transplant, recalls:

> A number of volunteers I witnessed going through and throwing out residents' belongings [while gutting], not understanding…kind of treating it like a game and singing and romping around and that sort of thing, not realizing they're weeding through the devastation of the life of the person who's right next to them.

After the trauma of disaster that destroyed property and lives, Hilary shows that volunteers not only were insensitive to such experiences but, in a sense, reproduced them. For volunteers whose job it is to remove everything from a flooded house that has likely been sitting for some period of time (generally months or years), it is understandable that most everything would look like debris or trash to be taken out quickly with minimal care. For the homeowner, however, such devaluation of their possessions, symbolic of their lives, is like reopening and pouring salt into the wound.

In the context of black and socioeconomically disadvantaged neighborhoods that recently experienced racialized and class-based trauma, volunteers' insensitivity to

disaster trauma was combined with uninterrogated class and race privilege. This manifested in both seemingly small and large ways. Sarah recalls that:

> So much of peoples' self-respect was taken away because they had to ask for help. And, like, in America asking for help and charity has a horrible stigma. So the fact that you had to ask all these little white kids for help, like, is already a problem. And then they disrespect you by calling you by your name…It's things as simple as saying, like, 'yes sir' and 'yes ma'am.' You know, people didn't do that. And then people felt like they were being treated like shit because they weren't being respected, like, and respect is huge.

In this quote, Sarah suggests that residents were well aware that receiving services from white volunteers placed them in a lower social position and symbolically reinforced existing race and class inequality. And as Phillips (2014) notes, manners are of high importance to residents in the South.

As my survey findings reveal, most respondents (61 percent) had never been to New Orleans prior to volunteering after Hurricane Katrina, while 23 percent had been there for vacation. They largely came from states in the Midwest (39 percent) and West (34 percent), while 14 percent came from the South (4 percent from Louisiana) and 12 percent came from the Northeast. While nonlocal volunteers likely were unaware that they were doing so, Sarah highlights that their violation of cultural norms sometimes translated into disrespect, which may have exacerbated the denigration or status difference already felt by Katrina survivors that received services through charitable volunteerism.

Like Phillips (2014), I find that post-Katrina volunteerism provided an opportunity for intercultural exchange and reciprocity between largely nonlocal white

volunteers and Southern black residents. However, I also find that these exchanges were shaped by power dynamics that sometimes manifested as white volunteers' expectations of gratitude from those they helped and/or cultural insensitivity. When asked about the role of race and class in her volunteer experience, Paula, a white female survey respondent in her forties, notes that she "was very impressed with the gratitude of the local neighbors." This response was not the only time gratitude came up as a response to a question about race and class. This pattern reflects Du Bois' (1920) assertion that white people who help black people often expect them to be jubilant and thankful for their service.

However, giving thanks can also provide a sense of agency for black beneficiaries. This often took the form of cooking or purchasing traditional Southern foods for volunteers to eat. Despite some concern from volunteer coordinators that the residents may not have been in an economic position to afford the expense, this was generally reported as an unproblematic and positive exchange between volunteers and residents. Hilary, however, notes that:

> One volunteer did go up to a resident when he offered her crawfish. She told him it was smelly in a really kind of nasty way…It was probably more racial or sub-cultural but…saying something like, "that food stinks" reflects a class based sentiment where you're not used to being hungry and so you're more discriminating about your food than you might otherwise be.

In this case, Hilary identifies the interaction of cultural difference with intersecting race and class privilege as a central dynamic in this volunteer's rejection of a staple of local cuisine offered by the homeowner. Further, this rejection likely reinforces class and race-

based difference (and hierarchy) that undermines any sense of reciprocity between the volunteer and service recipient.

While some participants were more liberal or radical in their ideologies or cultural self-representation, they were not always sensitive to their impacts on residents. Dan, a volunteer coordinator and white man in his mid-thirties, recalls that:

> Everything I did was at the request of residents, you know. Like, 'Hey, stop squatting in these houses,' you know. 'Stop shitting in buckets in that lady's house. Stop signing contracts and saying [our organization] is going to fix this shit when we don't have the resources to [do so]…Stop having drum circles in the backyard because all the elderly people around you were offended and they're trying to sleep,' you know. [Referring to men or transgender individuals] 'Please stop wearing dresses in the church. It's really offending the church leaders'…It was all this effort to use the labor of outside volunteers to help local residents, while keeping the local residents from being utterly offended and pissed at the outside volunteers.

On the one hand, Dan highlights the internal contradictions that sometimes occurred within volunteers as they enacted privilege despite their ideological orientation. On the other hand, the last complaint named in the above quote underscores the intersection of multiple competing axes of oppression and privilege. As it does with U.S. society broadly, genderbending may violate the heteronormative and homophobic norms of a relatively traditional community of color. However, this is too broad a brush to fully describe black New Orleanians. Mac, a white woman in her early twenties and New Orleans transplant, notes that:

> Some local residents are older and a little more traditional [and] conservative. You would think they might have issues with women doing things or GLBT volunteers, but there's been some funny instances of an old homeowner

> talking to one of my best friends who's gay and just talking about boys with him. They kind of have to say 'Oh that's okay,' but it's not an issue.

These contradictions underscore the heterogeneity of experiences within post-Katrina volunteerism for both volunteers and residents.

Poor Volunteer Labor and Condescension Toward Residents

Beyond insensitivities, volunteers "did" difference in ways that had material consequences for service recipients. For instance, volunteer labor was at times subpar. Sarah recalls that:

> So many people got shafted after the storm…The building supervisor, who actually knew what he was doing, would often get pissed off because he would come back behind people and realize that it wasn't done well…You have a bunch of like college students who could write a really good paper, but, like, they don't know how to build things.

One of the aspects of low quality volunteer labor is certainly a lack of skills and knowledge for the task at hand. However, a number of volunteer coordinators were convinced that ignorance was not the only factor at play. For instance, Manny, a twenty-something Latino man and New Orleans transplant, notes that:

> There was sometimes shitty work that was done that was like, 'Well you know you're getting a house apparently. What's the matter if it's a little sloppy?'

In this case, Manny goes beyond ignorance and asserts that the quality of work volunteers assumed was appropriate for those they served reflected the devaluation of recipients. What Manny describes is reminiscent of an infamous quote from the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina:

> Commenting on facilities that had been set up for the poor in the Houston Astrodome in Texas, [President George W.] Bush's mother and the wife of former President George H.W. Bush said in a National Public Radio interview, 'So many of the people here, you know, were underprivileged anyway, so this is working very well for them.' (Giroux 2006:176)

Beyond the logic that "free" labor need not be of high quality, I would argue that this is a moment in which volunteers "do" race and class difference. If volunteers perceive recipients as living in poverty, then they may assume, consciously or unconsciously, that poor black people are used to a low quality of living and therefore will not mind or notice if their labor is below the standard they would expect in their own homes.

Volunteers sometimes assumed the role of expert in host communities, which volunteer tourism scholars have voiced concern about previously (Guttentag 2009; McGehee 2012). While many organizations espouse that they are resident driven, volunteer coordinators suggest that this fails to negate such mindsets in actual volunteers. Danielle, a volunteer coordinator and twenty-something white woman, recalls that:

> Volunteers would get into fighting matches with residents about what to throw out. And it made me fucking nuts because they are like, 'This pillow is moldy. You are not going to be able to wash it.' And the resident's like, 'I want to keep it.' And they are like, 'No it's moldy. It will make you sick.' And it goes on like this forever. And it turns out that the resident's great-grandmother hand-stitched that pillow, and she was going to keep it in a plastic bag for the rest of her life if she had to because it was so important to the family.

While the volunteers in this quote likely see themselves as well-meaning, their actions suggest that they do not perceive service recipients as adults capable of making their own decisions. Though the volunteer is likely unaware of what they are doing, they are

investing in whiteness by asserting their superior social position by making decisions on behalf of recipients they treat as relatively inept.

In some cases, volunteers might have legitimate critiques of decisions made by service recipients, but would overlook the systemic constraints recipients faced in making those decisions. For instance, Manny notes that:

> People would come down here and just be like, 'This woman just uses all Styrofoam.' I'm like, 'Do you know that Styrofoam costs like six tenths of a cent per plate and your eco-friendly stuff costs two cents a plate?' Like you're gonna tell this old lady who's feeding you to pay four times as much for supplies. You know, I'm not saying that she shouldn't pay that because it should be recyclable. But I'm not gonna ask that…I think that those sensitivities that I have and other people have come from first making those mistakes coming down here and deciding that we, you know, we knew better, which is a local versus not-locals thing...The arguments were not wrong, they were just insensitive.

Manny highlights how volunteers imposed their white, middle-class values upon black working-class recipients without interrogating how socioeconomic status might constrain or shape certain decisions. Residents may or may not be aware of the environmental impacts of purchasing Styrofoam, but economic limitations may trump those concerns. Further, this reflects volunteers' uninterrogated class privilege, which causes them to assume that everyone has the economic freedom to purchase more expensive environmentally friendly products. This amounts to blaming the victim in the face of structural causes, very much like blaming the poor for their disproportionate consumption of fast foods (Freeman 2007).

While Activists (see Chapter 2 on volunteer types) are more likely to be reflexive with regard to their privilege(s), this does not mean that they never engage in acts of privilege. For instance, Hilary recalls that:

> I saw a lot of outside, privileged, white, mostly male activists speaking on behalf of the community… as though the community has one voice and as though they know what that voice is.

While these Activists organized and engaged in contentious collective action on behalf of residents, Hilary highlights their enactment of white male privilege. While it is possible that these individuals saw themselves as strategically using privilege to leverage benefits for others, Hillary suggests that they are instead symbolically homogenizing them and patronizingly standing in for them without consent. This finding is consistent with Robnett's (1997) study of civil rights activism that suggests that men are often the spokespeople for social movements. The (over)valuing of white and/or male voices is not random but fits within a historical trend of centering white men as actors and bearers of knowledge (Collins 1990; Haraway 1988; Harding 1993; Hartsock 1983; Smith 1974, 1990).

Judgment and Punishment of Service Recipients as the (Un)Worthy Poor

Shaped by multiple intersecting axes of power, volunteers' interactions with residents reflected tropes of the (un)worthy poor. Mary, a volunteer coordinator and white woman in her mid-twenties, notes that:

> I do know from my work with neighborhood leaders that there is often a certain kind of feel of, 'What are those young white kids doing in my neighborhood? Why do they

> want to talk to me? Or why would they think that I'm the face of the disaster?'

In this quote, Mary cites black residents trying to make sense of their experience of commodification by outside white volunteers. While well meaning, volunteers can be seen as tourists and voyeurs not only in the city of New Orleans but also in the lives of those disaster victims they wish to help. The trope of the benevolent white suggests that white volunteers may be looking to help those poor and incapable black people that they perceive as worthy of their charity. Danielle notes that:

> With white volunteer groups that I worked with, I saw crazy shit like whites who were really disappointed that they weren't working for a black person. They were like, "Please at least tell me they are poor."…They half wanted to work in black neighborhoods but half were worried about crime but wouldn't say it…When a group of white volunteers were working for a white family there was [an] underlying phenomenon of like, 'Oh my god should we work this hard for that family.' Like, 'the photo ops aren't as good blah blah blah.'… I felt like I had to justify to volunteers why they were working on a middle class…or what appeared to be a middle class house even if the owner is like saddled with debt and/or had a disability and/or had like dehabilitating traumatizing experiences. Whatever I had to justify that the work was worth it.

Danielle highlights the commodification of poor black people on the part of white volunteers in order to maximize the volunteer credibility. It isn't enough that service recipients requested aid because volunteers have not signed up to help just anyone but seek to maximize others' perception of them (via "photo ops") as not just helping those in need but those most marginalized (i.e., poor and black). Several examples highlight how race, class, and gender (along with other social dimensions) intersect to shape many

volunteers' notions of who is deserving of their services. When asked about why volunteers came to New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina, Manny asserts that:

> I think a lot of white folks who [came] got a lot of white guilt about coming down to help poor little old black ladies. I really do. And I don't think they talk about it.

Manny's identification of the "little old black lady" as the ideal worthy recipient of volunteer labor highlights the intersection not only of race and class but of gender and age. Not only does this trope rely on the recipient being poor and black but further renders them in need of assistance because they are old and a woman, both categories rendering them incapable not by choice but by ascription and therefore worthy in the imagination of the volunteer.

In contrast to the "little old black lady," younger recipients, and black men in particular, who did not fit the mold of the worthy poor were held accountable to their perceived deviance. These service recipients violated volunteers' expectation that seemingly able-bodied individuals should be self-sufficient or capable of working to help themselves. Stephen, a volunteer coordinator and white man in his late twenties, recalls that:

> People would say things that were either insensitive or potentially racially charged about whether local people were hard working or why they couldn't just work and volunteer like some of us were doing. In other words, not being totally aware of the differing levels of privilege and access to resources that allowed people to volunteer, versus needing to be paid for work that they did.

When asked about instances of conflict, tension, or insensitivity regarding race, Manny recalls that:

> There were instances all the time like that. Like some guy who was smoking weed in his FEMA trailer to kind of escape the world. And then he would go down and DJ every night and make enough money to support his mom and pay her medical bills. And volunteers were all very judgey about that…Y'all go out drinking, so what's the big deal? Oh, it's because he's black and he has weed, but you're a college student and you go smoke weed, but it's not a problem. But there was judgment made on those kinds of things like, 'That guy should be out here helping us paint the house.'

Most survey respondents and volunteer interview participants do not openly espouse this position, likely because they don't want to be perceived as racist or classist even if they agree with it. However, Torrey, a white female survey respondent (age unavailable), states:

> It wasn't about race because every family we helped was African American and that was irrelevant. There were those that appreciated what we did and helped and there were those that sat and watched us work like it was 'owed' to them.

Undergirding these volunteers' judgments is the trope of the black man as irresponsible and lazy, similar to that of the "deadbeat dad" (Reese 2005). Because his employment does not fit within the typical middle-class perception of work as 9:00am to 5:00pm, volunteers find it easy to condemn this black man who chooses to rest during his off hours instead of assisting volunteers with the work they signed up to do. To drive this point home, I find it difficult to imagine volunteers criticizing someone for not working with them late at night when they had work in the morning. Further, the double standard between a service recipient's and volunteer's use of drugs or alcohol highlights the assumption that privileged people should have the freedom to use recreational drugs

without recourse, but service recipients are rendered unworthy when engaging in similar behavior. This mindset parallels that of punitive welfare programs and conservative beliefs that welfare recipients should be drug tested in order to receive benefits.

Despite the "little old black lady" trope, volunteers may perceive service recipients through the lens of the manipulative "welfare queen" trope, which may encourage volunteers to punish service recipients for their perceived deception. Val, a volunteer coordinator and white woman in her early twenties, recalls that:

> My friend's boss… made a homeowner cry because he thought she was scamming them. She wanted two separate units… and she really just wanted it… for practical reasons. But he just assumed, right off the bat, that she was trying to pull one over. She was trying to rent out her house or something… because she's elderly and needed a source of income. Just that kind of like immediate assumption of… greed or guilt, which I don't think is fair.

While the homeowner in the above quotation fits the trope of the "little old black lady," even she is not given the benefit of the doubt when it appears to the volunteer coordinator that she is attempting to extract resources beyond her baseline needs from volunteer aid. The volunteer coordinator's assumption that this service recipient is attempting to "scam" volunteers reflects the trope of the manipulative "welfare queen" who works the system in order to extract lavish resources from the welfare state. While I do not mean to romanticize service recipients as always noble and incapable of deception as a survival technique given disaster trauma, racial discrimination, and limited economic opportunities, I do mean to highlight that this volunteer coordinator's underlying assumptions are not happenstance but a product of larger social narratives of poor blacks (and in this case, poor black women in particular).

When perceived through such a lens, volunteers may go beyond their assumptions and punish service recipients for their perceived deceit. Mike, a volunteer coordinator and middle-aged white man, recalls that:

> We had this poor woman who had her house, and we were over there gutting it, and [her] son came over… and then the daughter showed up…and obviously the children were of means… One of the volunteers said something like, 'Why in the hell aren't they over here doing this for their mother?'… So the younger volunteers… left the refrigerator with the duct tape all around it in the middle of the living room and left.

While the mother in this situation seems to fit the trope of the worthy "poor little black lady," her children's class presentation (not necessarily indicative of their actual resources) indicates to these volunteers that they are dishonestly extracting unneeded aid, very much like perceptions of the "welfare queen" who manipulates the system to extract resources from the state (Reese 2005). There is an assumption that family members are responsible for each other, that they should do for each other first before non-family members are brought in. In the minds of these volunteers, their lack of participation renders them lazy and irresponsible and therefore unworthy. Further, these volunteers take it upon themselves to punish those they perceive as deviant, drawing parallels to punitive welfare reforms and the "strict father" model of morality (Lakoff 1996). To understand the extent of this slight, it is necessary to consider that this refrigerator was likely stocked before the storm and its contents had been left to stew in the New Orleans heat for months on end. The removal of such a refrigerator requires duct taping it shut and hoping it doesn't open while being moved, which is always a possibility given its size and weight. Having had such a refrigerator open while moving it, I can say that it

was one of the more viscerally unpleasant events I have ever experienced. Further, this story perhaps represents a shift in these volunteers towards a more conservative and patronizing ideology in which they look down upon the service recipients as drains on society, rendering the volunteers unwilling to continue service work.

In these ways, volunteers define who is worthy of their sympathies based on preconceived criteria rooted in interlocking systems of race, class, gender, age and religiosity along with the ideology of family responsibility. The "little old black lady" epitomizes those perceived as most worthy of aid. Variation along several dimensions, however, causes recipients to be perceived as unworthy. White people, those perceived as not poor enough, and able-bodied black men do not fit volunteers' expectations for recipients. At the extreme, volunteers even enact punishment upon those they perceive as manipulating the system unfairly to their benefit. While the above examples might be dismissed as individual insensitivities, their embeddedness in broader contexts permeated by interlocking systems of power warrants their analysis as such.

CONCLUSION

While the motivations to volunteer and the impacts of participation on the volunteer have been heavily explored, the impacts of volunteers on recipients remain understudied. In the context of post-Katrina New Orleans, the overwhelming whiteness of socioeconomically privileged nonlocal volunteers and the blackness of socioeconomically disadvantaged local service recipients provides an opportunity to explore the raced, classed, and gendered nature of disaster volunteerism and volunteerism

more broadly. In short, I find these volunteers to be a doubled-edged sword. They hold more altruistic attitudes than the general population, hold progressive views regarding race, class, gender, and sexuality, and contributed substantial amounts of free labor to help rebuild the city. Further, I find that black Lower Ninth Ward residents and black volunteer coordinators from New Orleans report universally positive volunteer impacts on beneficiaries. This finding is consistent with other scholars, such as Phillips (2014), who, like myself, do not belong to the social location of beneficiaries.

However, Lower Ninth Ward residents who had mixed or negative experiences with volunteers may have chosen not to speak with me in the first place. Further, scholars of color have decried the warped findings produced by white researchers in communities of color due to their outside status, though they largely focus on the prejudices scholars import into their analysis. This is certainly a primary concern in this study, and as a socioeconomically advantaged white male who is also a student of race, class, and gender inequality, I seek to be reflexive regarding my privileges and prejudices. I can in no way claim insider knowledge along several axes: race, class, and New Orleans culture or nativity. The social power dynamic of an "outside" white man asking local black people to critically assess primarily white volunteers may also inhibit honest responses. While I endeavored to produce a rapport with interview participants, our interactions are undoubtedly shaped by lifetimes of racial experience. Given the oppression of people of color in the United States generally as well as the particular racialized violence experienced by black people in New Orleans following Katrina, a distrust of white people

generally, or at least an unwillingness voice a critical race perspective to a white person, seems a perfectly reasonable response.

An intersectional theoretical framework then highlights how class, gender, and age differences among service recipients shape the perceptions and therefore actions of volunteers. In this chapter, I find that volunteers reproduce intersecting race and class inequalities through insensitivity towards recipients and communities with regard to disaster trauma and cultural differences as well as poor quality of labor due to assumptions about "free" services. Further, I find that volunteers judge recipients as (un)worthy of services based primarily on their perceived class, gender, and age categories. The "little old black lady" is deemed most worthy (and is therefore the most desirable) recipient for volunteers, which contrasts with the young, purportedly able-bodied black man. In extreme cases, service recipients who violate volunteers' expectations of worthy service recipients are punished by volunteers who perceive them as manipulating the system for services of which they are not truly in need.

