Las Vegas Locals as Gamblers and Hosts to Visiting Friends and Family: Characteristics and Gaming Behavior

Rachel S. Shinnar
Cheri A. Young
David. L. Corsun

Abstract

Local gamblers are an important market segment for casino marketers providing a reliable source of revenue during slow periods. This paper presents selected gaming behavior of local residents in the Las Vegas area, linking socio-demographic characteristics with gaming behavior. In addition, this article examines the relationships of Las Vegas area locals and their visiting friends and family members in two aspects. First, we identified the influence local residents have on visiting friends and family in terms of recommendations made regarding gambling in general and specific gaming locations. Second, this article describes how visiting friends and family influence local residents in terms of gaming behavior and additional spending.

Key Words: Las Vegas, local gamblers, visiting friends and family, casino gambling

Introduction

The impact of local residents on casino revenue has long been recognized. In Nevada, casinos pay considerable attention to this market segment. Some casinos even categorize themselves as locals' casinos and cater almost exclusively to this group, offering customized promotions targeting local residents (Compton & Dancer, 2004). In the following, we provide a profile of Las Vegas area local gamblers and their gaming behavior. Local gamblers are also important in relation to the visiting friends and relatives sector extensively studied in tourism. We examine the influence local gamblers may have on the gaming behavior of visiting friends and relatives. In addition, the impact—in terms of gambling expenses—that visiting friends and relatives have on their host is also discussed. Our findings are based on phone interviews conducted with over 1000 households in Clark County, Nevada, during 2001. This paper reports on only the gaming related segment of a large scale study examining the behaviors of visiting friends and family and their influence on their hosts' tourist-like behaviors in a variety of activities. We compare our data with a national study of casino gamblers conducted by a major casino corporation, Harrah's Entertainment, Inc. and a local study conducted by the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA).

A look at Clark County gambling geography may be essential at this point to understand the locals' gambling phenomenon. The most famous area in Las Vegas, The Strip, comprises the portion of Las Vegas Boulevard where the casino megaresorts are located (e.g., MGM Grand, The Venetian, Caesar's Palace, Bellagio, Mandalay Bay). The Strip—referred to in this paper also as Las Vegas Boulevard or The Strip Corridor—is a tourist mecca, enjoyed by locals mainly for sightseeing, fine dining, and shows. A

Rachel S. Shinnar, Ph.D.
Appalachian State University
Walker College of Business
Department of Management
ASU Box 32089
Boone, NC 28608-2089
(828) 262-7314
shinnarrs@appstate.edu

Cheri A. Young, Ph.D.
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
4505 Maryland Parkway
Box 456021
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-6021
(702) 895-4124
cyoung@ccmail.nevada.edu

David L. Corsun, Ph.D.
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
4505 Maryland Parkway
Box 456021
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-6021
(702) 895-4967
dcorsun@ccmail.nevada.edu

second area, known as Downtown, lies within the corporate boundaries of Las Vegas City and is populated by fewer, older, more modest hotel/casinos that are also tourist oriented. The Boulder Strip stands for Boulder Highway, a thoroughfare East of The Strip that runs through several cities and county areas where many of the so-called locals' casinos are located. Locals' casinos can also be found in additional areas throughout Las Vegas, the City of North Las Vegas, City of Henderson and surrounding county, and Las Vegas valley locations.

Importance of the Local Market

Local residents, combined with the constant influx of new residents into the Las Vegas valley, represent a lucrative market segment for the casino industry. This market is a profitable niche because it is relatively "immune to the fluctuations of The Strip, which is dependent upon tourism and the health of the national and world economies" (Weissenstein, 1999, p. 1A). Bojanic and Voli (1992) add that "factors such as increasing inflation levels, erosion of real income and high fuel prices (or fuel shortages) can greatly affect the willingness of consumers to fly or drive great distances to a tourist destination" (p. 46). The near-home traveler is less sensitive to such fluctuations in fuel prices, providing "a consistent customer base and predictable revenues" (Anderson, 1998, p. 124), and should therefore not be overlooked in marketing efforts. In addition, local customers can help casinos generate income during slow periods in the tourist season (F. Razuk, personal communication, April 14, 2004). For example, during a summer—a traditionally slower season in the city—many casinos offer special promotions, from car and cash giveaways to gas cards, based on slot play (Compton & Dancer, 2004).

Some casino companies focus a large part of their marketing efforts on the local market. Station Casinos Inc., for example, owns and operates many casinos throughout the valley, none of which are on The Strip. This company caters exclusively to local gamblers and claims to control about 45% of the local market (Weissenstein, 1999). Numerous casinos pursue this market, competing among each other to attract local residents (Burns, 2002). These locals' casinos are spread throughout the valley, increasing their competitiveness based on location and by offering "Las Vegas area residents easier access to newer facilities than [those] available, for instance, in Downtown Las Vegas" (Roehl, 1998).

Roehl (1998) examined the changes in the casino industry in Nevada. He believes that the "geographic spread of casinos, combined with the dominance of ubiquitous coin-operated devices, may change the casino product from a specialty good to a convenience good" (p. 39). Given the growth in supply, which causes market areas to become smaller, Roehl (1998) believes that local gamblers will typically pick the closest casino. These changes require casino-marketing executives to become more aware of "traditional market factors, such as product mix, location advantage, pricing policy, etc." (Roehl, 1998, p. 39). In the face of such increased competition, the local sector may gain even more importance for casino marketers.

Local customers can help casinos generate income during slow periods in the tourist season.