While extending existing concepts from the race, class, and gender inequality literature(s) to the context of volunteerism, these findings primarily have implications for the scholarship on volunteerism. I seek to fill the gap in the literature highlighted by Phillips (2014:27) with regard to *"*the intangible effects that volunteers have on beneficiaries" and, more specifically, what Luft (2008:24) describes as "the deleterious consequences of assistance that *has* been received." While volunteerism certainly can and does have positive impacts on service recipients, researchers need to take more seriously the potentially deleterious and degrading potential of charitable volunteerism. Some

previous arguments focus on how charity allows society to overlook needed structural reforms. Poppendieck (1999) argues that charitably-oriented altruism not only ignores structural social problems, but acts as a "moral safety valve…relieving the discomfort of the privileged and thus the pressure for more fundamental action" (p. 9). This overlaps with critiques of the nonprofit industrial complex as providing a stopgap of services that mitigates against upheaval by transforming potential activists into passive service recipients (Luft 2008).

Further, Poppendieck (1999) defines charity as "a gift, offered with condescension and accepted in desperation that is necessitated by incapacity and failure" (p. 231). With charity, a social distance is maintained between the giver and receiver. Charity work is performed by volunteers who have "*sympathy* with the suffering of others who are deemed worthy of one's support" (Reitan 2007:51). While little systematic evidence has been collected, some scholars have asserted that community-based learning and volunteer tourism create environments that reproduce race, class, and national inequality both in the minds' of volunteers and through their interactions with service recipients and host communities (Endres and Gould 2009; Guttentag 2009; Heldman 2011; McGehee 2012).

This chapter provides systematic evidence that raced, classed, and gendered microaggressions are enacted by volunteers through interactions with recipients. Further, I examine the way underlying assumptions of race, class, age, and gender lead to subpar material outcomes of volunteer labor as well as punitive actions on the part of volunteers who deem recipients unworthy of the services they receive. In this case, volunteers

idealize the poor "little old black lady" as a service recipient while demonizing the perceived laziness and manipulation of younger, able-bodied black men and middle-class blacks. While the negative impacts of volunteers has been theorized based largely on personal experience and anecdotes, this chapter provides systematic empirical evidence that compels scholars to take seriously that volunteer labor is very much a double-edged sword for service recipients if they do not "do difference" within a very narrow set of criteria based on raced, classed, aged and gendered stereotypes that volunteers perceive as worthy of their labor (Fenstermaker and West 2002). In this way, volunteers can exacerbate existing traumas or produce new traumas for those already dealing with adversity, whether caused by a disaster, systemic inequality, or some combination of the two. Viewed through this lens, volunteerism may be seen as a face of the larger racial project of the "altruistic White" and the possessive investment in whiteness because of the ways it reproduces existing race and class inequalities (Du Bois 1920; Bonilla-Silva 2010; Lipsitz 2006; Omi and Winant 1994:56; Warren and Hytten 2004). It is unlikely that volunteers perceive their own work in this way, but the stories provided by volunteer coordinators bring into greater focus the less palatable aspects of volunteerism.

These finding also have implications for volunteer-based organizations. As has been called for, and implemented by, some activists and scholars, organizations that wish to mitigate the negative impacts of volunteers on service recipients should provide educational trainings for volunteers. Such trainings should focus on the systemic causes of social inequalities to minimize victim blaming and punishment. Volunteers should also be sensitized to the precariousness of middle class families of color, who may be too busy

with employment obligations to carry out the work themselves or may lack the disposable income to hire others to do it. Such individuals or families may not appear to volunteers to be "worthy" of their labor on the surface but who may be a disaster, natural or not, away from losing their hard fought gains. On the other hand, such sensitization is a great deal to ask of volunteer-based organizations. Volunteers' insensitivity reflects larger social narratives that shape our (particularly white people's) perceptions of race, class, and gender. Of course, preventative consciousness-raising around intersecting relations of domination and oppression is needed at a scope much broader than volunteerism to be truly effective.

Chapter 4

"I Had One Volunteer Explain How to Use a Ruler": Sex-Based Discrimination on Volunteer Worksites

> Men would always assume that they knew more than you (though they rarely did), hogged all the tools, insisted on helping you or took over what you were doing. You had to constantly prove yourself to show you could do the work and it felt like you were always under observation.
>
> -*Kate, volunteer and white woman in her late twenties*

This chapter focuses on gendered volunteer work experiences. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016), 62.6 million people volunteer annually, 58 percent of whom are women. Women who volunteer are most likely to collect, prepare, distribute, or serve food (13 percent). In contrast, the most popular form of volunteerism for men is general labor[1], which women engage in at half the rate (6 percent) and so make up 41 percent of general labor volunteers. It follows that approximately 2.2 million women engage in this masculine form of volunteerism each year.

Gender has always been an issue in volunteer research because of the historical association of volunteer work with women, especially those belonging to the middle and

1 The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics differentiates the category "engaging in general labor, supply transportation to people" from the following other categories of volunteer labor: coaching, referring or supervising sports teams; tutoring or teaching; mentoring youth; being an usher, greeter, or minister; collecting, preparing, distributing, or serving food; collecting, making or distributing clothing, crafts or goods other than food; providing counseling, medical care, fire/EMS/protective services; providing general office services; provide professional or management assistance, including serving on a board or committee; and "other" forms of volunteerism.

upper classes. Researchers have looked at the role gender plays in the market for volunteer labor – who volunteers, what they volunteer for, and the kinds of tasks they are assigned. Does volunteer work also reinforce existing gender inequalities and stereotypes? To date, existing literature on volunteer experiences has largely neglected this question. In the context of volunteer-based disaster recovery efforts in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina, I address gendered participation in volunteerism, the gendered division of labor, women's experiences with learning masculine construction skills, and women's experiences of sex-based harassment. An intersectional lens highlights that these volunteers, both men and women, are largely white and socioeconomically advantaged.

Sex-based harassment, commonly but misleadingly referred to as sexual harassment, has been defined in many ways (Welsh 1999). The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) asserts that "it is unlawful to harass a person…because of a person's sex," which includes both sexual forms (e.g. "unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical harassment of a sexual nature") and nonsexual forms of harassment (e.g., "making offensive comments about women in general") and may be targeted at an individual or produce a "hostile environment" (U.S. EEOC 2016). In this paper, I follow the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ), which breaks down sex-based harassment in three ways: unwanted sexual attention, sexual coercion, and gender harassment (Leskinen and Cortina 2013). Unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion are referred to as "sex-advance" harassment and capture what most people understand to be sexual harassment. On the other hand, gender

harassment refers to "a broad range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors not aimed at sexual cooperation but that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about women" (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, and Drasgow 1995:430).

Nearly five decades of research on the paid workforce have established that sex-based harassment is common (MacKinnon 1979; Sojo, Wood, and Genat 2016). Uneven measurement and sampling methods cause reported rates to vary widely, but a meta-analysis that includes 55 probability samples containing a total of more than 86,000 respondents suggests that, on average, 58 percent of U.S. women experience sex-based harassment at work over the course of their career (Ilies et al. 2003). While instances of gender harassment may have less impact than instances of sex-advance harassment (i.e., sexual coercion and unwanted sexual attention), gender harassment does comparable harm to well-being due to its greater frequency (Sojo et al. 2016). Informal work environments in masculine fields have particularly negative outcomes for women (Ridgeway 2009).

My study is the first to systematically address "doing gender" in volunteer labor. I employ a mixed methods approach using both interviews with volunteer coordinators and a survey of volunteers. Comparable to women in the paid workforce, I find that 62 percent of women report experiences of sex-based harassment. What makes this finding so striking is that a significantly higher percentage of men, most of whom are white, are liberal and altruistic than men in the general population. While men in the construction trades engage in the sexualization of, and gendered homophobia towards, tradeswomen, men who volunteer tend to engage in benevolent sexism. Glick and Fiske (2001) define

benevolent sexism as a subjectively favorable, chivalrous ideology that offers protection and affection to women who embrace conventional roles. Before discussing my findings, I first put them into context of relevant scholarly literature and then discuss my data and methods. Four different literatures inform this chapter, starting with research on the prevalence of sex-based harassment in the workplace and its relationship to masculinities, gender and volunteerism, and disaster recovery.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Frameworks: Ethnomethodology, Doing Gender, and Intersectionality

Gender is a situated accomplishment because we repeatedly do gender in social interactions in which we are assessed by others and held accountable for "doing gender" properly. West and Zimmerman (1987) emphasize how we learn to maneuver the already gendered interactional infrastructure as ethnomethodological practitioners. Individuals restrict how they do gender to display social competence at a very early age, which then masquerades as and reinforces myths of natural sex differences. Yet, biological studies suggest that female and male bodied individuals are on average much more alike than different, and that there is greater physical variation within the categories female and male than across them (Fausto-Sterling 2000).

Sex differences are re/produced and even celebrated in institutionalized social interactions (e.g. paid work, homemaking, parenting, sports etc.) such that "gender stratification becomes at once both an individual and institutional practice" (Fenstermaker, West, and Zimmerman 2009:26). While West and Zimmerman (1987)

perhaps do not focus on the meso and macro dynamics of gender, it is readily compatible with scholarship that better theorizes how the institutionalization of gender perpetuates gender inequality (Fenstermaker et al. 2009; Lucal 1999). Doing gender emphasizes the ways in which the micro and macro interact to re/produce gender.

Gender also intersects with other axes of power, such as race, class, sexuality, and age. As is laid out in a previous chapter on the impacts of volunteers on beneficiaries, intersectionality highlights constellations of social identities. As Luft (2008, 2009) notes, volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans are largely white and socioeconomically privileged. Given the underrepresentation of volunteers of color in post-Katrina New Orleans, an analysis of the distinct experiences of women and men of color who volunteered is beyond the scope of this chapter and begs for future study. Therefore, this chapter is largely an analysis of white gendered practices.

Sex-Based Harassment and Masculinities

Organizational hierarchies are maintained by inequality regimes: "loosely interrelated practices, processes, actions, and meanings that result in and maintain class, gender, and racial inequalities within particular organizations" (Acker 2006:443). Women are disadvantaged through inequality regimes, with poor women, women of color, and queer women even more so. At the interactional level, inequality regimes manifest as "doing gender" at work, often enacted as sex-based harassment (Fenstermaker and West 2002; Martin 2003). Sex-based harassment is widespread, underreported, and often unrecognized (Welsh 1999). While the Sexual Experiences

Questionnaire (SEQ) breaks down sex-based harassment into unwanted sexual attention, sexual coercion, and gender harassment, the Gender Experiences Questionnaire (GEQ) further breaks gender harassment into the subdimensions of sexist remarks, sexually crude/offensive behavior, work/family "policing," gender "policing," and infantilization (Leskinen and Cortina 2013). A corollary of the infantalization dimension of gender harassment is "mansplaining," a combination of the words "man" and "explaining" that refers to "a man explaining something from the position of power as a man, to a woman in a condescending manner" (Kurzdorfer 2012:102).

Sex-based harassment may present as hostile or benevolent sexism. While hostile sexism triggers women to push back, benevolent sexism is not always perceived as prejudice (Barreto and Ellemers 2005; Becker and Wright 2011; Kilianski and Rudman 1998). However, benevolent sexism causes mental intrusions about women's sense of competence and therefore impairs task performance (Dardenne, Dumont, and Bollier 2007; Dumont, Sarlet, and Dardenne 2008; Vescio et al. 2005). This form of "protection" also limits women's access to challenges and therefore leadership opportunities (King et al. 2012). Women who do achieve leadership positions are even more likely to be harassed and experience heightened scrutiny (Kanter 1993; McLaughlin, Uggen, and Blackstone 2012).

Sex-based harassment is strongly correlated with heterosexist harassment, which refers to "insensitive verbal and symbolic…behaviors that convey animosity toward nonheterosexuality" (Silverschanz et al. 2007:180). Many LGBQ employees (25–66 percent) experience heterosexist harassment, and heterosexual individuals are often

targeted as well (Rabelo and Cortina 2014). Konik and Cortina (2008) assert that "gender harassment and heterosexist harassment are linked at a fundamental level, both serving to punish deviation from traditional patriarchal gender norms."

Sex-based harassment and heterosexist harassment are enactments of masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity, relationally constructed as the rejection of the feminine, varies historically and contextually (Bederman 1995; Connell 2005; Kimmel 2005). Contemporary hegemonic masculinity is intertwined not only with heterosexuality but with class privilege, whiteness, and other forms of privilege (Collins 1990; Feliciano, Robnett, and Komaie 2009; hooks 2000; Min and Kim 2009; Pyke 1996; Ramirez and Flores 2013).

Connell (2005), however, argues that most men perform complicit masculinity, what Heath (2003) calls "soft-boiled" masculinity, which strikes a compromise between hegemonic masculinity and the pragmatism of everyday life. Men who perform complicit masculinity "realize the patriarchal dividend, without the tensions or risks of being the frontline troops of patriarchy…Marriage, fatherhood and community life often involve extensive compromises with women rather than naked domination or an uncontested display of authority" (Connell 2005:79). Heath (2003) argues that this introduces a less easily targeted version of patriarchy that enables "good men" to maintain power.

Gender and Volunteerism

Volunteerism has long been associated with white upper-class femininity, but women in North America actually volunteer at only slightly higher rates than men

(Jenner 1982; Rotolo and Wilson 2007; Wilson 2000). Gender is one of numerous factors that predict volunteer participation, such as paid employment, parental status, age, race, and religiosity (Mattis et al. 2000; Mesch et al. 2006; Taniguchi 2006; Tiehen 2000; Van Slyke and Eschholz 2002a, 2002b; Wymer and Samu 2002). Broad generalizations overlook the importance of particularities regarding gender and volunteerism.

Similar to the paid workforce, volunteerism is shaped by inequality regimes. Voluntary organizations tend to be segregated by gender at both the organizational and job level (McPherson and Smith-Lovin 1986; Popielarz 1999). Women who volunteer tend to engage in "women's work" (e.g., collect, prepare, distribute, or serve food) in small gender-homogenous organizations oriented towards social or health services, while men tend to engage in general labor in large gender-heterogeneous organizations oriented towards economics, politics, or science (McPherson and Smith-Lovin 1982, 1986; Taniguchi 2006; Wilson 2000). Leadership positions continue to be disproportionately filled by men (Taniguchi 2006; Wilson 2000).

Gender and Activism

Participation in activism is partly determined by different expectations of men and women as political actors. While the differences are small, Schlozman, Burns, and Verba (1994) find men to be more politically active than women in general and particularly so with regard to frequency of campaigns contributions, contacting officials, and political organization membership. Reflecting a "general cultural context of assumptions of women's (a)political (non)participation…that contests their validity as collective actors"

(Beckwith 1996:1062–63), McAdam (1990) finds that women's participation in Freedom Summer was met with resistance. In short, men participate in political activity at higher rates because it is perceived as appropriately masculine, whereas women's participation is dampened by its perception as improperly feminine.

Women overcome these obstacles to political participation by largely relational means (Blee 2003; Neuhouser 1995; Stall and Stoecker 1998). While the public sphere and therefore political participation is generally accessible to men, women are more likely to be mobilized when movements use social networks to blur the private-public divide. Initial recruitment, often through personal networks, helps to diminish gendered barriers to further participation (McAdam 1990; Schlozman et al. 1994; Taylor and Rupp 1993; Whittier 2011).

Social movement organizations, even those that espouse progressive politics, are shaped by inequality regimes. Thorne (1975:179–80) notes that "men are more visible, more powerful, and they have more prestige; women, who are generally in a subordinate position, perform more routine and less visible tasks ('movement housework'), and tend to be defined by their relationship with movement males." In Freedom Summer and the Civil Rights Movement, women were disproportionately assigned to "women's work" such as secretarial work, teaching, or cooking and meal preparation while men engaged in more recognized political work such as voter registration (Blee 2003; Irons 1998; McAdam 1990; Roth 2004). Further, McAdam (1990: 1235) finds that "male volunteers and staff members [were] granted far more behavioral license and moral tolerance than their female counterparts." Sexism within movements tends to be maintained through

appeals to unity along other axes of oppression (Blee 2003; Holmila 1986; Ray and Korteweg 1999; Roth 2004). In this way, movements ask women to deprioritize their oppression as women in order to combat other systems of power. In short, the reproduction of gender hierarchy, along with its intersections with other systems of power, is commonplace within social movements across political ideologies.

Gender and Disaster Recovery

The disaster literature also speaks to the gendered nature of volunteerism in post-Katrina New Orleans. Disaster zones produce a gender performance that Luft (2008) refers to as "disaster masculinity." In her case study of an activist-oriented volunteer organization, (Luft 2008:26) finds the organization to be characterized "a culture of male heroic adventure" undergirded by physical labor (e.g., gutting) and a sense of American frontier-like danger and individualism.

Disaster recovery volunteerism shares many characteristics with the construction trades, where women make up less than 2 percent of the workforce. In their study of the building trades, (Denissen and Saguy 2014:381) argue that "women's presence in these male-dominated jobs threatens (1) notions of the work as inherently masculine and (2) a gender order that presumes the sexual subordination of women." The presence of lesbian tradeswomen also "threatens heteronormativity and men's sexual subordination of women." Tradesmen simultaneously engage in sexualization of and gendered heterosexist harassment against tradeswomen as a means of neutralizing threat and dampening tradeswomen's solidarity and collective action. Through participant observation and a

small number of interviews with volunteers in one organization, Luft (2008) finds that women who engage in disaster recovery volunteerism also experience backlash. I extend Luft's preliminary findings on this subject with a systematic analysis of volunteer experiences through interviews with volunteers and volunteer coordinators as well as a survey of volunteers across many organizations.

METHODOLOGY

I address my primary question of how gender shapes the volunteer experience through my interviews with a total of 23 volunteers and 25 volunteer coordinators as well as results from my on-line survey of 176 volunteers. In interviews with volunteers and volunteer coordinators, I asked questions about how gender shaped the interviewee's experiences volunteering as well as their perceptions of the impacts on volunteers more broadly.

Based on the SEQ/GEQ, respondents were asked "During your volunteer experience in New Orleans, how often did you experience the following behaviors by fellow volunteers or volunteer supervisors?" followed by a series of statements, each measured using a 5-point response scale from 1 (never) to 5 (many times). The SEQ breaks down sex-based harassment into three dimensions and provides subscales for each: unwanted sexual attention, sexual coercion, and gender harassment. The GEQ further specifies five subdimensions of gender harassment and provides subscales for each: sexist remarks, sexually crude/offensive behavior, infantilization, work/family policing, and gender policing. Leskinen and Cortina (2013) also provide a subscale for

heterosexist harassment. For my survey, I used the question with the highest alpha score from each subscale. Additionally, I created one measure of gender policing customized for this study ("Suggested women are ill-suited for physically challenging work sites"). I also asked an open-ended question: "How did your gender impact your experience as a volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans?"

While disaster recovery provides a rich context to explore sex-based harassment on volunteer worksites, its generalizability is limited. First, gutting is unique to flood settings, though it has similarities to activities such as debris removal following other forms of disaster. Second, construction labor is masculine and unlike many non-disaster volunteer activities, with the exception of programs like Habitat for Humanity that focus on home construction (Denissen 2010a, 2010b; Denissen and Saguy 2014). This is layered with the informality of volunteer organizations and therefore lack of formal mechanisms to handle cases of gender bias or sex-based harassment. In paid work settings, informal environments are found to be beneficial for women in weakly gendered fields but detrimental in strongly masculine fields (Ridgeway 2009). Disaster settings, which are already masculine, are also less likely to have functional external authorities to hold volunteers accountable for worksite harassment if redress was desired (Luft 2008). Although limited to a specific context, my findings are revealing. We might expect women to experience lower levels of sex-based harassment at voluntary work sites because they are occupied by "good people" doing "good work." Scholarship on voluntarism also tends to emphasize the positive impacts on those who volunteer (see

Wilson 2000 for review). However, my findings suggest that we cannot take these assumptions for granted.

FINDINGS

More women volunteered in New Orleans than men, and many women felt empowered by the masculine labor they performed. However, I also find that job or task segregation was commonplace, that women volunteers experienced sex-based harassment at a comparable rate to women in the paid workforce, and that sex-based harassment was most acute among women who were volunteer coordinators. In contrast to men in the building trades who tended to engage in hostile sexism (Denissen and Saguy 2014), volunteer men tended to engage in benevolent sexism. In this section, I combine findings from volunteer coordinator interviews and volunteer survey respondents, which overlapped to a great extent.

It has already been established in previous chapters that volunteers in post-Katrina New Orleans are different in many ways from the general population, but there are important differences between women and men who volunteered as well. These differences are presented in Table 14a and Table 14b. To summarize, when compared to female respondents in my sample, a greater percentage of men were older, heterosexual, less educated, retired, conservative, attended religious services, and hold more conservative views regarding class.

When focusing on differences between my sample and the general population, women in my sample tend to be younger, but men do not. Women in my sample are

Table 14a – Survey – Volunteer Demographics by Gender

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age					
Women*	81	36.2	13.9	20.0	71.0
Men	68	45.4	20.3	20.0	86.0
Age (GSS)					
Women**	1391	49.2	17.6	18	89+
Men	1138	48.8	17.1	18	89+

			GSS 2014	
	Women	**Men**	**Women**	**Men**
Sex/Gender┼	54.1% (86)	45.91% (73)	55.0% (1397)˜	45.0% (1141)
Race				
White	87.2% (75)	78.1% (57)	67.5% (943)**˜	73.4% (838)
Multi-racial	5.8% (5)	11.0% (8)	7.6% (106)	6.5% (75)
Black	3.5% (3)	2.7% (2)	16.5% (231)**˜	10.7% (122)**
Latinx	1.2% (1)	5.5% (4)	4.4% (62)	5.1% (59)
Asian, P.I.	1.2% (1)	2.7% (2)	2.9% (41)	2.8% (32)
Other	1.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.1% (2)**˜	0.7% (8)
Sexual Orientation* **				
Heterosexual	72.1% (62)*	89.9% (62)	95.1% (1199)**	95.4% (996)**
LGBTQ	27.9% (24)*	10.1% (7)	4.9% (62)**	4.6% (48)**
Education				
HS or equiv.	3.5% (3)*	11.2% (10)	62.4% (871)**	63.8% (728)**
AA	1.2% (1)	1.4% (1)	8.7% (122)**˜	5.6% (64)
BA	61.2% (52)*	45.1% (32)	18.4% (257)**	18.8% (215)**
MA	34.1% (29)	39.4% (28)	10.5% (147)**	11.7% (134)**
Work Status (while volunteering in New Orleans; can check more than one)				
Student	39.5% (34)	31.5% (23)	3.8% (53)**	3.2% (37)**
Full Time	31.4% (27)	31.5% (23)	41.9% (586)˜	56.5% (644)**
Part Time	26.7% (23)*	8.2% (6)	12.0% (168)**˜	9.2% (105)
Other	8.1% (7)	9.6% (7)	3.1% (43)**	2.9% (33)**
Retired	3.5% (3)*	13.7% (10)	17.8% (248)**	18.6% (212)
Unemployed	2.3% (2)	5.5% (4)	2.9% (41)˜	5.5% (63)
Temp. Unemp.	1.2% (1)	4.1% (3)	1.9% (27)	1.1% (13)**
Homemaker	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.5% (231)**˜	2.8% (32)

┼Percentages for female/male binary; 3 respondents identified at genderqueer and 1 as transgender.
* Comparing women and men in my sample, significant at the $p < .05$ using t-test, chi-squared, or using Fisher's exact test because some cells have a frequency of less than 5
** Comparing my sample to the GSS within gender group, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test
*** Comparing women and men in my sample at the variable level, significant at the $p < .05$ using t-test, chi-squared, or using Fisher's exact test because some cells have a frequency of less than 5
˜ Comparing women and in the GSS, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

Table 14b – Survey – Volunteer Demographics by Gender

	Women	Men	GSS 2014 Women	Men
Frequency of religious service attendance* **				
Never	23.5% (20)*	6.9% (5)	23.4% (325)˜	30.3% (344)**
Less than once a year	10.6% (9)	11.0% (8)	6.3% (87)˜	8.5% (96)
Once or twice a year	15.3% (13)	12.3% (9)	12.9% (180)	13.8% (157)
Several times a year	8.2% (7)	12.3% (9)	8.9% (124)	11.1% (126)
About once a month	0.0% (0)	4.1% (3)	6.7% (93)**	4.9% (56)
2-3 times a month	3.5% (3)	5.5% (4)	9.7% (135)˜	7.2% (82)
Nearly every week	14.1% (12)	8.2% (6)	5.2% (73)**˜	3.6% (41)**
Every week	17.7% (15)	28.8% (21)	19.0% (264)˜	14.7% (167)**
Several times a week	7.1% (6)	9.6% (7)	7.9% (110)˜	5.7% (65)
Political Ideology (Before volunteering in New Orleans)				
Ext. Lib.	25% (21)*	9.9% (7)	3.5% (47)**	4.3% (47)**
Lib.	34.5% (29)	33.8% (24)	11.7% (158)**	13.2% (146)**
Slightly Lib.	17.8% (15)	14.0% (10)	11.0% (148)	10.4% (115)
Moderate	8.3% (7)	15.4% (11)	42.8% (575)**˜	37.5% (414)**
Slightly Con.	4.7% (4)	4.2% (3)	14.1% (189)**	13.1% (145)**
Cons.	8.3% (7)*	19.7% (14)	13.5% (181)	16.0% (177)
Ext. Con.	1.1% (1)	2.8% (2)	3.5% (47)˜	5.4% (60)
Altruism				
Personally assisting people in trouble is very important to me				
Strongly Disagree	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.7% (5)	1.0% (6)
Somewhat Disagree	2.4% (2)	1.4% (1)	2.8% (19)	3.8% (22)
Neither	6.0% (5)	4.1% (3)	12.9% (88)	15.6% (91)**
Somewhat Agree	31.0% (26)	21.9% (16)	56.1% (382)**	55.7% (324)**
Strongly Agree	60.7% (51)	72.6% (53)	27.5% (187)**	23.9% (139)**
People should be willing to help others who are less fortunate				
Strongly Disagree	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.4% (3)	1.2% (7)
Somewhat Disagree	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.5% (10)	1.5% (9)
Neither	3.5% (3)	0.0% (0)	6.1% (42)	6.0% (35)**
Somewhat Agree	18.8% (16)	11.0% (8)	41.1% (281)**	46.1% (268)**
Strongly Agree	77.7% (66)	89.0% (65)	50.8% (347)**˜	45.1% (262)**
Classism				
Those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others* **				
Strongly Disagree	47.6% (40)*	29.2% (21)	4.1% (28)**	3.1% (18)**
Somewhat Disagree	33.3% (28)	31.9% (23)	21.6% (148)**˜	15.9% (92)**
Neither	7.1% (6)	15.3% (11)	25.1% (172)**	22.6% (131)
Somewhat Agree	9.5% (8)*	20.8% (15)	37.1% (254)**˜	45.7% (265)**
Strongly Agree	2.4% (2)	2.8% (2)	12.0% (82)**	12.8% (74)**

* Comparing women and men in my sample, significant at the $p < .05$ using t-test, chi-squared, or using Fisher's exact test because some cells have a frequency of less than 5

** Comparing my sample to the GSS within gender group, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

*** Comparing women and men in my sample at the variable level, significant at the $p < .05$ using t-test, chi-squared, or using Fisher's exact test because some cells have a frequency of less than 5

˜ Comparing women and in the GSS, significant at the $p < .05$ using z-test

disproportionately white but men are not, while both women and men in my sample are disproportionately not black. Both women and men in my sample disproportionately identify as LGBTQ. Both women and men in my sample disproportionately report being a student when volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans. Women in my sample disproportionately report working part time when volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans, but men do not. Women in my sample disproportionately report not being retired and not being a homemaker when volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans, but this is not true for men. Conversely, men in my sample disproportionately report not working full-time, but this is not true for women. Only women in my sample disproportionately report never attending religious services, both men and women in my sample disproportionately report attending nearly every week, and only men in my sample disproportionately attending every week. Both women and men in my sample are disproportionately liberal and extremely liberal; women tend to extremely liberal at a higher rate than men, while men tend to be conservative at a higher rate than women. Both women and men in my sample are disproportionately altruistic and hold disproportionately progressive views regarding class. I now turn to the specifics of these differences in turn.

Women Volunteers in a Masculine Domain

My first finding is that women were disproportionately well represented as engaging in general volunteer labor in post-Katrina New Orleans, which is somewhat surprising given the masculine nature of the work. In this chapter, I work within the

gender binary because only three percent of respondents identify as genderqueer, androgynous or transgender, which is unfortunately too small of a subsample for meaningful analysis. Taking this into account, survey respondents are 54 percent women and 46 percent men, but this difference is not significant. Interview participants, however, consistently report that volunteers were either evenly distributed or were disproportionately women (they estimated that between half and two thirds of volunteers were women). Compared to the 41 percent of general labor volunteers in the U.S. that are women based on data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016), a significantly higher percentage of my respondents, who are also largely engaging general labor, are women (54 percent). In short, while there isn't a statistically significant difference in the number of women and men in my sample, the proportion of women in my sample is significantly greater than what might be expected in most general volunteer labor.

Disaster recovery volunteerism is an unusual hybrid of traditionally feminine and masculine activities. Volunteerism is feminized, while disaster and the construction-based recovery labor that follows it are masculinized. Given this combination, it is somewhat surprising that women slightly outnumbered men in post-Katrina New Orleans. While most respondents do not offer much of an explanation beyond women's heightened empathy, Dan, a white man and volunteer coordinator in his mid-thirties, asserts that:

> If it had been advanced carpentry, it probably wouldn't have been mostly women… But to gut houses took no actual [skill]…You could swing a hammer and pull a piece of sheet rock off the wall with minimal training.

The feminization of volunteerism and the demand for unskilled gutting/construction labor opened the door for women to engage in masculine tasks they are typically discouraged from doing both by gendered stereotypes and the uneven distribution of skills, knowledge, and experience across genders.

Empowerment Through Masculine Labor

My second finding is that women felt empowered by the masculine labor they performed, which is supported by interviews and qualitative survey responses. Meredith, a white woman and volunteer coordinator in her mid-twenties, notes that:

> In terms of individual comfort level with physical work, men and boys tend to be more comfortable with that than women or girls, particularly young girls who did not have any experience with that. But it was great. It's liberating to discover that they had that in them.

For women, the action of using their bodies as a tool to master their environment was transformative, going beyond just a fleeting sense of empowerment. Melanie, a white woman and volunteer coordinator in her mid-twenties, asserts that:

> A lot of the women…were responding to how powerful that one week of construction, that one week of gutting [was]…That became sort of a touchstone of their life… That it was physical, and it was exhausting, and they felt strong, and they felt like they were eating for fuel… is sort of a rare phenomenon, especially for young women.

Inexperienced volunteers, women and men alike, learned low-level construction skills. Longer term volunteers and volunteer coordinators often learned more advanced construction skills that are generally dominated by men (Denissen 2010b). Stephanie, a white woman and volunteer coordinator in her mid-twenties, recalls that:

> My dad would be like "Yeah, my daughter knows how to frame a house." I think my grandmas were in shock that, "You know how to do that for real? Oh my gosh, that's amazing. I could never do that."…It's given a lot of people skills that they would not have had the chance to otherwise have.

Women volunteers felt empowered by the chance to learn masculine skills and engage with other women doing so. Women who challenged traditional gender roles also inspired other women. Gina, a black woman from New Orleans and volunteer coordinator in her forties, notes that:

> The young females that have come, I'm amazed when I see them up on roofs, doing all of this manual labor. It is just amazing to me.

Rebecca, a white woman and survey respondent in her mid-twenties wrote:

> I met other women who had restored their own homes…My world opened up a lot in terms of what I believed was possible, especially as a woman.

Construction based volunteerism provided all volunteers the opportunity to use their bodies as tools and to learn new skill sets. For women, this was a particularly empowering experience because it broke with the constraints of proper femininity and presented new possibilities, within and beyond volunteerism.

Job Segregation

My third finding is the occurrence of job segregation between women and men, which is supported by both interviews and survey data. While women and men worked together much of the time, this did not preclude a gendered division of labor with regard

Table 15a – Survey – Statistically Significantly Gendered Forms of Participation*

As a volunteer in New Orleans, have you participated in the following ways? Please check all that apply.

	Women	Men	% Ratio	% Diff.
Woman-dominated activities				
Signed a petition/public letter	29.1% (25)	17.8% (13)	1.6	11.3%
Man-dominated activities				
Contributed money to vol. org	38.4% (33)	54.8% (40)	0.7	-16.4%
Skilled construction tasks	20.9% (18)	48.0% (35)	0.4	-27.0%
Took part in direct action	4.7% (4)	12.3% (9)	0.4	-7.7%
Provided counseling	3.5% (3)	13.7% (10)	0.3	-10.2%

*Comparing women and men within my sample, significant at the $p < .1$ using chi-squared, or using Fisher's exact test because some cells have an expected frequency of less than 5

to masculine gutting and construction work. Stephen, a volunteer coordinator and white man in his late twenties, remembers that:

> Men would go out do the physical work, where the women were not necessary even actively or intentionally, encouraged… to help with cleaning and help with more domestic type activities in volunteer organizations, cooking and cleaning, etc. Those divisions definitely existed… Women had to speak up or activate themselves in order to become crew leaders and do work that was more 'male.'

Based on chi-squared tests for independence, Table 15a shows the volunteer activities that have a significant relationship with gender and also differentiates between those that women or men are more likely to report engaging in. Relatedly, Table 15b shows those volunteer activities that do not have a significant relationship with gender, and also differentiates between conventionally nonpolitical and political activities.

According to my survey data, there is no significant relationship between gender and gutting flooded homes or participation in unskilled/low skilled construction tasks. In contrast, there is a significant relationship between gender and engagement in skilled construction tasks such that women are less than half as likely to have done so compared

Table 15b – Survey – Weakly Gendered Forms of Participation – Ordered by % Ratio

As a volunteer in New Orleans, have you participated in the following ways? Please check all that apply.

	Women	Men	% Ratio	% Diff.
Conventionally Nonpolitical Activities				
Connect people to services or shelter	30.2% (26)	26.0% (19)	1.2	4.2%
Provided shelter	4.7% (4)	4.1% (3)	1.1	0.5%
Tutored children	24.4% (21)	21.9% (16)	1.1	2.5%
Gutted flooded homes	60.5% (52)	61.6% (45)	1.0	-1.2%
Engaged in unskilled construction	77.9% (67)	86.3% (63)	0.9	-8.4%
Engaged in neighborhood clean-up	51.2% (44)	60.3% (44)	0.9	-9.1%
Served meals	29.1% (25)	39.7% (29)	0.7	-10.7%
Conventionally Political Activities				
Joined a strike	2.3% (2)	1.4% (1)	1.7	1.0%
Used online technologies	18.6% (16)	12.3% (9)	1.5	6.3%
Engaged in consciousness raising	27.9% (24)	20.6% (15)	1.4	7.4%
Attended city government meetings	14.0% (12)	11.0% (8)	1.3	3.0%
Participated in a rally	32.6% (28)	28.8% (21)	1.1	3.8%
Contacted a politician	15.1% (13)	13.7% (10)	1.1	1.4%
Deliberately bought certain products	12.8% (11)	13.7% (10)	0.9	-0.9%
Wore or displayed a campaign badge	14.0% (12)	15.1% (11)	0.9	-1.1%
Donated money to a political organization	9.3% (8)	11.0% (8)	0.9	-1.7%
Boycotted certain products	9.3% (8)	11.0% (8)	0.9	-1.7%
Engaged in illegal forms of action	1.2% (1)	4.1% (3)	0.3	-3.0%
Spoke at city government meetings	0.0% (0)	2.7% (2)	0.0	-2.7%

to men (21 percent compared to 48 percent). Volunteer coordinators note that most volunteers, both women and men, were unskilled, but they also refer to the presence of retired men who had previously worked as construction contractors.

However, the size of this gap suggests the influence of larger patterns of occupational and job segregation by sex/gender (England 2005). Mark, a white man and volunteer coordinator in his early twenties, recalls that:

> I would say, "I need half of you to help move the tools and stuff into the house and get them set up and do some like cutting with saws. I need half of you to clean the house"… Ninety percent of the time they would divide guys and girls. The girls would go clean the house, and the guys would go mess with the tools.

In part, this gender division appears to be driven by volunteer "choice" rather than assignments from volunteer coordinators. However, choices are informed by larger social expectations of who does what work that shape interactions between volunteers, especially when women challenge them by engaging in masculine labor.

Rates of Sex-Based Harassment

My fourth finding is that women volunteers experience sex-based harassment at roughly the same rate as women in the paid workforce, which I arrive at through analysis of quantitative survey responses. Table 16 shows the rates at which women and men in my sample reported the various forms of sex-based and heterosexist harassment. Compared to 58 percent of women in paid work (and we would expect this number to be higher in field dominated by men), I find that 62 percent of women volunteers experience sex-based harassment (Ilies et al. 2003). All women volunteers who report sex-based

Table 16 – Survey – Crosstab – Gender and Sexist Behavior on Volunteer Worksites

Experienced the following behaviors by fellow volunteers or volunteer supervisors at least once or twice.

	Women	Men
Sex-based harassment	**61.6% (53)**	**54.2% (39)**
Gender harassment	**61.6% (53)**	**54.2% (39)**
Sexist remarks: Made sexist remarks about women in your presence	53.5% (46)	48.6% (35)
Infantilization: Treated you as if you were stupid or incompetent	41.9% (36)	30.6% (22)
Gender policing: Suggested women are ill-suited for physically challenging work sites†	40.7% (35)	38.9% (28)
Sexually crude/offensive behavior: Made unwanted attempts to draw you into discussion of sexual matters	32.6% (28)	23.6% (17)
Gender policing: Criticized you for not behaving “like a woman should” or "like a man should"	22.1% (19)	19.4% (14)
Work/family policing: Suggested women belong at home, not in the workplace	15.3% (13)	19.4% (14)
Sexual-advance harassment	**15.1% (13)**	**6.9% (5)**
Unwanted sexual attention: Continued to ask you for dates even though you said ‘No’	14.0% (12)	6.9% (5)
Sexual coercion: Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative	4.7% (4)	1.4% (1)
Heterosexist harassment		
Gossiped about someone’s sexual orientation at your workplace	25.6% (22)	23.6% (17)

†This measure is not drawn from the GEQ but created specifically for this study.
*None of these differences are statistically significant across gender.

harassment report some form of gender harassment, and 15 percent of women volunteers report some form of sexual-advance harassment, which is composed of unwanted sexual attention (14 percent) and sexual coercion (5 percent). While sex-based harassment appears as pervasive on the volunteer worksite as it is in paid work, qualitative survey and interview responses suggest it took on a distinct character.

Hegemonic masculinity encourages men to engage in hostile sexism, but those who volunteer are "good men" engaging in "good work" and are therefore enact complicit masculinity in the form of benevolent sexism. Hegemonic masculinity, as well as disaster masculinity's "culture of male heroic adventure," encourage men to feel threatened by the presence of women in a masculine domain (Luft 2008:26). As Denissen and Saguy (2014) find for women in the building trades, Luft (2008) suggests that women's presence in disaster recovery volunteerism feminizes what is supposed to be masculine labor and therefore degrades it, and, in doing so, degrades men's sense of superiority. While my survey questions differentiate between sex-advance harassment and gender-based harassment, they fail to differentiate between hostile and benevolent sexism. However, interview participants discussed their gendered experience of volunteerism largely in terms of benevolent sexism, as is discussed in detail below.

Benevolent Gender Harassment

My fifth finding is that men who volunteered tended to engage in benevolent gender harassment in the form of sexist comments, gender policing, and infantalization, which is supported by interview and survey data. Denissen and Saguy (2014) find that

men in the building trades engage in the sexualization of, and gendered homophobia towards, tradeswomen. This suggests that an analysis of sex-based harassment would be incomplete without addressing heterosexist harassment.

As discussed earlier, both men and women in my sample disproportionately identify as LBGTQ compared to the general population, and a significantly higher percentage of women in my sample identify as LGBTQ compared to men in my sample. However, women and men in my sample reported similar rates of heterosexist harassment (26 percent and 24 percent), which are comparable to the low end of rates found in the paid workforce (25-66 percent). There are also significant but relatively weak correlations between sex-based harassment and heterosexist harassment for both as well (r = .42 and r = .44, respectively). Courtney, a volunteer coordinator and queer white woman in her mid-twenties, suggests that:

> I think it has a lot more to do with my gender and how I present myself in that way than my sexuality.

While homophobia was reported, there was general agreement among volunteers and volunteer coordinator interview respondents, both LGBTQ and heterosexual, that sexuality did not strongly shape their experiences or the experiences of post-Katrina volunteers generally. A possible explanation for this is that benevolent sexism is seen by many people as positive, but there isn't an equivalent form of heterosexist harassment that "good people doing good work" can engage in without being frowned upon.

One form of gender harassment involved gendered assumptions about work tasks, often through sexist comments and gender policing. Most women volunteers interacted with men on volunteer worksites who assumed women were unable to do certain acts of

physical labor or that men should be doing them instead. In my survey, 53 percent of women and 49 percent of men report that fellow volunteers or volunteer supervisors made sexist remarks about women in their presence, and 41 percent of women and 39 percent of men report the occurrence of gender policing through suggestions that women are ill-suited for physically challenging work sites. Tanya, a survey respondent and white woman in her early twenties, recalls that:

> I did feel that you definitely get a lot of condescending treatment from men. 'Oh, let me carry this for you.' 'Oh, let me help you with that.' 'Oh, you shouldn't be swinging that tool.' I felt that I had something to prove as a woman.

This behavior is driven by the belief that men are biologically better equipped for gutting and construction labor due to their perceived advantages in size, strength, and spatial reasoning. Ernie, a survey respondent and white man in his late fifties wrote:

> Men are able to do more work by their genetics, but many of the women way out worked them by their desire to help.

Benevolent sexism in the form of men insisting on carrying heavy objects for women is not unique to gutting or construction labor. However, the frequency of women engaging in masculine actions seems to have prompted men to overtly "do gender" by asserting their assumptions of sex difference (in this case, size and strength). Men also frequently assumed women's incompetence.

Another form of gender harassment is mansplaining to or infantalization of women. On gutting and construction volunteer worksites, men tended to assume that they knew what they were doing. Frank, a volunteer coordinator and white man in his early-twenties, notes that:

> I've seen more of the young ladies lacking confidence right when they first show up, and…the dudes are just going, 'I'm going for it,' and screw things up.

This fits a larger pattern of men overestimating their abilities (Furnham 2001). Men who volunteered assumed not only that they were physically more capable, but also more knowledgeable. While a chi-squared test for independence does not reveal a significant difference across gender, 42 percent of women in my sample compared to 31 percent of men in my sample report that fellow volunteers or volunteer supervisors treated them as if they were stupid or incompetent. Women's (and not men's) experiences of infantilization and condescension by men who volunteered was also a consistent theme in most interviews. Leslie, a volunteer and multiracial woman in her early twenties, notes that:

> I'm doing construction work with pretty much all men…In the beginning I wasn't really even acknowledged... everyone is definitely surprised to see a girl doing construction.

Kate, a survey respondent and white woman in her late twenties, recalls that:

> Men would always assume that they knew more than you (though they rarely did), hogged all the tools, insisted on helping you or took over what you were doing. You had to constantly prove yourself to show you could do the work and it felt like you were always under observation.

Hegemonic masculinity encourages men to think of themselves as superior to women in any domain they enter, and this is exaggerated in masculine spaces. Complicit masculinity, however, encourages these assumptions to manifest as unsolicited helping behavior. Val, a volunteer coordinator and white woman in her mid-twenties, recalls that:

> There's a little bit of proving yourself being a woman in construction… I had one volunteer explain how to use a ruler to me, which was a little offensive because I've known how to use a ruler since I was a child.

The condescension in this interaction is a good example of mansplaining. The assumption that an adult is unable to use a simple tool that most people learn to use as a child is a form of gendered infantilization (Kurzdorfer 2012).

While women experience mansplaining in many contexts, it happened so frequently in masculine gutting and construction that women discussed it collectively. Patricia, a survey respondent and white woman in her mid-twenties, recalls that:

> Most of the women I know and I have had long conversations about the ridiculous things men had said to us on construction sites… I loved working with women, but that's because we were all fighting the same battle together.

In short, women's shared experiences of gendered microaggressions deepened their collective gender identity. Within some organizations, this translated into collective responses.

Some volunteers and volunteer coordinators report organizational responses to sexism, such as integrating anti-sexism into volunteer trainings and establishing worksite rules against unsolicited helping. However, these seemed the exception rather than the trend. Volunteerism is an informal space with little leverage over the volunteers themselves. Women who experienced sexism likely had little recourse beyond talking with other women. This is consistent with findings that informal organizations within masculine domains are detrimental to gender equality, while more formal organizations within masculine domains produced relatively better outcomes for women (Ridgeway

2009). In these masculine domains, women are afforded relatively less credibility than they would be within feminized domains and therefore benefit from the protection of rigid organization and are subject to greater discrimination when that protection is removed. In contrast, feminized domains afford women relatively more credibility and therefore women are able to take advantage of the benefits of an informal environment. In this case, disaster recovery volunteer organizations are embedded within a masculine domain but tend to be relatively informal, which puts women who volunteer at greater risk of experiencing sex-based discrimination.

Harassment of Women in Leadership

My sixth finding is that gender harassment was worse for women who were volunteer coordinators, which is supported by interview and qualitative survey responses. Women in leadership positions consistently experienced challenges from men under their supervision. Karen, a survey respondent and white woman (age unavailable), wrote:

> Being a female crew chief made me much more aware of my limitations (as perceived by others) and how those did not reflect reality.

The age discrepancy between volunteer coordinators who were younger women and volunteers who were older men also contributed to challenges to women's leadership. Stephanie, a volunteer coordinator and white woman in her mid-twenties, notes that:

> It's always interesting too when you get an older short term male, to have them be led by a younger girl…Which is difficult for both people involved because the girl's like, 'Hey, I know what I'm doing. Why are you talking down to me?' And the guy's like 'Uh, you don't know anything. Why are you here? I should be in charge.'

This is in line with the research finding that women in leadership positions are more likely to experience harassment than those outside of leadership (McLaughlin et al. 2012). In this context, interview participants who were older men tended to report having a background in construction, and volunteer coordinators who were women emphasized that older men were often the source of harassment. This is perhaps because older men volunteered because they had a useful construction background, while younger men would be more likely to volunteer through institutions to which they belonged, such as their college or a church youth group.

Younger women and men in my sample were both more likely to report sex-based harassment, but the interview and qualitative survey suggest that women were the primary targets. There are significant and moderate negative correlations between age and reporting the occurrence of sex-based harassment for both women and men (r = -.62 and r = -.66, respectively). However, interview participants do not report that young men are the targets of sex-based harassment. This pattern may be due to harassment being more commonly targeted at younger women than older ones, or because younger people were more aware its occurrence. Patricia notes that:

> A lot of guys…didn't want to take any kind of instruction from females….I was cutting siding, after having worked for a couple months, and I remember having a group of dudes who were all standing in a semi-circle. I mean, they were waiting for me to mess up, but I wasn't messing up, and they were just watching, and that was a little bit of a triumph because I had dealt with so much.

The men who watched Patricia didn't say anything specific, and we don't know their inner thoughts. However, her impression of this situation reflects an environment in

which women's leadership and competence is assumed to be inferior and therefore under constant scrutiny, which is in line with previous findings on women in positions of leadership in paid work (Kanter 1993).

To sum up, women who engaged in construction-based volunteerism in post-Katrina New Orleans experienced a double-edged sword. While these women often felt empowered, they also experienced sex-based harassment at comparable levels to the paid workforce despite my finding that men who volunteered were significantly more liberal and altruistic than men in the general population. Despite engaging in masculine construction-based labor in a masculine disaster context that might encourage the performance of hegemonic masculinity, volunteer men tended to engage in benevolent forms of sexism congruent with complicit masculinity. As with benevolent sexism more broadly, the sex-based harassment enacted by these "good men," which masquerades as helping behavior, has detrimental impacts on women and upholds patriarchy. While the disaster context may exacerbate this, these findings are likely generalizable to women's volunteerism in construction-based labor across contexts.

CONCLUSION

Gender is a pervasive social force, and volunteerism is no exception, despite volunteers being more liberal and altruistic than the general population. The literature on volunteerism overlooks sex-based harassment within volunteer organizations, as volunteerism is generally considered a wholly positive experience for participants. This study advances the literature by demonstrating that women who volunteered in post-

Katrina New Orleans faced comparable rates of sex-based harassment as women in the paid workforce. Women who volunteer may face a hostile work environment, which raises the question of whether volunteers are protected from sex-based harassment under anti-discrimination law.

Whether volunteers receive the same legal protections as employees under U.S. federal law is not entirely clear. In the 2012 case Volling v. Antioch Rescue Squad, "a federal District Court in Illinois…allowed a female volunteer for two nonprofit emergency ambulance services to sue for sexual harassment and discrimination under the employee protection provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act" (Kramer 2013). The defendant argued that compensation was necessary for Title VII to apply. The Court, however, found the definition of employee under Title VII to be tautological, stating that "an employee is someone employed by an employer" and therefore followed the U.S. Supreme Court in using "common law principles of agency in lieu of a substantive definition of 'employee'" (Kramer 2013). There are a number of factors that make up these principles, but no single one is decisive, including remuneration. If volunteers are found to be constrained by the workplace in similar ways to employees, they may be eligible for the same legal protections.

Some states go beyond federal law to protect volunteers from sex-based harassment. In California, for example, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) explicitly covers not only employees but also volunteers, unpaid interns, and independent contractors (California Department of Fair Employment and Housing 2017).

Louisiana state law, however, does not appear to explicitly cover volunteers and instead relies on the definition of employee provided use by federal law in Title VII.

I find that volunteering had both positive and negative impacts on women. The feminized activity of volunteerism disproportionately drew women to engage in masculine gutting and construction labor in a masculine disaster setting. The opportunity to gut flooded homes and engage in construction tasks was empowering for many women because it afforded a chance to feel physically capable and strong. Many women also appreciated the acquisition of construction skills that are generally monopolized by men.

However, these positive outcomes were dampened by inequality regimes in the form of gender harassment. Women were often confronted by men who didn't think women should carry heavy objects and assumed women were less knowledgeable about using tools. Women who were volunteer coordinators often had their legitimacy challenged by the men they supervised (particularly if they were older men with backgrounds in construction) and therefore shared a sense that their actions were under greater scrutiny than crew leaders who were men.

My findings suggest that students of volunteerism need to move beyond attention to only gendered participation, motivations, and organizational makeup. We must be attentive to how "doing gender" and volunteering are bound up with one another in such a way that encourages even altruistic men to engage in sex-based harassment. For feminist scholars, my findings provide empirical evidence for how "nice guys" engage in "complicit" or "soft-boiled" masculinity in a setting where "hard-boiled masculinity" is no longer the norm. Women and men tend to perceive it as harmless, yet research shows

that benevolent sexism and gender harassment have serious consequences for women's health and occupational well-being, including increased feelings of incompetence, decreased cognitive performance, decreased job satisfaction, increased distress, and increased alcohol consumption as a means of palliative coping (Dardenne et al. 2007; Dumont et al. 2008; Piotrkowski 1998; Sojo et al. 2016; Vescio et al. 2005). While the occurrence of sex-based harassment on volunteer worksites is likely less emotionally and financially impactful because they are short-term activities or because women are not economically dependent upon them, the potential impacts on women should not be overlooked and beg further study.

Volunteer organizations, particularly those who focus on disaster and construction, need to take steps to prevent job segregation and gender harassment on volunteer worksites. A "primary prevention" approach has been found to effectively reduce rates of sex-based harassment within organizations, and is characterized by management commitment to addressing the root causes of sex-based harassment to prevent its development instead of simply being reactive, having zero tolerance for sex-based harassment when it does occur, and regular assessments and trainings to ensure that employees are aware of sex-based harassment and pertinent organizational policies (Bell, Quick, and Cycyota 2003). Volunteer organizations, particularly those in disaster or construction contexts, would be wise to implement primary prevention not only for sexual harassment but for gender harassment, as my findings suggest this is a much more pervasive problem within volunteer organizations. As with the rest of society, we must find ways to mitigate the manifestations of patriarchy within volunteerism so we can

focus on helping others and maximizing its sometimes transformative benefits for participants.

For women who volunteer in masculine spaces such as disaster and construction, the worksite is like the Wild West where experiences of gendered labor, mansplaining, presumed incompetence, and challenges to women's leadership are common, but with little to no formal mechanisms to prevent it or address it after the fact. This is a significant finding because 2.2 million women in the U.S. volunteer through general labor each year, let alone the millions more women who do so around the globe.

Conclusion

In the decade following Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans has been awash with volunteers from across the country and around the world. Together, these largely white and socioeconomically privileged volunteers contributed a staggering amount of labor and resources towards the rebuilding of the city. Well over one million people travelled to the Gulf Coast to volunteer, and New Orleans was the largest destination. Many residents have expressed their gratitude and amazement at volunteers' willingness to forgo a leisurely vacation and to instead engage in uncompensated labor that is often physically taxing, especially in the sweltering heat and humidity of the South. Post-Katrina New Orleans fits within a long history of people helping each other in the wake of disaster, but it also fits within the history of the neoliberal racial state and its engagement in racial genocide against black Americans.

While all disasters result from a combination of natural, technological, and social factors, the Katrina disaster was strongly the result of human choices before, during, and after the storm. These choices disproportionately affected African Americans, who were more likely to die in the flood, to die following the storm due to disaster related trauma, to lose their possessions, home, and community, to be permanently flung afar in the diaspora, and to be reliant upon volunteer labor to rebuild. Before Katrina, New Orleans' Lower Ninth Ward neighborhood was a dense and tightly knit community with one of the highest rates of black homeownership in the nation that stretched back generations. Over a decade after the storm, only a fraction of this neighborhood has returned. While the people of the Lower Ninth Ward continue to be resilient in claiming their right to return

home, many also feel they have permanently lost the multigenerational community built by their parents and grandparents. In Chapter 1, I argue that the people of the Lower Ninth Ward are the survivors of a cultural genocide at the hands of local, state, and federal government that threatened to and partially succeeded in wiping this community off the face of the earth. It is within this context that volunteers came to New Orleans following Katrina, and their varying understandings of this background shaped who came, why they came, what they did, and how they impacted service beneficiaries.

While the vast majority of volunteers were white and socioeconomically privileged, they were also diverse in their orientations. In Chapter 2, I find that these nonlocal disaster recovery volunteers fall into three primary categories: Servants, Activists, and Tourists. I find that these three groups of volunteers differ in their motivations, framing of the disaster, and volunteer activities. With regard to motivations, Servants are driven by a desire to help the needy, Activists combine altruism with a desire for social justice, and Tourists combine altruism with a desire to experience New Orleans as a travel destination. In terms of framing, Servants and Tourists perceive the Katrina disaster as the result of a naturally occurring hurricane that could not have been prevented, but Activists see the Katrina disaster as the result of endemic racism and classism (and, to some degree, sexism) before, during, and after the storm. Regarding activities, Servants focus their time and energy on hands-on rebuilding labor, Activists combine this with a broader array of un/contentious social services in addition to more conventional protest activities, and Tourists combine a lesser commitment to service provision with an emphasis on the consumption of New Orleans' vast tourism industry.

While they help us to make sense of the variation in volunteer orientations, these categories are ideal types that function more as a spectrum than as neatly delineated groupings. Further, individual position on this spectrum can change. While most volunteers do not experience a shift in their political views, a sizeable subset do. The bulk of those whose who experience a shift are liberals that then move further to the left, and attribute this to increased consciousness around racism and classism.

Not all volunteers travel to help disaster victims at the same time. We are already aware of the distinction between disaster relief volunteers (who converge on a disaster zone immediately following the disaster event) and recovery volunteers (who converge on a disaster zone after the response phase in order to rebuild the community). In Chapter 2, I find that different "disaster volunteer metaspaces" draw different kinds of volunteers, depending on the perceived nature of the disaster event, where it is located, and how far along in the recovery process it is. A disaster event that is perceived to be largely caused by natural forces will primarily draw Servants, and a disaster event that is perceived to be due to social or technological forces will tend to draw Activists. My findings suggests that a disaster event that occurs in a small town or a city without a tourist industry will draw largely Servants (and perhaps Activists), but when a disaster occurs in a place with a strong tourist draw (like New Orleans), it will also attract Tourists. Further, it is not entirely clear when the disaster response period phases out and the recovery period begins, which obscures the line between response and recovery volunteers.

As risk-taking disaster responders go home, relatively risk-averse recovery volunteers take their place. In the case of the Lower Ninth Ward, the social components

of the Katrina disaster also informed when and where Activists volunteered. Following the storm, a military perimeter and curfew largely kept people out of the neighborhood for months, disabling resident- and volunteer-based recovery efforts. In response, Activists began gutting homes without the required permits, breaking the nighttime curfew, and standing in front of bulldozers employed by the city to tear down houses without the owner's knowledge or consent. Activists were willing to bend or break the law to resist the erasure of the Lower Ninth Ward, but rule-abiding Servants and risk-averse Tourists largely waited to enter the Lower Ninth until it was legal and perceived to be safe. As is the case with volunteer metaspaces more broadly, New Orleans had to be seen as relatively safe and stable before recovery volunteers came in droves. To some degree, the endemic social problems of racism, classism, and sexism that the Katrina disaster resulted from and exacerbated continue to render New Orleans a volunteer metaspace, even with the Katrina disaster far in the rear-view mirror. It doesn't hurt that people still want to visit Bourbon Street, party during Mardi Gras, eat traditional Cajun cuisine, and feel like they did something good in the process.

Volunteers certainly want to help people, but why and how they do so are shaped by the intersecting forces of race, class, and gender, which render their "free" labor a double-edged sword. In Chapter 3, residents express a desire for people to see the impacts of the Katrina disaster on their community and to share this story with their people back home. Volunteer coordinators also report that volunteers sometimes do so in a voyeuristic manner that makes residents feel as though they are in a zoo or fish bowl. Residents also express their gratitude for volunteers, which often took the form of feeding them local

cuisine, which allows service beneficiaries to give back to volunteers and facilitates positive exchange across race, class, and cultural divides. When they receive such gifts, however, volunteers are sometimes insensitive in ways that can be interpreted as classed and/or raced and therefore reduce the positive effects or even make these interactions negative. Further, volunteers sometimes enact raced and classed assumptions about how good their "free" labor really needs to be. Service beneficiaries tended to be poor, working-class, or in the precarious middle-class of color, and therefore living in substandard conditions while they worked to rebuild their lives. Therefore, volunteers sometimes provided sloppy or subpar labor because they assumed it was still good enough for people who they perceived to be used to such conditions.

These dynamics also shape who volunteers want to serve and how they do so. For volunteers, the ideal service recipient is embodied by the "little old black lady," who fits their raced, classed, and gendered notions of who constitutes the worthiest poor. In addition to satisfying volunteers' moral expectations, the "little old black lady" maximizes the social capital volunteers receive from their friends, family, and affiliated institutions (e.g., school or church) when they return home. Service recipients, however, often do not fit this idealized model. In contrast to the "little old black lady," seemingly young and able-bodied black men are sometimes perceived to be lazy if they do not work alongside volunteers. Beneficiaries who appear to have financial resources are perceived as manipulating volunteer organizations to extract resources they do not truly need. At best, these situations can lead volunteers to implicitly or explicitly voice their judgements about beneficiaries to each other. At worst, they can lead volunteers to find ways to

punish beneficiaries for violating their expectations of worthiness, such as providing sloppy work or intentionally leaving a refrigerator full of rotted food inside the home. At the interactional level, these dynamics can reinforce existing stereotypes held by volunteers and lead to microaggressions targeted at beneficiaries. At the structural level, these dynamics reproduce the existing racial project of the "altruistic White," the smiling face of the possessive investment in whiteness who provides charity to racial others.

Disaster recovery volunteerism also offers women the opportunity to engage in conventionally masculine activities, but exposes them to a masculine environment in which they are likely to experience sex-based discrimination. While volunteerism is a traditionally feminine activity associated with upper-class white women, contemporary data suggest that women and men in the U.S. are equally as likely to volunteer. However, women are underrepresented in "general labor" volunteerism in the general population. In contrast, women volunteered at a rate similar to or slightly higher than men in post-Katrina New Orleans. Both are disproportionately white, rendering inter-volunteer interactions a gendered white space, despite the racially charged broader context in which these interactions occurred. In doing so, women were afforded the opportunity to use their bodies as tools to master their environment (like boys and men are traditionally encouraged to) and many took advantage of this opportunity to learn traditionally masculine construction skills. For many women, this break with proper femininity was empowering. On the other hand, it also exposed them to rates of sex-based discrimination similar to those found in the paid workplace. In post-Katrina New Orleans, this largely

manifested as a gendered division of labor and men's gender harassment of women in the form of benevolent sexism.

While not a single instance of explicit or formal relegation of women to conventionally feminine activities is reported, it is clear that gender norms implicitly encouraged a gendered division of labor on volunteer worksites. This largely manifested as volunteers self-segregating into masculine and feminine tasks under the veil of individual "choice." While I find that women are just as likely as men to have gutted flooded homes or participated in unskilled/low skilled construction tasks, I also find that women are less than half as likely to have engaged in skilled construction tasks. While this is perhaps partially explained by men being more likely to have received prior training in skilled labor, it also suggests that unskilled women were less likely than unskilled men to learn highly masculine skilled construction tasks (relative to demolition and low-skilled labor, which are still masculine but have a lower threshold for entry).

Men who volunteered in post-Katrina New Orleans were more liberal and altruistic than men in the general population, and so their perpetration of sex-based harassment tended to be softened and presented as benevolence. Men often asked if, or asserted that, women needed help carrying heavy objects and that women needed guidance with basic construction tasks. Underlying such seemingly helpful behavior are assumptions of women's inherent inability and incompetence regarding masculine labor. This was common enough that many women report developing a sense of shared experience with other women who volunteered, along with an increased consciousness regarding gender oppression. Further, women in positions of leadership experienced

greater scrutiny than men in similar positions and often had their legitimacy challenged, particularly when supervising older men with backgrounds in construction.

When put in conversation with each other, these findings further my analysis of disaster recovery volunteerism. With regard to Chapter 1, the findings from Chapter 2 suggest that volunteers vary in their awareness of the Katrina disaster as a manifestation of anti-black genocide and the neoliberal racial state, let alone complicity with or resistance to it. Further, Servants and Tourists likely do not perceive the nonprofit industrial complex (NPIC) as problematic. Activists who engage in service provision (in contrast to those who only engage in contentious action) may perceive the NPIC as a flawed model, but also see it offering an outlet for limited resistance in addition to providing needed resources to the oppressed. While my data does a poor job of explicitly addressing how Chapters 2 and 3 connect, it is plausible that Servants and Tourists would be most likely to enact their race, class, and gender prejudices, but my data suggests that Activists also engage in such actions that are not consistent with their purported worldview. With regard to Chapter 1 and Chapter 3, volunteers have both resisted and complied with anti-black genocide at the hands of the neoliberal racial state, reinforcing the idea that we must take an "both/and" approach instead of distorting reality to fit within a limited "either/or" perspective. A "both/and" model also helps shed light on the experiences of women who volunteered. While Chapter 1 establishes the Katrina event as an extension of endemic social inequalities, the findings in Chapter 4 suggest that women's experiences of sex-based discrimination in post-Katrina volunteerism are also an extension of these forces in a number of ways. Volunteers are disproportionately white

and socioeconomically privileged, which highlights how people of color and poor people are not equally afforded these opportunities. Further, the sexism that women face in this context is an extension of a broader structure of patriarchy that, at least in some contexts, is increasingly "soft-boiled" so that it is more difficult to detect as maintaining men's privilege and women's subordination. With regard to Chapters 2 and 4, it is possible that Activists are more likely to try to minimize sexism within their ranks. Yet, as previous studies have shown, Activists focused on racism and classism are not necessarily concerned with sexism (and, to some degree, vice versa). Finally, tying together Chapters 3 and 4, we see how some women who experience sexism may also be turning around and engaging in forms of racism and classism (just as men do), which reminds us again that experiencing a particular form of oppression does not automatically lead to consciousness around other forms of oppression. Overall, my findings suggest that disaster recovery volunteerism in post-Katrina New Orleans is a complex manifestation of multiple intersecting systems of power playing out in the context a largely white and relatively affluent, but otherwise heterogenous, group of people attempting to voluntarily help others, mostly black people, in the wake of disaster. As volunteers around the globe continue to try to serve beneficiaries in diverse contexts laden with power dynamics, these findings suggest the need for antiracist, anticlassist, and antisexist trainings to minimize the negative impacts of volunteers on beneficiaries and on each other.

There are many questions that this study brings up but are beyond its scope. With regard to Chapter 1, what will the Lower Ninth Ward look like in twenty or thirty years? Someone is likely to buy and develop the many empty lots that scatter the

neighborhood's landscape, but it is not clear who this will be, who their work will serve, and whether they will resist or contribute to the cultural genocide of Lower Ninth Ward residents. With regard to Chapter 2, in what proportions do Servants, Activists, and Tourists volunteer following disaster events that are variably based on natural, technological, or social causes? Does the location and its proximity to a tourist destination encourage certain types of volunteers to participate? How do these dynamics persist or vary across domestic volunteers and international volunteers? With regard to Chapter 3, is there a way to determine whether the contributions of volunteers do or do not outweigh their negative effects on beneficiaries? Do the dynamics of the "little old black lady" and other assumptions about who is worthy or unworthy of services carry over when beneficiaries are not largely black or when volunteers are not largely white? Does this affect the quality of labor produced on average by volunteers? Do antiracist, anticlassist, and/or antisexist trainings effectively reduce the negative impacts of volunteers on beneficiaries? Do volunteers with more mainstream or conservative ideologies really abandon the organizations they are volunteering with when confronted with their own privileges and prejudices? Regarding Chapter 4, do the positive impacts of women's participation in masculine volunteer labor outweigh the negative impacts of the sex-based discrimination they experience when doing this work? In an informal volunteer environment, do antisexist trainings designed for the paid workplace effectively reduce women's experiences of job/task segregation and gender harassment in the form of benevolent sexism? Further research is needed to address these questions.

It is tempting to conclude from this study that volunteerism does more harm than good and should therefore be abandoned if we seek to eliminate social inequalities. However, I believe this is an overly simplistic perspective. While I appreciate the arguments that service provision leads to a nonprofit industrial complex (NPIC) that dampens the contentious activities needed to move away from existing social inequalities, I am not convinced that service provision (which is a form of triage) cannot be combined with, or even itself be a form of, contentious action that resists social injustices. I concede that most volunteer service provision does not take such an activist approach, that most of these apolitical volunteers will never become politicized on behalf of the people they purport to serve, and that volunteerism serves as a release valve for their guilty consciences regarding social inequalities. However, it seems cruel to pull this informal safety net out from beneath marginalized people with the hope that it will theoretically lead to a more socialist state that will better serve their needs in the long term. Further, volunteering does appear to lead some participants to become politicized, and to change the ways in which they go about their volunteer work. In short, I am most convinced by arguments that it is *how* service provision is done that is most important in shaping its effects, not service provision itself. While it won't happen overnight and likely won't happen for most volunteers in the NPIC, volunteering can be a valuable if flawed route to providing needed services to oppressed peoples while expanding the political consciousness of volunteers themselves so that they actively work to mitigate how their own racism, classism, and sexism negatively impacts service beneficiaries. I hope this study can shed light on how we might take a step in this direction.

Appendix 1 – Lower Ninth Ward Residents – Oral History Interview Guide

Remembering the Past

- Could you please state your name for the recording?
- How long have (or did) you lived in the Lower Ninth Ward?
- How long has your family lived in the Lower Ninth Ward?
- Can you tell us about your life living/growing up in this neighborhood?
- What memories stand out when you think about your time in the L9?
- When you think about the Lower Ninth Ward, who are the people that stand out in your mind?
- If you feel comfortable, can you share your experiences with Hurricane Betsy (1965)?
- If you feel comfortable, can you tell us about your experience with Hurricane Katrina?
    - Did you leave New Orleans?
        - If NO…what were you experiences being here during the storm?
        - If YES: Ask the Below Questions
            - When the mandatory evacuation was ordered, did you hesitate to leave?
            - Where did you evacuate to?
            - Who did you evacuate with?
            - When were you able to come back?
            - Did you have any fears about coming back home?

- What would you like to say to family and friends who have been displaced and are still displaced because of Hurricane Katrina?

Sharing Stories of the Present

- What has changed about this community since Hurricane Katrina?
- How do you feel about the government's treatment of the Lower Ninth Ward?
- What is important to you about this community and about this neighborhood?
- What do you love most about the Lower Ninth Ward?
- What are aspects of this community that are unique to the Lower Ninth Ward?

Planning for the Future

- What do you hope to see change in the future for this neighborhood?
- What do you think *will* happen for the future of the Lower Ninth Ward?
- What would you like the world to know about the Lower Ninth Ward?
- Is there anything else you'd like to share with us?

Appendix 2 – Lower Ninth Ward Residents – Interview Guide

Thank you for taking the time to complete this interview. You have been asked to do so because you are a resident of a New Orleans neighborhood impacted by post-Katrina volunteer efforts. This interview is planned to last about forty-five minutes. If your responses exceed this time, I have scheduled extra time to accommodate that. I'll start with some follow-up questions about your background in the neighborhood. I will then ask about how volunteers have impacted you, your community, and the city more broadly. Finally, I will ask some basic demographic questions and then about other local residents you think I should talk to regarding these topics. Throughout these questions, please share your general thoughts and opinions as well as specific instances or stories.

Background (Pre- and Post-Katrina)

As I mentioned, I'll begin by asking about your background in the neighborhood.

1. In the previous part of the interview, we touched on your background in your community, but I would like to ask a few specific follow-up questions.

    a. How would you describe your economic situation before Hurricane Katrina?

        i. How would you describe your economic situation following the storm?

    b. Were you a homeowner before Hurricane Katrina?

        i. Has your status as a homeowner or renter changed since the storm?

    c. How involved in your neighborhood were you before Hurricane Katrina?

        i. How involved in your neighborhood have you been since the storm?

    d. Were you involved in any volunteer or unpaid work before Hurricane Katrina?

i. Have you been involved in any volunteer or unpaid work following the storm?

e. Were you involved in any political work or activism before Hurricane Katrina?

i. Have you been involved in any political work or activism following the storm?

2. Could you tell me about your experience rebuilding following Hurricane Katrina?

a. Have you received support in rebuilding your home following Hurricane Katrina?

i. If yes, from what organizations? What kind?

Volunteers

Since Hurricane Katrina, many volunteers from other parts of the country have come to New Orleans. Some residents have positive things to say about these volunteers, while others are more critical or have had negative experiences. I would like to ask you about the impacts of "outside" volunteers.

3. Have you interacted with volunteers following Hurricane Katrina? (if they mentioned this above, then ask: Could you tell me more about your experience with volunteers?)

a. If yes, how so? Did you receive services? What organizations?

i. If received services, how would you describe the quality of the services you received? Have you had to replace any work done by volunteers? (RQ2/4)

ii. If received services, were volunteers sensitive or insensitive to your experience with Hurricane Katrina and the damage to your home and possessions? (RQ2)

4. Do you live near organizations that house volunteers or bring them in to work?

5. How has the presence of so many volunteers affected your everyday life? (RQ2)

6. How would you say volunteers have affected everyday life for people living in your neighborhood? (RQ4)

    a. Has this changed over time? (RQ4)

7. How would you describe these volunteers? Are there different types of volunteers? (RQ1)

8. Do you see certain volunteer organizations as better serving New Orleans residents than other organizations? (RQ2/4)

9. With many volunteers being from somewhere other than New Orleans, what role have cultural differences played between volunteers and residents? (RQ2)

10. With many volunteers being from faith-based organizations, what role has religion or faith played between volunteers and residents? (RQ2)

11. What role has economic status played between volunteers and local residents? Have you witnessed or heard of any insensitivity with regard to class? (RQ2)

12. With so many white volunteers working in primarily black communities, what role has race played between volunteers and residents? Have you witnessed or heard of any insensitivity with regard to race? (RQ2)
    a. How would you compare white people from New Orleans with white volunteers who came to New Orleans following Katrina? (RQ2)

13. What role has gender played between volunteers and residents? Have you noticed any differences in how male and female volunteers interact with local residents? (RQ2)

14. With some volunteers identifying as gay, what role has sexual orientation played in relations between volunteers and residents? (RQ2)

Demographics

While you've touched on some of these earlier, I just have some specific demographic questions.

15. What year were you born?

16. What is the highest level of schooling you have completed?

17. What is your racial or ethnic background?

18. Would you describe yourself as politically conservative, moderate, or liberal?

19. What is your religious preference?

Snowball/Concluding Questions

20. Are there any particular New Orleans residents you think I should talk to about post-Katrina volunteers? Are you willing to provide contact information?

21. During this interview, were there any questions that bothered you or you think should be changed? Are there any additional questions I should be asking?

22. Before we complete this interview, is there anything else you would like to share regarding post-Katrina volunteers? If there is nothing further you would like to add, then I will stop recording now. While I do not anticipate follow-up interviews, I may contact you in the future if new questions come up during interviews. Thank you again for taking the time to complete this interview.

Appendix 3 – Initial List of Post-Katrina Volunteer Recovery Organizations

Volunteer organizations identified by the Corporation for National and Community Service (2010) as contributing to Gulf Coast rebuilding:

- Catholic Charities USA
- Christian Reformed World Relief Committee
- Common Ground Relief
- Corporation for National and Community Service
- Episcopal Relief and Development
- Habitat for Humanity
- Hands On Gulf Coast
- International Relief and Development
- Junior League International
- KaBOOM
- Lutheran Disaster Response
- Mennonite Disaster Services
- National Youth Leadership Council
- Nazarene Compassionate Ministries
- Noah's Wish
- Operation NOAH Rebuild (Northern American Mission Board)
- Points of Light Foundation and Volunteer Center National Network
- Presbyterian Disaster Services
- Salvation Army
- Travelers' Aid International
- United Jewish Communities
- United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR) Katrina Aid Today
- Volunteers of America South East Region
- Week of Compassion, Disciples of Christ

Appendix 4a – Volunteer Coordinators – Supplemental Survey Form (Final Iteration)

New Orleans Volunteerism Interview/Survey

Thank you for taking the time to complete this important survey and interview. Your participation is *completely voluntary* – feel free to stop at any point. Please do not put your name on this survey so that your answers will remain anonymous. Thanks in advance for your time and honesty.

Organizational Involvement

1. Please list the organizations you have been most involved with in post-Katrina recovery efforts:

Organization #1: _____
Organization #2: _____
Organization #3: _____
Organization #4: _____
Organization #5: _____

2. During your work with these organizations, have you served in a high level administrative position?

☐ Yes
☐ No

3. During your work with these organizations, have you served in a leadership position where you supervised volunteers or non-volunteer staff members?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes, have you supervised more than 100 volunteers or staff in the course of your work?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes, have you served in such a role for at least six months in the course of your work?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Background Information

4. What year were you born? _____

5. What is your sex/gender?
   ☐ Male
   ☐ Female

6. Which of the following best describes you?
   ☐ Gay, lesbian, or homosexual
   ☐ Bisexual
   ☐ Heterosexual or straight

7. What is your race/ethnicity? Please check one.
   ☐ Black, African-American
   ☐ White, Caucasian
   ☐ Spanish, Hispanic, Latino
   ☐ Asian, Pacific Islander
   ☐ American Indian, Alaska Native
   ☐ Other (please specify)_____

8. What is the highest level of schooling you have completed?
   ☐ Less than high school
   ☐ High school diploma or the equivalent (GED)
   ☐ Some college, no degree
   ☐ Associate degree
   ☐ Bachelor's degree
   ☐ Some graduate school, no degree
   ☐ Master's degree
   ☐ Professional or Doctorate degree

9. In which of these groups did your earnings from all sources for 2010 fall? That is, before taxes and other deductions.

	Personal	*Total Household*
None-$15,000	☐	☐
$15,000-$25,000	☐	☐
$25,000-$50,000	☐	☐
$50,000-$75,000	☐	☐
$75,000-$100,000	☐	☐
$100,000-$200,000	☐	☐
More than $200,000	☐	☐

10. Which of the following best describes your political views?

- ☐ Extremely Liberal
- ☐ Liberal
- ☐ Slightly Liberal
- ☐ Moderate, Middle of the Road
- ☐ Slightly Conservative
- ☐ Conservative
- ☐ Extremely Conservative
- ☐ Don't know, haven't thought about it

11. What is your religious preference?
    - ☐ Protestant
    - ☐ Catholic
    - ☐ Jewish
    - ☐ None
    - ☐ Other (Please specify religion and/or church denomination)

      _____

Appendix 4b – Volunteer Coordinators - Interview Guide (Final Iteration)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this interview. You have been asked to do so because you have been identified as someone who has served in a leadership position in post-Katrina recovery efforts in New Orleans. This interview is planned to last about one hour based on an average of two minute responses to thirty questions. If you feel you need to exceed two minutes for any given question, I have scheduled in extra time to accommodate that. I'll start with some questions about post-Katrina recovery efforts as a social movement. I will then ask about how participants have impacted these efforts and the city more broadly. I will then ask about how and why you became involved with post-Katrina recovery efforts. Finally, I will ask about other organizations and people you think I should talk to regarding post-Katrina recovery efforts in New Orleans. Throughout these questions, please share any specific instances you may recall that illustrate your perspectives.

Post-Katrina Social Movement?

Since 2005, the Corporation for National Community Service reports that over one million people have come to the Gulf Coast to engage in short-term volunteering. One sociologist described this influx: "From Liberal Christians to young anarchists, white volunteers have deluged New Orleans, offering assistance, services, and advice." This influx of post-Katrina volunteers, many of whom have relocated to New Orleans in both volunteer and paid capacities to continue in post-Katrina recovery efforts, has been called the New Orleans Rebirth Movement by some scholars, but has been largely undocumented by the social movement literature. Now I would like to ask you some questions about this phenomenon.

1. Do you think that this influx of volunteers and transplants alongside local residents in post-Katrina recovery efforts constitutes a social movement? Why or why not?
    - ➔ If no, how would you classify this phenomenon?
2. Do you identify as a participant in this movement/phenomenon? Why or why not?
3. How would you describe the participants involved in this movement/phenomenon? Are there different groups? Has this changed over time?
4. As a collective effort, what has this movement/phenomenon sought to achieve? How has this changed over time?
5. Are individual participants in this movement/phenomenon actively involved in one issue, a small number of issues, or a large number of issues? Has this changed over time?
6. What types of work fall within post-Katrina recovery efforts, and what types of work fall outside of post-Katrina recovery efforts?

7. What post-Katrina recovery efforts have been accomplished and what remains to be accomplished?
8. How involved have New Orleans residents been in this movement/phenomenon as opposed to people coming from other places? How so? Do they work together?
9. What skill sets do most participants bring to this movement/phenomenon? Has this changed over time?
10. How involved has paid work been in this movement/phenomenon as opposed to volunteer work? How so? What has been the relationship between paid and volunteer work?
11. Have participants taken part in any protests, demonstrations, letter writing campaigns, boycotts, or other noninstitutional tactics as a part of post-Katrina recovery efforts?
12. Have the efforts of participants in post-Katrina recovery efforts been a part of a larger social conflict? Who are the different sides involved in that conflict?
13. Have the efforts of participants in post-Katrina recovery efforts been a part of a call for institutional change, whether within government, organizations, etc.?
14. As a participant in post-Katrina recovery efforts, have you experience a change or shift in personal identity? In group identity or "we-ness"?

Impact of Volunteers

Now I would like to ask you some questions about how this influx of "outsider" participants has affected this movement/phenomenon as well as New Orleans more broadly.

15. How has this influx of "outsiders" affected the ability of displaced residents to return to the city?
16. How has this influx of "outsiders" affected the quality of life for returned local residents?
17. How has this influx of "outsiders" affected leadership opportunities for local residents in post-Katrina recovery efforts?
18. With many participants being from somewhere other than New Orleans, have cultural differences played a role in the relationship between participants and local residents?
19. What role has race played in this movement/phenomenon? What role has race played in the relationship between participants and local residents? Have you witnessed or heard of any tensions or conflicts with regard to race?
20. What role has class played in this movement/phenomenon? What role has class played in the relationship between participants and local residents?
21. What role has age played in this movement/phenomenon? Has age played a role in the relationship between participants and local residents?
22. What role has sex or gender played in this movement/phenomenon? Has sex or gender played a role in relations between participants? Between participants and local residents?

23. What role has sexual preference has played in this movement/phenomenon? Has sexual preference played a role in the relationship between participants and local residents?
24. What role has religion played in this movement/phenomenon? Has religion played role in the relationship between participants and local residents?

Participant Motivations

Now I would like to ask you some questions about what has drawn so many people to participate in post-Katrina recovery efforts.

25. Why have people participated in this movement/phenomenon?
    Has this changed over time?
26. Why have some participants relocated full time to New Orleans while others have not?
    Has this changed over time?
27. Could participants in this movement/phenomenon have done similar work in their own communities? If so, why do you think they chose to work in New Orleans instead of in their own communities?

Your Work in New Orleans

Now I'd like to ask about how you have been involved in this movement/phenomenon
***Reference survey form for organizations.

28. How did you become involved with these organizations, and in what capacity did you serve these organizations?
29. Did the organizations you have worked with experience an influx of volunteers after Katrina? When did this begin? How did it change over time?
30. Do you know how many post-Katrina volunteers have worked with these organizations? Non-volunteer staff members? How accurate would you say these estimates are?
31. Did these organizations exist prior to Katrina?
    - ➔ If yes, how did it become involved in post-Katrina work?
    - ➔ If no, was this organization's founding a direct or indirect response to the storm and its aftermath?
32. Are these organizations still involved in post-Katrina recovery efforts? Do they still work with volunteers? How has this changed over time?
33. Why did you first come to New Orleans after Katrina? What motivated you to do so? Why did you come at that particular time? ***Why didn't you come sooner?
34. Are you still engaging in post-Katrina recovery efforts?
    - ➔ If no, how did you're involvement end and why? What work are you doing now? Do you plan to return to post-Katrina work in the future?
    - ➔ If yes, why have you chosen to stay involved? How long do you intend to stay involved in post-Katrina recovery efforts?
35. Do you currently live in New Orleans?
    - ➔ If yes, how did you decide to relocate/return to the city? How long do you plan to stay in New Orleans? Why?

➔ If not, where do you currently live? Did you ever consider moving to New Orleans?

Snowball/Concluding Questions

36. What organizations were most involved in post-Katrina efforts immediately following the storm? Since the storm? Now?
37. Are there any particular volunteers, staff, administrators, or local residents that you think should I talk to with regard to post-Katrina recovery efforts? Would you be willing to provide contact information for these individuals? I can send a follow up email.
38. During this interview, were there any questions that bothered you? Are there any additional questions I should be asking?

Before we completed this interview, is there anything else you would like to share regarding post-Katrina recovery efforts? If there is nothing further you would like to add, then I will stop recording now. While I do not anticipate follow-up interviews, I may contact you in the future if needed. Thank you again for taking the time to complete this interview!

Appendix 5 – Volunteers – Survey Instrument

Post-Katrina Volunteerism in New Orleans

Thank you for taking the time to complete this important survey! The purpose of this survey is to gather your experiences as a volunteer in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina. The survey is anonymous and will take about 10 minutes to fill out.

This research is being funded by the National Science Foundation and conducted under the auspices of the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Riverside. If you have questions about this project, please contact me at ibrec001@ucr.edu.

What organizations have you volunteered with doing post-Katrina recovery work in New Orleans? Please check all that apply.

Camp Restore
Travelers' Aid International
Volunteer Louisiana
Week of Compassion, Disciples of Christ
Rebuilding Together
People's Institute for Racism and Beyond
Noah's Wish
National Youth Leadership Council
Nazarene Compassionate Ministries (Nazarene Disaster Response)
Lower Ninth Ward Living Museum
International Relief and Development Gulf Coast
Junior League International
KaBOOM
Corporation for National and Community Service/Americorps
A Community Voice
Beacon of Hope Resource Center
Christian Reformed World Relief Committee
ACORN
United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR)
United Methodist Volunteers in Mission (UMVIM)
American Red Cross
Catholic Charities USA
Common Ground Collective/Relief
Emergency Communities
Episcopal Relief and Development
Habitat for Humanity
Hands On New Orleans/Gulf Coast
Lower9.org
The Lower Ninth Ward Community Village

Lutheran Disaster Response
Mennonite Disaster Services
Operation NOAH Rebuild
Our School at Blair Grocery
People's Hurricane Relief Fund
Points of Light Foundation and Volunteer Center National Network
Presbyterian Disaster Services
Salvation Army
St. Bernard Project
United Jewish Communities
Volunteers of America
Other (please specify)

What types of organizations have you volunteered with before, during and after volunteering in post-Katrina New Orleans? Please check all that apply.

Possible responses for each category:
Before
Post-Katrina New Orleans
After

Categories:
Disaster response and recovery
Faith-based or religious
General voluntary club (such as Elks or Lions club)
Advocacy/activism
Service learning course at college or university
High school organization (such as a club)
College organization (such as a club, sorority or fraternity)
Corporate sponsor
Corporate sponsor Before
Professional association
Government program (such as Americorps)
Volunteer tourism (combines tourist and volunteer experiences)

Had you been to New Orleans prior to volunteering after Hurricane Katrina? Please check all that apply.

No
Yes, I lived there
Yes, for family
Yes, for work
Yes, for vacation

Yes, other (please specify)

In what state did you live when you first volunteered in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina?

DROP DOWN MENU OF ALL STATES AND OPTION FOR OUTSIDE US

During which years have you volunteered in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina? Please check all that apply.

2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014

How many trips have you made to New Orleans to volunteer? Please check one.

One
Two
Three
Four
Five or more

What is the longest single trip you have taken to New Orleans to volunteer? Please check one.

One or a few days
One week
2 or 3 weeks
One month
2 or 3 months
3-6 months
6-11 months
A year or more

Have you relocated to New Orleans full-time as a result of your volunteer experience?

Yes, currently living in New Orleans
Yes, but relocated elsewhere

No

On a typical day, how many hours per day did you volunteer while in New Orleans?

OPEN ENDED NUMERICAL RESPONSE BETWEEN 1 AND 24

As a volunteer in New Orleans, have you participated in the following ways? Please check all that apply.

Gutted flooded homes
Engaged in unskilled or low skilled construction tasks (drywall, painting, etc.)
Engaged in skilled construction tasks (framing, roofing, plumbing, etc.)
Engaged in neighborhood clean-up
Served meals
Tutored children
Provided shelter
Helped connect people to services or shelter
Provided counseling
Used online technologies to show support, share information, or organize
Contributed money to volunteer organization
Donated money to a political organization or group
Contacted a politician, government, or local government official
Attended city government meetings
Spoke at city government meetings
Engaged in consciousness raising or political education
Signed a petition/public letter
Boycotted certain products
Deliberately bought certain products
Wore or displayed a campaign badge/sticker
Joined a strike
Participated in a rally, demonstration, march or vigil
Took part in direct action (such as blockade, occupation, civil disobedience)
Engaged in illegal forms of action
Used violent forms of action (against property or people)

How important were each of the following to your decision to volunteer in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina? Please check one for each row.

Possible responses for each category:
Very Important
Somewhat Important
Not Very Important
Not at All Important
Don't Know

Not Applicable

Categories:

I wanted to help victims of disaster
I wanted to help victims of social injustice
My religious values
My education (for example, taking a service-learning course)
My professional development
I wanted to visit New Orleans
I was asked by a friend or family member
I was offered the opportunity by an organization to which I belong

How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? Please check one for each row.

Possible responses for each category:

Strongly Agree
Somewhat Agree
Neither Agree Nor Disagree
Somewhat Disagree
Strongly Disagree

Categories:

Disasters such as floods are the work of nature and cannot be prevented
If a racial minority family with about the same income and education as I have moved in next door, I would mind a great deal
Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations
Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people
Those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others
If every individual would carry his/her own weight, there would be no poverty
Women's requests in terms of equality between the sexes are simply exaggerated
Personally assisting people in trouble is very important to me
People should be willing to help others who are less fortunate
White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin
I welcome new friends who are gay

During your volunteer experience in New Orleans, how often did you experience the following behaviors by fellow volunteers or volunteer supervisors? Please check one for each row.

Possible responses for each category:

Many times
Often
Sometimes
Once or twice
Never

Categories:

Made sexist remarks about women in your presence
Made unwanted attempts to draw you into discussion of sexual matters
Treated you as if you were stupid or incompetent
Suggested women belong at home, not in the workplace
Suggested women are ill-suited for physically challenging work sites
Criticized you for not behaving “like a woman should” or "like a man should"
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said ‘No’
Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative
Gossiped about someone’s sexual orientation at your workplace

Which of the following best describes your political views before and after your experience as a volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans? Please check one for each row.

Possible responses for each category:

Extremely Liberal
Liberal Slightly Liberal
Moderate, Middle of the Road
Slightly Conservative Conservative
Extremely Conservative

Categories:

Before volunteering in New Orleans
After volunteering in New Orleans

Have you experienced an increase or decrease in any of the following attitudes, beliefs, or desires as a result of your volunteer experience in New Orleans? Please check one for each row.

Possible responses for each category:
Increased
Stayed the Same

Decreased

Categories

Desire to help others
Desire to be active in politics
Desire to be active in issues of social justice
Belief that racism is a major issue in the United States
Belief that classism is a major issue in the United States
Belief that sexism is a major issue in the United States
Belief that homophobia is a major issue in the United States
Trust in government
Belief that volunteer recovery efforts in New Orleans will generally benefit the interests of local residents

Which of the following best describes your religious beliefs? Please check one.

Protestant
Evangelical
Catholic
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
Non-denominational Christian
Buddhist
Jewish
Hindu
Islamic
Spiritual (no specific religion)
Agnostic
Atheist
Other (please specify)

How often do you attend religious services? Please check one.

Never
Less than once a year
About once or twice a year
Several times a year
About once a month
2-3 times a month
Nearly every week
Every week
Several times a week
Don't Know

What year were you born?

OPEN ENDED NUMERICAL RESPONSE

What is your race? Indicate one or more races that you consider yourself to be.

White
Black, African American
American Indian, Alaska Native
Asian, Pacific Islander
Latino, Hispanic
Other (please specify)

What is your gender identity? Please check one.

Female
Genderqueer/Androgynous
Intersex
Male
Transgender
Transsexual
FTM (female-to-male)
MTF (male-to-female)
Other (please specify)

Do you identify as LGBTQ?

Yes
No

What is the highest level of schooling you have completed? Please check one.

Less than high school
High school diploma or the equivalent (GED)
Some college, no degree
Associate degree
Bachelor's degree
Some graduate school, no degree
Master's degree
Professional or Doctorate degree

When you were volunteering in New Orleans, were you doing work other than your volunteer work? If yes, then please check all that apply.

Working full-time
Working part-time
With a job, but not at work because of temporary illness, vacation, strike

Underemployed, working fewer hours than you would like
Unemployed, laid off, looking for work
Retired
In school
Keeping house
Don't know
Other (please specify)

When you were volunteering in New Orleans, what was your typical annual household income (all members of the household combined)? That is, before taxes and other deductions.

Under $10,000
$10,000 to 19,999
$20,000 to 29,999
$30,000 to 39,999
$40,000 to 49,999
$50,000 to 59,999
$60,000 to 74,999
$75,000 to 89,999
$90,000 to 109,999
$110,000 to 129,999
$130,000 to 149,999
$150,000 or over
Don't know

Which of these statements applies to you? Please check one.

I have a steady partner, and we live in the same household
I have a steady partner, but we don't live in the same household
I don't have a steady partner

How many children age 0 to 17 live in your household?

OPEN ENDED NUMERICAL QUESTION

Please answer the following open-ended question in as much detail as you are comfortable with.

How did your volunteer work in post-Katrina New Orleans impact your life goals?

OPEN ENDED WRITTEN RESPONSE

How did your volunteer work in post-Katrina New Orleans impact your views on race and class?

OPEN ENDED WRITTEN RESPONSE

How did your gender impact your experience as a volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans?

OPEN ENDED WRITTEN RESPONSE

How do you think volunteers have affected people who live in New Orleans?

OPEN ENDED WRITTEN RESPONSE

Is there anything else you would like to share with regard to your experience as a volunteer in New Orleans following Hurricane Katrina?

OPEN ENDED WRITTEN RESPONSE

Would you be willing to engage in a follow up interview regarding your experiences as a volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans? If so, please provide the best e-mail at which to contact you.

OPEN ENDED WRITTEN RESPONSE

Appendix 6 – Volunteers – Interview Guide

Thank you for taking the time to complete this interview. You have been asked to do so because you have participated in post-Katrina recovery efforts in New Orleans. This interview is planned to last about forty minutes based on an average of two minute responses to twenty questions. If you feel you need to exceed two minutes for any given question, I have scheduled in extra time to accommodate that. Throughout these questions, please share any specific instances you may recall that illustrate your responses.

Since 2005, the Corporation for National Community Service reports that over one million people have come to the Gulf Coast to engage in short-term volunteering. Now I'd like to ask you some question about your experience as a volunteer in post-Katrina New Orleans.

Initial Involvement (When/Why/How)

1. Can you tell me more about your history as a volunteer more generally? Before and after Katrina?

2. When did you first come to New Orleans following Katrina and why did you come at that particular time? If delayed arrival, why didn't you come sooner?

3. Why did you decide volunteer in New Orleans?

4. Where were you coming from?

5. Were you part of a larger group trip? What group/organization?

6. Did you make multiple trips to the city? Why?

7. Did you ever relocate full-time to New Orleans? Why or why not?

8. How did you acquire the time and resources needed to come to New Orleans? Was this difficult?

9. What was your relationship to New Orleans before coming to volunteer following Katrina?

10. How important was visiting New Orleans as a specific destination in your decision to volunteer there?

Would you consider yourself a volunteer tourist? Why?

Types of Participation

11. What did you do as a volunteer in New Orleans?

12. What do you think volunteers in New Orleans have accomplished?

13. Do you feel like you participated in something bigger than yourself? Why or why not?

14. Did your organization ever give out t-shirts? Did wearing your t-shirt affect your interactions with local residents?

15. To what degree do you think Katrina was a natural disaster or a human made disaster? Was the disaster avoidable?

16. People volunteered in New Orleans in many different ways and for many different reasons. How important was it to you to help victims of disaster?

17. If at all, do you think of your volunteering in New Orleans as activism?

18. Are you involved in activism outside of post-Katrina recovery efforts? How so?

19. As a participant in post-Katrina recovery efforts, have you experience a change or shift in personal identity?

Race/Class/Gender questions

20. As a volunteer in New Orleans, did you interact with local residents? Who? In what context? About how many total?

21. What role has/did religion play in your participation in post-Katrina recovery efforts?

22. Considering that many of the participants in this movement/phenomenon are from somewhere other than New Orleans, did/have cultural differences play a role in your interactions with local residents?

23. Did/has class background play a role in your interactions with local residents?

    Do you think that all people who received services were equally in need?

24. What role has/did race play in your participation in post-Katrina recovery efforts?

25. As a volunteer in New Orleans, did/have you experienced or heard about instances of insensitivity, tension, or conflict between local residents and "outside" volunteers?

26. What role has/did age play in your participation in post-Katrina recovery efforts?

27. What role has/did sex or gender play in your participation in post-Katrina recovery efforts?

Snowball/Concluding Questions

28. Are there two or three individuals in particular that you think should I talk to who have participated in or have received services from post-Katrina volunteer efforts? Would you be willing to provide contact information? Email follow up?

29. During this interview, were there any questions that bothered you or you thought were a problem? Are there any additional questions you think I should be asking?

30. Before we completed this interview, is there anything else you would like to share regarding post-Katrina volunteerism or social movement activity or their impacts on the city? If not, then I will stop recording now. While I do not anticipate follow-up interviews, I may contact you in the future if this becomes necessary. Thank you again for taking the time to complete this interview.

References

Acker, Joan. 2006. "Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations." *Gender & Society* 20(4):441–64.

Adams, Vincanne. 2013. *Markets of Sorrow, Labors of Faith: New Orleans in the Wake of Katrina*. Durham and London: Duke University Press Books.

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 1997. "Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration." *The International Migration Review* 31(4):826–74.

Allen, Lara. 2006. "From Rights to Responsibilities: Identity Politics and Ethnographic Methodology, Dialogues with South African Musicians." *Social Dynamics* 32(2):50–80.

Almaguer, Tomas. 1975. "Race, Class, and Chicano Oppression." *Socialist Revolution* 71–99.

Almaguer, Tomás. 1987. "Ideological Distortions in Recent Chicano Historiography: The Internal Model and Chicano Historical Interpretation." *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 18(1):7–28.

Aosved, Allison C., Patricia J. Long, and Emily K. Voller. 2009. "Measuring Sexism, Racism, Sexual Prejudice, Ageism, Classism, and Religious Intolerance: The Intolerant Schema Measure." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 39(10):2321–54.

Baldwin, James. 2010. "White Man's Guilt." Pp. 320–25 in *Black on White: Black Writers on What It Means to Be White*, edited by D. R. Roediger. New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Barrera, Mario. 1989. *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality*. 1st edition. University of Notre Dame Press.

Barreto, Manuela and Naomi Ellemers. 2005. "The Burden of Benevolent Sexism: How It Contributes to the Maintenance of Gender Inequalities - 540ef3600cf2d8daaacfabe0.pdf." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 35:633–642.

Becker, Julia C. and Stephen C. Wright. 2011. "Yet Another Dark Side of Chivalry: Benevolent Sexism Undermines and Hostile Sexism Motivates Collective Action for Social Change." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 101(1):62–77.

Beckwith, Karen. 1996. “Lancashire Women against Pit Closures: Women’s Standing in a Men’s Movement.” *Signs* 21(4):1034–68.

Bederman, Gail. 1995. “‘Civilization,’ the Decline of Middle-Class Manliness, and Ida B. Wells’s Anti-Lynching Campaign (1892-94).” Pp. 407–32 in *We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible: A Reader in Black Women’s History*, edited by D. C. Hine and W. King. NYU Press.

Bell, Myrtle P., James Campbell Quick, and Cynthia S. Cycyota. 2003. *Assessment and Prevention of Sexual Harassment of Employees: An Applied Guide to Creating Healthy Organizations*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. Retrieved December 12, 2015 (http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=312699).

Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. “Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 26(1):611–39.

Blackstone, Amy. 2004. “‘It’s Just About Being Fair’: Activism and the Politics of Volunteering in the Breast Cancer Movement.” *Gender & Society* 18(3):350–68.

Blackstone, Amy. 2007. “Finding Politics in the Silly and the Sacred: Anti-Rape Activism on Campus.” *Sociological Spectrum* 27(2):151–63.

Blee, Kathleen M. 2003. *Inside Organized Racism: Women in the Hate Movement*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Blocker, T. J., E. B. Rochford, and D. F. Sherkat. 1991. “Political Responses to Natural Hazards: Social Movement Participation Following a Flood Disaster.” *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 9(3):367–82.

Bogart, Laura M. and Sheryl Thorburn. 2006. “Relationship of African Americans’ Sociodemographic Characteristics to Belief in Conspiracies about HIV/AIDS and Birth Control.” *Journal of the National Medical Association* 98(7):1144–50.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2010. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bradley, James. 2010. *The Imperial Cruise: A Secret History of Empire and War*. Reprint edition. Back Bay Books.

Brinkley, Douglas. 2007. *The Great Deluge: Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans, and the Mississippi Gulf Coast*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Brown, Carol Necole and Serena M. Williams. 2007. “The Houses That Eminent Domain and Housing Tax Credits Built: Imagining a Better New Orleans.” *Fordham Urban Law Journal* 34:689.

Brown, Wendy. 1992. “Finding the Man in the State.” *Feminist Studies* 18(1):7–34.

Butcher, Jim. 2006. “A Response to Building a Decommodified Research Paradigm in Tourism: The Contribution of NGOs by Stephen Wearing, Matthew McDonald and Jess Ponting. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 13, No. 5, 2005: 424–455.” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 14(3):307–10.

Butcher, Jim and Peter Smith. 2010. “‘Making a Difference’: Volunteer Tourism and Development.” *Tourism Recreation Research* 35(1):27–36.

Card, Claudia. 2003. “Genocide and Social Death.” *Hypatia* 18(1):63–79.

Caron, Simone M. 1998. “Birth Control and the Black Community in the 1960s: Genocide or Power Politics?” *Journal of Social History* 31(3):545–69.

Carroll, Matthew S., Travis Paveglio, Pamela J. Jakes, and Lorie L. Higgins. 2011. “Nontribal Community Recovery from Wildfire Five Years Later: The Case of the Rodeo–Chediski Fire.” *Society & Natural Resources* 24(7):672–87.

Chalk, Frank Robert and Kurt Jonassohn. 1990. *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Chamlee-Wright, Emily and Virgil Henry Storr. 2009. “‘There’s No Place Like New Orleans’: Sense of Place and Community Recovery in the Ninth Ward After Hurricane Katrina.” *Journal of Urban Affairs* 31(5):615–634.

Choo, Hae Yeon and Myra Marx Ferree. 2010. “Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities.” *Sociological Theory* 28(2):129–149.

Churchill, Ward. 1997. *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Civil Rights Congress. 1951. *We Charge Genocide: The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government Against the Negro People*. edited by W. L. Patterson. New York: Civil Rights Congress.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990a. “Defining Black Feminist Thought.” Pp. 217–59 in *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*, edited by L. Nicholson. New York: Routledge.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990b. “Defining Black Feminist Thought.” Pp. 217–59 in *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*, edited by L. Nicholson. New York: Routledge.

Colten, C. E., R. W. Kates, and S. B. Laska. 2008. *Community Resilience: Lessons From New Orleans and Hurricane Katrina*. Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Retrieved January 8, 2014 (http://emergencyvolunteering.com.au/home/Resource%20Library/CR_lessons_H Katrina.pdf).

Combahee River Collective. 1997. “A Black Feminist Statement.” Pp. 63–70 in *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*, edited by L. Nicholson. New York: Routledge.

Connell, R. W. 2005. *Masculinities: Second Edition*. University of California Press.

Cooper, Allan D. 2012. “From Slavery to Genocide The Fallacy of Debt in Reparations Discourse.” *Journal of Black Studies* 43(2):107–26.

Crabtree, Robbin D. 1998. “Mutual Empowerment in Cross Cultural Participatory Development and Service Learning: Lessons in Communication and Social Justice from Projects in El Salvador and Nicaragua.” *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 26(2):182–209.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.” *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 139–67.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review* 43(6):1241–99.

Cress, Daniel M. 1997. “Nonprofit Incorporation Among Movements of the Poor:” *Sociological Quarterly* 38(2):343–60.

Daley, Ken. 2016. “Danziger Bridge Officers Pleading Guilty, Face 7 to 12 Years for Shooting.” *NOLA.com*. Retrieved March 25, 2017 (http://www.nola.com/crime/index.ssf/2016/04/danziger_bridge_plea_agreement. html).

Danielson, Emily. 2010. “Volunteerism in Crisis: AmeriCorps as Disaster Response.” *University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations*. Retrieved (http://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/1232).

Dardenne, Benoit, Muriel Dumont, and Thierry Bollier. 2007. "Insidious Dangers of Benevolent Sexism: Consequences for Women's Performance." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 93(5):764–79.

David, Emmanuel and Elaine Pitt Enarson. 2012. *The Women of Katrina: How Gender, Race, and Class Matter in an American Disaster*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Davis, Mike. 2005. "Gentrifying Disaster." *Mother Jones*. Retrieved January 8, 2014 (http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2005/10/gentrifying-disaster).

Delpit, Lisa. 2006. *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. 1 edition. New York: New Press, The.

Denissen, Amy M. 2010a. "Crossing the Line: How Women in the Building Trades Interpret and Respond to Sexual Conduct at Work." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 39(3):297–327.

Denissen, Amy M. 2010b. "The Right Tools for the Job: Constructing Gender Meanings and Identities in the Male-Dominated Building Trades." *Human Relations*. Retrieved November 25, 2015 (http://hum.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/03/10/0018726709349922).

Denissen, Amy M. and Abigail C. Saguy. 2014. "Gendered Homophobia and the Contradictions of Workplace Discrimination for Women in the Building Trades." *Gender & Society* 28(3):381–403.

Donato, Katharine M., Nicole Trujillo-Pagan, Carl L. Bankston III, and Audrey Singer. 2007. "Reconstructing New Orleans after Katrina: The Emergence of an Immigrant Labor Market." Pp. 217–34 in *The Sociology of Katrina: Perspectives on a Modern Catastrophe*, edited by D. L. Brunsma, D. Overfelt, and J. S. Picou. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dovidio, Jack F. and Samuel L. Gaertner. 2004. "Aversive Racism." Pp. 1–51 in *Advances in experimental social psychology*, vol. 36, edited by M. P. Zanna. San Diego , CA: Academic Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1920. "The Souls of White Folks." Pp. 17–29 in *Darkwater: Voices from Within the Veil*. Courier Corporation.

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1933. "Marxism and the Negro Problem." Pp. 28–53 in *W.E.B. Du Bois: A Reader*, edited by D. L. Lewis. New York: Henry Holt.

Dumont, Muriel, Marie Sarlet, and Benoit Dardenne. 2008. "Be Too Kind to a Woman, She'll Feel Incompetent: Benevolent Sexism Shifts Self-Construal and Autobiographical Memories Toward Incompetence." *Sex Roles* 62(7–8):545–53.

Dyson, Michael Eric. 2006. *Come Hell Or High Water: Hurricane Katrina and the Color of Disaster*. New York: Basic Books.

Eliasoph, Nina. 2013. *The Politics of Volunteering*. John Wiley & Sons.

Endres, Danielle and Mary Gould. 2009. "'I Am Also in the Position to Use My Whiteness to Help Them Out': The Communication of Whiteness in Service Learning." *Western Journal of Communication* 73(4):418–36.

Engels, Friedrich. 1892. *Origins of the Family: Private Property and the State*. New York: Penguin Books.

Enzi, Nadia. 2005. "Katrina: The Aftermath: Beware New Resettlement; Gentrification May Displace Black Residents." *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, September 15.

Epstein, Steven. 1997. "Specificities: AIDS Activism and the Retreat from the 'Genocide' Frame." *Social Identities* 3(3):415–38.

Erdely, Jennifer Lea. 2011. "When the Saints Go Marching In: An Ethnography of Volunteer Tourism in Post-Hurricane Katrina New Orleans." Retrieved March 20, 2014 (http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-04262011-104341/).

Espinoza, Cholene. 2006. *Through the Eye of the Storm: A Book Dedicated to Rebuilding What Katrina Washed Away*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Espiritu, Yen Le. 2003. *Home Bound: Filipino American Lives across Cultures, Communities, and Countries*. University of California Press.

Farrell, Walter C., Jr., Marvin P. Dawkins, and John Oliver. 1983. "Genocide Fears in a Rural Black Community: An Empirical Examination." *Journal of Black Studies* 14(1):49–67.

Faust, Kelly L. and David Kauzlarich. 2008. "Hurricane Katrina Victimization as a State Crime of Omission." *Critical Criminology* 16(2):85–103.

Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 2000. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. Basic Books.

Feliciano, Cynthia, Belinda Robnett, and Golnaz Komaie. 2009a. "Gendered Racial Exclusion among White Internet Daters." *Social Science Research* 38(1):39–54.

Feliciano, Cynthia, Belinda Robnett, and Golnaz Komaie. 2009b. "Gendered Racial Exclusion among White Internet Daters." *Social Science Research* 38(1):39–54.

Fenstermaker, Sarah and Candace West. 2002a. *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power, and Institutional Change*. New York: Routledge.

Fenstermaker, Sarah and Candace West. 2002b. *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power, and Institutional Change*. New York: Routledge.

Fenstermaker, Sarah, Candace West, and Don H. Zimmerman. 2009. "Gender Inequality: New Conceptual Terrain." in *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power, and Institutional Change*, edited by S. Fenstermaker and C. West. Routledge.

Finzsch, Norbert. 2008. "'Extirpate Or Remove That Vermine': Genocide, Biological Warfare, and Settler Imperialism in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century." *Journal of Genocide Research* 10(2):215–32.

Fisher, Tracy. 2006. "Race, Neoliberalism, and 'Welfare Reform' in Britain." *Social Justice* 33(3 (105)):54–65.

Fitzgerald, Louise F., Michele J. Gelfand, and Fritz Drasgow. 1995. "Measuring Sexual Harassment: Theoretical and Psychometric Advances." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 17(4):425–45.

Flaherty, Jordan. 2007. "Corporate Reconstruction and Grassroots Resistance." Pp. 100–119 in *What Lies Beneath: Katrina, Race, and the State of the Nation*, edited by South End Press. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.

Foner, Nancy. 2010. "The Social Construction of Race in Two Immigrant Eras." Pp. 194–207 in *Race in an Era of Change: A Reader*, edited by H. Dalmage and B. K. Rothman. New York: Oxford University Press.

Frankenberg, Ruth. 2008. "Whiteness as an 'Unmarked' Cultural Category." Pp. 81–87 in *The meaning of difference: American constructions of race, sex and gender, social class, sexual orientation, and disability*, edited by K. E. Rosenblum and T.-M. C. Travis. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Freudenburg, William R., Robert B. Gramling, Shirley Laska, and Kai Erikson. 2011. *Catastrophe in the Making: The Engineering of Katrina and the Disasters of Tomorrow*. 2nd edition. Washington: Island Press.

Furnham, A. 2001. "Self-Estimates of Intelligence: Culture and Gender Difference in Self and Other Estimates of Both General (G) and Multiple Intelligences." *Personality and Individual Differences* 31(8):1381–1405.

Fussell, Elizabeth and James R. Elliott. 2009. "Introduction: Social Organization of Demographic Responses to Disaster: Studying Population—Environment Interactions in the Case of Hurricane Katrina." *Organization & Environment* 22(4):379–94.

Gamble, V. N. 1997. "Under the Shadow of Tuskegee: African Americans and Health Care." *American Journal of Public Health* 87(11):1773–78.

Gans, Herbert J. 1999. "The Possibility of a New Racial Hierarchy in the Twenty-First Century United States." Pp. 371–90 in *The Cultural Territories of Race: Black and White Boundaries*, edited by M. Lamont. University of Chicago Press.

General Assembly of the United Nations. 1948. "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide." Retrieved January 7, 2014 (http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=a/res/260(III)).

Giroux, Henry A. 2006. "Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability." *College Literature* 33(3):171–96.

Glick, Peter and Susan T. Fiske. 2001. "An Ambivalent Alliance: Hostile and Benevolent Sexism as Complementary Justifications for Gender Inequality." *American Psychologist* 56(2):109–18.

GNOCDC. 2015. "Lower Ninth Ward | The Data Center." *Greater New Orleans Community Data Center*. Retrieved November 6, 2016 (http://www.datacenterresearch.org/data-resources/neighborhood-data/district-8/lower-ninth-ward/).

GNOCDC. 2016. "Neighborhood Recovery Rates: Growth Continues through 2016 in New Orleans Neighborhoods | The Data Center." *Greater New Orleans Community Data Center*. Retrieved November 6, 2016 (http://www.datacenterresearch.org/reports_analysis/neighborhood-recovery-rates-growth-continues-through-2016-in-new-orleans-neighborhoods/).

Gotham, Kevin Fox and Miriam Greenberg. 2008. "From 9/11 to 8/29: Post-Disaster Recovery and Rebuilding in New York and New Orleans." *Social Forces* 87(2):1039–62.

Greenebaum, Jessica. 2009. "'I'm Not an Activist!': Animal Rights vs. Animal Welfare in the Purebred Dog Rescue Movement." *Society & Animals* 17(4):289–304.

Grimm, Andy. 2016. "A Decade after Danziger Bridge Shooting, Killings Still Cast a Shadow." *NOLA.com*. Retrieved March 25, 2017 (http://www.nola.com/crime/index.ssf/2015/09/a_decade_after_shootings_danzi.html).

Guttentag, Daniel A. 2009. “The Possible Negative Impacts of Volunteer Tourism.” *International Journal of Tourism Research* 11(6):537–551.

Hartman, Chester W. and Gregory D. Squires. 2006. *There Is No Such Thing as a Natural Disaster: Race, Class, and Hurricane Katrina*. New York: Routledge.

Hartmann, Heidi. 1979. “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union.” *Capital & Class* 3(2):1–33.

Heath, Melanie. 2003. “Soft-Boiled Masculinity Renegotiating Gender and Racial Ideologies in the Promise Keepers Movement.” *Gender & Society* 17(3):423–44.

Heldman, Caroline. 2011. “Solidarity, Not Charity?: Issues of Privilege in Political Community Based Learning.” Pp. 33–42 in *Democratic Dilemmas of Teaching Service-Learning: Curricular Strategies for Success*, edited by C. M. Cress and D. M. Donahue. Sterling, Va.: Stylus Publishing.

Heldman, Caroline and Mackenzie Israel-Trummel. 2012. “The Double-Edged Sword of Disaster Volunteerism: A Study of New Orleans Rebirth Movement Participants.” *Journal of Political Science Education* 8(4):311–32.

Heynen, Nik. 2010. “Cooking up Non-Violent Civil-Disobedient Direct Action for the Hungry: ‘Food Not Bombs’ and the Resurgence of Radical Democracy in the US.” *Urban Studies* 47(6):1225–40.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. 2003. “Reconciliation Tourism: Tourism Healing Divided Societies!” *Special Issue: Volunteer Tourism* 28(3):35–44.

Higgins-Desbiolles, Freya. 2008. “Justice Tourism and Alternative Globalisation.” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 16(3):345–64.

Hilderbrand, Sue, Scott Crow, and Lisa Fithian. 2007. “Common Ground Relief.” Pp. 80–99 in *What Lies Beneath: Katrina, Race, and the State of the Nation*, edited by South End Press. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.

Hinton, Alexander Laban. 2002. *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Holmila, Marja. 1986. “Life Style Issues - Debate between Men and Women in the Finnish Trade Union Movement.” *Acta Sociologica* 29(1):3–12.

hooks, bell. 1981. *Ain’t I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. 2 edition. Routledge.

hooks, bell. 2000. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Pluto Press.

Hunter, Margaret. 2010. “The Beauty Queue: Advantages of Lighter Skin.” Pp. 83–93 in *Race in an Era of Change: A Reader*, edited by H. Dalmage and B. K. Rothman. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hurtado, Aida. 1997. *The Color of Privilege: Three Blasphemies on Race and Feminism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ilies, Remus, Nancy Hauserman, Susan Schwochau, and John Stibal. 2003. “Reported Incidence Rates of Work-Related Sexual Harassment in the United States: Using Meta-Analysis to Explain Reported Rate Disparities.” *Personnel Psychology* 56(3):607–31.

Incite! Women of Color Against Violence. 2007. *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.

Irons, Jenny. 1998. “The Shaping of Activist Recruitment and Participation: A Study of Women in the Mississippi Civil Rights Movement.” *Gender & Society* 12(6):692–709.

Jackson, Jesse. 2005. “Eased Out of the Big Easy.” *Chicago Sun-Times*, October 4. Retrieved January 8, 2014 (http://www.commondreams.org/views05/1004-24.htm).

James, Joy. 2007. “Political Literacy and Voice.” Pp. 157–66 in *What Lies Beneath: Katrina, Race, and the State of the Nation*, edited by South End Press. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.

James, Joy. 2009. “The Dead Zone: Stumbling at the Crossroads of Party Politics, Genocide, and Postracial Racism.” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 108(3):459–81.

Jenner, Jessica R. 1982. “Participation, Leadership, and the Role of Volunteerism Among Selected Women Volunteers.” *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 11(4):27–38.

Johnson, Cedric. 2011. *The Neoliberal Deluge: Hurricane Katrina, Late Capitalism, and the Remaking of New Orleans*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Johnson, Robert and Paul S. Leighton. 1995. “Black Genocide? Preliminary Thoughts on the Plight of America’s Poor Black Men.” *Journal of African American Men* 1(1):3–21.

Jones, Adam. 2000. “Gendercide and Genocide.” *Journal of Genocide Research* 2(2):185–211.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1993. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. Basic Books.

Keese, James R. 2011. “The Geography of Volunteer Tourism: Place Matters.” *Tourism Geographies* 13(2):257–79.

Kilianski, Stephen E. and Laurie A. Rudman. 1998. “Wanting It Both Ways: Do Women Approve of Benevolent Sexism?” *Sex Roles* 39(5–6):333–52.

Kim, Nadia Y. 2007. “Critical Thoughts on Asian American Assimilation in the Whitening Literature.” *Social Forces* 86(2):561–74.

Kimmel, Michael S. 2005. *The History of Men: Essays on the History of American and British Masculinities*. SUNY Press.

King, Eden B. et al. 2012. “Benevolent Sexism at Work Gender Differences in the Distribution of Challenging Developmental Experiences.” *Journal of Management* 38(6):1835–66.

Konik, Julie and Lilia M. Cortina. 2008. “Policing Gender at Work: Intersections of Harassment Based on Sex and Sexuality.” *Social Justice Research* 21(3):313–37.

Kromm, Chris and Sue Sturgis. 2008. *Hurricane Katrina and the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement: A Global Human Rights Perspective on a Natural Disaster*. Institute for Southern Studies and Southern Exposure. Retrieved January 8, 2014 (http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/events/2008/1/14%20disasters/0114_isskatrina.pdf).

Kuklinski, James H., Michael D. Cobb, and Martin Gilens. 1997. “Racial Attitudes and the ‘New South.’” *The Journal of Politics* 59(02):323–349.

Kuper, Leo. 1982. *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kurzdorfer, Max. 2012. “Anti-Trans Hatred in the Name of Feminism.” *Dissenting Voices* 1(1). Retrieved (http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/dissentingvoices/vol1/iss1/15).

Lee, Jennifer and Frank Bean. 2008. “America’s Changing Color Lines: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Multiracial Identification.” Pp. 87–94 in *The meaning of difference: American constructions of race, sex and gender, social class, sexual orientation, and disability*, edited by K. E. Rosenblum and T.-M. C. Travis. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lemkin, Raphael. 1944. *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress*. The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd.

Leong, Karen J., Christopher A. Airriess, Wei Li, Angela Chia-Chen Chen, and Verna M. Keith. 2007. "Resilient History and the Rebuilding of a Community: The Vietnamese American Community in New Orleans East." *The Journal of American History* 94(3):770–79.

Leskinen, Emily A. and Lilia M. Cortina. 2013. "Dimensions of Disrespect Mapping and Measuring Gender Harassment in Organizations." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 0361684313496549.

Levene, Mark. 2008. *The Meaning of Genocide*. New York: I. B. Tauris.

Lippman, Matthew. 2002. "A Road Map to the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime Genocide." *Journal of Genocide Research* 4(2):177–95.

Lipsitz, George. 2006. *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics, Revised and Expanded Edition*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lopez, Ian F.Haney. 1994. "Social Construction of Race: Some Observations on Illusion, Fabrication, and Choice, The." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 29:1.

Louis, Andrea. 2009. "'Pandas, Lions, and Dragons, Oh My!' How White Adoptive Parents Construct Chineseness." *Journal of Asian American Studies* 12(3):285–320.

Lucal, Betsy. 1999. "WHAT IT MEANS TO BE GENDERED ME Life on the Boundaries of a Dichotomous Gender System." *Gender & Society* 13(6):781–97.

Luft, Rachel E. 2008a. "Looking for Common Ground: Relief Work in Post-Katrina New Orleans as an American Parable of Race and Gender Violence." *NWSA Journal* 20(3):5–31.

Luft, Rachel E. 2008b. "Looking for Common Ground: Relief Work in Post-Katrina New Orleans as an American Parable of Race and Gender Violence." *NWSA Journal* 20(3):5–31.

Luft, Rachel E. 2009. "Beyond Disaster Exceptionalism: Social Movement Developments in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina." *American Quarterly* 61(3):499–527.

MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1979. *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination*. Yale University Press.

MacKinnon, Catherine. 1982. “Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory.” *Signs* 7(3):515–44.

Mananzala, Rickke and Dean Spade. 2008. “The Nonprofit Industrial Complex and Trans Resistance.” *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* 5(1):53–71.

Martin, Patricia Yancey. 2003. “‘Said and Done’ Versus ‘Saying and Doing’: Gendering Practices, Practicing Gender at Work.” *Gender & Society* 17(3):342–66.

Marty, D. 1998. “White Antiracist Rhetoric as Apologia: Wendell Berry’s The Hidden Wound.” Pp. 51–68 in *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by T. K. Nakayama and J. N. Martin. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Marullo, Sam and Bob Edwards. 2000. “From Charity to Justice The Potential of University-Community Collaboration for Social Change.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5):895–912.

Mattis, Jacqueline S. et al. 2000. “Religiosity, Volunteerism, and Community Involvement Among African American Men: An Exploratory Analysis.” *Journal of Community Psychology* 28(4):391–406.

McAdam, Doug. 1990. *Freedom Summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McCall, Leslie. 2005. “The Complexity of Intersectionality.” *Signs* 30(3):1771–1800.

McCarthy, Brendan and A. C. Thompson. 2010. “Man Indicted for Alleged Racial Attack in Post-Katrina New Orleans.” *ProPublica*. Retrieved January 8, 2014 (http://www.propublica.org/article/charges-filed-in-post-katrina-shooting).

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. “Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory.” *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6):1212–41.

McClure, Molly. 2006. “Solidarity Not Charity: Racism in Katrina Relief Work.” *Infoshop News*.

McCorkel, Jill A. and Kristen Myers. 2003. “What Difference Does Difference Make? Position and Privilege in the Field.” *Qualitative Sociology* 26(2):199–231.

McGehee, Nancy Gard. 2012. “Oppression, Emancipation, and Volunteer Tourism: Research Propositions.” *Annals of Tourism Research* 39(1):84–107.

McIntosh, Peggy. 2007. “White Privilege and Male Privilege.” Pp. 377–84 in *Race, ethnicity, and gender: selected readings*, edited by J. F. Healey and E. O’Brien. Los Angeles: Pine Forge Press.

McIntyre, Alice. 1997. *Making Meaning of Whiteness: Exploring Racial Identity with White Teachers*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

McLaughlin, Heather, Christopher Uggen, and Amy Blackstone. 2012. "Sexual Harassment, Workplace Authority, and the Paradox of Power." *American Sociological Review* 77(4):625–47.

McPherson, J.Miller and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1982. "Women and Weak Ties: Differences by Sex in the Size of Voluntary Organizations." *American Journal of Sociology* 87(4):883–904.

McPherson, J.Miller and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1986. "Sex Segregation in Voluntary Associations." *American Sociological Review* 51(1):61–79.

Merriam, Sharan B. et al. 2001. "Power and Positionality: Negotiating Insider/Outsider Status within and across Cultures." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 20(5):405–16.

Mesch, Debra J., Patrick M. Rooney, Kathryn S. Steinberg, and Brian Denton. 2006. "The Effects of Race, Gender, and Marital Status on Giving and Volunteering in Indiana." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 35(4):565–87.

Meyer, David S. and Nancy Whittier. 1994. "Social Movement Spillover." *Social Problems* 41(2):277–98.

Min, Pyong Gap and Chigon Kim. 2009. "Patterns of Intermarriages and Cross-Generational In-Marriages among Native-Born Asian Americans." *The International Migration Review* 43(3):447–70.

Mirande, Alfredo. 2006. "Alfredo's Caribbean Adventure: Latcrit Theory, Narratives, and the Politics of Exclusion." *Chicano-Latino Law Review* 26:207.

Morales, Erica. 2012. "Parental Messages Concerning Latino/Black Interracial Dating: An Exploratory Study among Latina/O Young Adults." *Latino Studies* 10(3):314–33.

Moses, A.Dirk. 2008. *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Moses, A.Dirk and Alexander Hinton, eds. 2008. "Savages, Subjects, and Sovereigns: Conjunctions of Modernity, Genocide, and Colonialism." Pp. 440–60 in *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Muhammad, Saladin. 2006. “Hurricane Katrina: The Black Nation’s 9/11! A Strategic Perspective for Self-Determination.” *Socialism and Democracy* 20(2):3–17.

National Park Service. n.d. “State, Tribal, and Local Plans & Grants.” Retrieved February 16, 2017 (https://www.nps.gov/preservation-grants/civil-rights/).

Neuhouser, Kevin. 1995. “‘Worse Than Men’: Gendered Mobilization in an Urban Brazilian Squatter Settlement, 1971-91.” *Gender & Society* 9(1):38–59.

Neville, Helen A., Roderick L. Lilly, Georgia Duran, Richard M. Lee, and LaVonne Browne. 2000. “Construction and Initial Validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS).” *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 47(1):59–70.

NORA. 2009. “NORA Glossary | NORA: The New Orleans Redevelopment Authority.” Retrieved January 8, 2014 (http://www.noraworks.org/glossary).

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. 2nd printing, edition. Duke University Press Books.

Padín, José Antonio. 2010. “The Normative Mulattoes: The Press, Latinos, and the Racial Climate on the Moving Immigration Frontier.” Pp. 327–42 in *Race in an Era of Change: A Reader*, edited by H. Dalmage and B. K. Rothman. New York: Oxford University Press.

Painter, Nell Irvin. 2010. *The History of White People*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Parker, Charles F., Eric K. Stern, Eric Paglia, and Christer Brown. 2009. “Preventable Catastrophe? The Hurricane Katrina Disaster Revisited.” *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* 17(4):206–20.

Pateman, Carol. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Perea, Juan F. 1997. “The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The ‘Normal Science’ of American Racial Thought.” *California Law Review* 85(5):1213–58.

Phillips, Brenda. 2009. *Disaster Recovery*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Phillips, Brenda. 2014. *Mennonite Disaster Service: Building a Therapeutic Community after the Gulf Coast Storms*.

Phillips, Brenda and Pamela Jenkins. 2010. “The Roles of Faith-Based Organizations after Hurricane Katrina.” Pp. 215–38 in *Helping families and communities recover from disaster: Lessons learned from hurricane Katrina and its aftermath*,

edited by R. P. Kilmer, V. Gil-Rivas, R. G. Tedeschi, and L. G. Calhoun. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Pierce, Chester M. 1995. "Stress Analogs of Racism and Sexism: Terrorism, Torture, and Disaster." Pp. 277–96 in *Mental Health Racism And Sexism*, edited by C. V. Willie. University of Pittsburgh Pre.

Piotrkowski, Chaya S. 1998. "Gender Harassment, Job Satisfaction, and Distress Among Employed White and Minority Women." *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 3(1):33–43.

Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:283–305.

Popielarz, Pamela A. 1999. "(In)Voluntary Association: A Multilevel Analysis of Gender Segregation in Voluntary Organizations." *Gender & Society* 13(2):234–50.

Poppendieck, Janet. 1999. *Sweet Charity?: Emergency Food and the End of Entitlement.* New York: Penguin.

Pyke, Karen. 2010. "An Intersectional Approach to Resistance and Complicity: The Case of Racialised Desire among Asian American Women." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31(1):81–94.

Pyke, Karen D. 1996. "CLASS-BASED MASCULINITIES The Interdependence of Gender, Class, and Interpersonal Power." *Gender & Society* 10(5):527–49.

Rabelo, Verónica Caridad and Lilia M. Cortina. 2014. "Two Sides of the Same Coin: Gender Harassment and Heterosexist Harassment in LGBQ Work Lives." *Law and Human Behavior* 38(4):378–91.

Ramirez, Hernan and Edward Flores. 2013. "Latino Masculinities in the Post-9/11 Era." Pp. 32–40 in *Men's Lives*, edited by M. S. Kimmel and M. A. Messner. Boston: Pearson.

Ray, R. and A. C. Korteweg. 1999. "Women's Movements in the Third World: Identity, Mobilization, and Autonomy." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:47–71.

Raymond, Eliza Marguerite and C.Michael Hall. 2008. "The Development of Cross-Cultural (Mis)Understanding Through Volunteer Tourism." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 16(5):530–43.

Reese, Ellen. 2005. *Backlash against Welfare Mothers: Past and Present.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reese, Ellen and Elvia Ramirez. 2002. “The New Ethnic Politics of Welfare: Struggles Over Legal Immigrants’ Rights to Welfare in California.” *Journal of Poverty* 6(3):29–62.

Reitan, Ruth. 2007. *Global Activism*. New York: Routledge.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2009. “Framed Before We Know It How Gender Shapes Social Relations.” *Gender & Society* 23(2):145–60.

Risman, Barbara J. 2009. “From Doing to Undoing: Gender as We Know It.” *Gender and Society* 23(1):81–84.

Rochford, E.Burke and T.Jean Blocker. 1991. “Coping with ‘Natural’ Hazards as Stressors The Predictors of Activism in a Flood Disaster.” *Environment and Behavior* 23(2):171–94.

Rodes, Sanja. 2014. “Make It Right: The Agency of Architecture in the Image.” Retrieved November 6, 2016 (http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/handle/10072/61445).

Rodríguez, Dylan. 2007. “The Meaning of ‘Disaster’: Under the Dominance of White Life.” Pp. 133–56 in *What Lies Beneath: Katrina, Race, and the State of the Nation*, edited by South End Press. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.

Rodríguez, Dylan. 2011. “The Black Presidential Non-Slave: Genocide and the Present Tense of Racial Slavery.” *Political Power and Social Theory* 22:17–50.

Roediger, David. 2006. *Working Toward Whiteness: How America’s Immigrants Became White*. New York: Basic Books.

Roth, Benita. 2004. *Separate Roads to Feminism: Black, Chicana, and White Feminist Movements in America’s Second Wave*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Rotolo, Thomas and John Wilson. 2007. “The Effects of Children and Employment Status on the Volunteer Work of American Women.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 36(3):487–503.

Schaller, Dominik J. and Ju¨rgen Zimmerer. 2008. “Settlers, Imperialism, Genocide: Seeing the Global Without Ignoring the Local—Introduction.” *Journal of Genocide Research* 10(2):191–99.

Schlozman, Kay Lehman, Nancy Burns, and Sidney Verba. 1994. “Gender and the Pathways to Participation: The Role of Resources.” *The Journal of Politics* 56(04):963–90.

Sharkey, Patrick. 2007. “Survival and Death in New Orleans: An Empirical Look at the Human Impact of Katrina.” *Journal of Black Studies* 37(4):482–501.

Shaw, Martin. 2007. *What Is Genocide?* Polity.

Sheets, Gary. 2007. “N.O. Tear-down Law Is Raising Questions.” *NOLA.com*. Retrieved January 8, 2014 (http://blog.nola.com/topnews/2007/05/no_teardown_law_is_raising_que.html).

Shope, Janet Hinson. 2006. “‘You Can’t Cross a River Without Getting Wet’ A Feminist Standpoint on the Dilemmas of Cross-Cultural Research.” *Qualitative Inquiry* 12(1):163–84.

Silverschanz, Perry, Lilia M. Cortina, Julie Konik, and Vicki J. Magley. 2007. “Slurs, Snubs, and Queer Jokes: Incidence and Impact of Heterosexist Harassment in Academia.” *Sex Roles* 58(3–4):179–91.

Sojo, Victor E., Robert E. Wood, and Anna E. Genat. 2016. “Harmful Workplace Experiences and Women’s Occupational Well-Being A Meta-Analysis.” *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 40(1):10–40.

South End Press, ed. 2007. *What Lies Beneath: Katrina, Race, and the State of the Nation*. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press.

Stall, Susan and Randy Stoecker. 1998. “Community Organizing Or Organizing Community? Gender and the Crafts of Empowerment.” *Gender & Society* 12(6):729–56.

Staples, Robert. 1987. “Black Male Genocide: A Final Solution to the Race Problem in America.” *The Black Scholar* 18(3):2–11.

Stephens, Kevin U.Sr et al. 2007. “Excess Mortality in the Aftermath of Hurricane Katrina: A Preliminary Report.” *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness* 1(01):15–20.

Sue, Derald Wing et al. 2007. “Racial Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Implications for Clinical Practice.” *The American Psychologist* 62(4):271–86.

Swanson, David A., Jerome N. McKibben, Lynn Womhold, Richard G. Forgette, and Mark V. Van Boening. 2009. “The Demographic Effects of Katrina: An Impact Analysis Perspective.” *The Open Demography Journal* 2:36–46.

Taniguchi, Hiromi. 2006. “Men’s and Women’s Volunteering: Gender Differences in the Effects of Employment and Family Characteristics.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 35(1):83–101.

Taylor, Verta and Leila J. Rupp. 1993. “Women’s Culture and Lesbian Feminist Activism: A Reconsideration of Cultural Feminism.” *Signs* 19(1):32–61.

Thomas, S. B. and S. C. Quinn. 1991. “The Tuskegee Syphilis Study, 1932 to 1972: Implications for HIV Education and AIDS Risk Education Programs in the Black Community.” *American Journal of Public Health* 81(11):1498–1505.

Thompson, A. C., Brendan McCarthy, and Laura Maggi. 2009a. “Did New Orleans SWAT Cops Shoot an Unarmed Man?” *ProPublica*. Retrieved March 25, 2017 (https://www.propublica.org/nola/story/did-new-orleans-swat-cops-shoot-an-unarmed-man-1215).

Thompson, A. C., Brendan McCarthy, and Laura Maggi. 2009b. “New Orleans Police Department Shootings after Katrina under Scrutiny.” *NOLA.com*. Retrieved March 25, 2017 (http://www.nola.com/crime/law_and_disorder/index.ssf/2009/12/nopd_acts_under_fire.html).

Thorne, Barrie. 1975. “Women in the Draft Resistance Movement.” *Sex Roles* 1(2):179–95.

Tiehen, Laura. 2000. “Has Working More Caused Married Women to Volunteer Less? Evidence from Time Diary Data, 1965 to 1993.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 29(4):505–29.

Totten, Samuel and Paul R. Bartrop. 2009. *The Genocide Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Totten, Samuel, William S. Parsons, and Robert K. Hitchcock. 2002. “Confronting Genocide and Ethnocide of Indigenous Peoples: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Definition, Intervention, Prevention, and Advocacy.” Pp. 54–91 in *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, edited by A. L. Hinton. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tourism Research and Marketing. 2008. *Volunteer Tourism: A Global Analysis*. Retrieved January 10, 2014 (http://www.atlas-webshop.org/epages/61492534.sf/en_GB/?ObjectPath=/Shops/61492534/Products/ATL_00073).

Turner, C. and W. A. Darity. 1973. “Fears of Genocide Among Black Americans as Related to Age, Sex, and Region.” *American Journal of Public Health* 63(12):1029–34.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2016. “Volunteering in the United States, 2015.” Retrieved August 11, 2016 (http://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm).

U.S. Census Bureau. 2014. “New Orleans (City) QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau.” Retrieved January 8, 2015 (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/22/2255000.html).

U.S. EEOC, U. S.Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. n.d. “Sexual Harassment.” Retrieved August 11, 2016 (https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual_harassment.cfm).

Van Schaack, Beth. 1997. “The Crime of Political Genocide: Repairing the Genocide Convention’s Blind Spot.” *Yale Law Journal* 106:2259.

Van Slyke, D. M. and S. Eschholz. 2002a. “Are Women More Generous Than Men? Gender Differences in Motivations for Charitable Giving.” Montreal, Canada.

Van Slyke, D. M. and S. Eschholz. 2002b. *New Evidence about Women and Philanthropy: Findings from Metro Atlanta*. United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta Women’s Legacy Project. Retrieved January 12, 2014 (http://aysps.gsu.edu/publications/womensphilanthropy.pdf).

Vargas, João Helion Costa. 2008. *Never Meant to Survive: Genocide and Utopias in Black Diaspora Communities*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Incorporated.

Vescio, Theresa K., Sarah J. Gervais, Mark Snyder, and Ann Hoover. 2005. “Power and the Creation of Patronizing Environments: The Stereotype-Based Behaviors of the Powerful and Their Effects on Female Performance in Masculine Domains.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88(4):658–72.

Villenas, S. 1996. “The Colonizer/Colonized Chicana Ethnographer : Identity, Marginalization, and Co-Optation in the Field.” *Harvard Educational Review* 66(4):711–31.

Wagner, Peter and Susan Edwards. 2006. “New Orleans by the Numbers | Dollars & Sense.” *Dollars & Sense*. Retrieved January 10, 2014 (http://www.dollarsandsense.org/archives/2006/0306wagneredwards.html).

Walsh, Edward J. 1988. *Democracy in the Shadows: Citizen Mobilization in the Wake of the Accident at Three Mile Island*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Warren, John T. and Kathy Hytten. 2004. “The Faces of Whiteness: Pitfalls and the Critical Democrat.” *Communication Education* 53(4):321–39.

Watson, Harry. 2008. “Front Porch.” *Southern Cultures* 14(2):1–5.

Wearing, Stephen and Nancy Gard McGehee. 2013. "Volunteer Tourism: A Review." *Tourism Management* 38:120–30.

Weisbord, Robert G. 1973. "Birth Control and the Black American: A Matter of Genocide?" *Demography* 10(4):571–90.

Welsh, Sandy. 1999. "Gender and Sexual Harassment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:169–90.

West, Candace and Donald H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2):125–51.

Whittier, Nancy. 2011. *Politics of Child Sexual Abuse: Emotion, Social Movements, and the State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willhelm, Sidney M. 1986. "The Economic Demise of Blacks in America: A Prelude to Genocide?" *Journal of Black Studies* 17(2):201–54.

Wilson, John. 2000a. "Volunteering." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:215–40.

Wilson, John. 2000b. "Volunteering." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:215–40.

Wolensky, Robert P. 1979. "Toward a Broader Conceptualization of Volunteerism in Disaster." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 8(3–4):33–42.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2008. "Structure and Event: Settler Colonialism, Time, and the Question of Genocide." Pp. 102–32 in *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*, edited by A. D. Moses. New York: Berghahn Books.

Wu, Frank H. 2003. *Yellow: Race in America Beyond Black and White*. New York: Basic Books.

Wymer, Walter W. and Sridhar Samu. 2002. "Volunteer Service as Symbolic Consumption: Gender and Occupational Differences in Volunteering." *Journal of Marketing Management* 18(9–10):971–89.

Xie, Yu and Kimberly A. Goyette. n.d. "A Demographic Portrait of Asian Americans." Pp. 415–46 in *The American People: Census 2000*, edited by R. Farley and J. Haaga. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Younge, Gary. 2006. "Big Business Sees a Chance for Ethnic and Class Cleansing : Black and Poor Residents Are Excluded from the City Elections and They're Still Finding Bodies, but America Has Lost Interest." *The Guardian (London)*, April 20.

Zavella, Patricia. 1987. *Women's Work and Chicano Families: Cannery Workers of the Santa Clara Valley*. 1st edition. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Zhou, Min. 2004. "Are Asian Americans Becoming 'White?'" *Contexts* 3(1):29–37.

Zinn, Maxine Baca. 1979. "Field Research in Minority Communities: Ethical, Methodological and Political Observations by an Insider." *Social Problems* 27(2):209–19.

Zinn, Maxine Baca and Bonnie Thornton Dill. 1996. "Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism." *Feminist Studies* 22(2):321–31.