Given the potential importance of the local gambler to casino revenues, learning more about local gamblers and their gambling preferences could be beneficial to casino marketers. In addition, the ability of local gamblers to influence the choices made by visiting friends and family, in terms of gambling activity, could also benefit casinos that attract these locals. For this reason, we chose to study the characteristics and gaming behaviors of local gamblers. To add to existing knowledge, we examined the ways in which local gamblers influence the gambling behavior of visiting friends and family. Furthermore, we looked into the reverse effect as well, namely that of visiting friends and family influencing the casino related spending behaviors of local gamblers.

Methodology

Our findings are based on a large-scale study conducted in the Las Vegas metropolitan area between January 2000 and January 2001. This study consisted of structured phone interviews, conducted in four waves, to account for seasonal variability. Professional telephone interviewers from the Cannon Research Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas conducted the interviews. The head of household was asked to reply to interview questions, which took approximately 20 minutes to answer. Questions examined a variety of activities local residents engage in when hosting visiting friends and family. Respondents were randomly selected using a random-digit-dial sample of Clark County households. Each wave consisted of approximately 250 households during the months of January, April, July, and October. Calls were made until the target number of households agreed to participate, which resulted in a total sample of 1109 participants. This paper presents only the findings related to gaming behavior of the local resident. First, we present the findings related to individuals categorized as gamblers, and compare their behaviors to those categorized as non-gamblers. Second, we discuss the influence of gamblers on the gaming behaviors of visiting friends and relatives and vice versa.

Identifying Local Gamblers

Harrah's annual survey of casino gamblers (2002) defined a casino gambler as someone who indicated he or she had gambled in a casino during the past 12 months. Based on this definition, and on the way our data were coded, we identified casino gamblers as those who participated in legalized gambling twice a year or more. This resulted in a total of 678 individuals, or 61.1%, of our respondents being categorized as gamblers (see Table 1). The LVCVA study, which consisted of 1,200 interviews, categorized a slightly higher percentage of locals as gamblers, 69% (Simpson, 2003), possibly because in this study, individuals who gambled less frequently than twice a year were also considered as gamblers. The gambling frequency in the LVCVA study showed that 26% gambled twice a week or more, 17% gambled once a week, 36% gambled once or twice a month, and 20% played less than once a month (LVCVA, 2001/2002, p. 14).

Table 1
Gambling Behavior

Gambling Occurrence	Frequency	Percent
1 More than 5 times a week	36	5.3%
2 About twice a week	105	15.5%
3 About once a week	117	17.3%
4 About twice a month	112	16.5%
5 About once a month	108	15.9%
6 About once every two months	48	7.1%
7 About 4 times a year	77	11.4%
8 About twice a year	75	11.0%
Total	678	100.0%

Our data indicate that the majority of the local gamblers play in casinos located on the Boulder Strip (24.4%) and other locations throughout the valley (47.7%) rather than on The Strip (18.7%) or Downtown (9.2%). This is similar to the LVCVA study findings, which show The Strip corridor and Downtown (16% and 6%, respectively) to be less popular gambling destinations among locals, than the Boulder Strip (17%) and other locations throughout the valley (58%) (LVCVA, 2001/2002, p. 24). Similarly, Simpson (2003) reported 84% of resident gamblers prefer off-strip locations when going out to gamble. The locations identified in our study as places where local players played ***aside*** from The Strip, Downtown or the Boulder Strip included: Station Casinos (18.3%), local bars or grocery stores (8.4%) and a neighborhood casino in respondents' area of residence (29.5%). This is somewhat different from the findings of the LVCVA study, which found that 33% of local gamblers played, at least occasionally, in convenience stores, grocery stores, or gas stations and 30% played, at least occasionally, in local bars or restaurants (LVCVA, 2001/2002, p. 6).

Most respondents (57%) in our study reported having a particular casino where they played more frequently than others. Those who identified a favorite casino mentioned various casinos that are part of the Station Casinos group (45.6%) and other locations in the valley (35.3%); casinos that are on The Strip corridor (10.6%) and Downtown (8.5%) were less popular. Similar findings were presented by the LVCVA study, which identified the casinos played at most frequently as being located in outlying areas (48%) followed by The Strip corridor (21%), Boulder Strip (20%) and finally Downtown (3%).

Demographic Profile

Of the individuals identified as gamblers 60.5% were female, 47.7% were employed full-time, 31.3% were retired and 21% were either employed part-time, unemployed or students. Approximately 71.8% were homeowners—higher than the 60.9% home ownership rate for the state of Nevada. In addition, 60.5% of the respondents were married, 20.9% were single, 8.3% were divorced/separated and 10.3% were widowed. Only 39.2% of the respondents had children living at home and their average length of residence in Las Vegas was 14.4 years (standard deviation: 13 years, median: 10 years). The racial and ethnic categories included 79.1% White/Caucasian, 6% Black/African American, 7.7% Hispanic, 4.7% Asian and 1.8% other. This appears to be similar to the racial distribution in Nevada overall, which is 65.2% Non-Hispanic White, 6.8% African American, 4.5% Asian and 19.7% Hispanic (see Table 2), with the exception of the Hispanic population which appears to be under-represented in our sample. It is possible that Hispanic gamblers were underrepresented because the phone interviews were conducted in English and individuals with limited English proficiency may have declined participation.

Table 2
Racial and Ethnic Categories

Category	Our Sample	Nevada
White/Caucasian (Non-Hispanic White)	79.5%	65.2%
Black/African American	6.1%	6.8%
Hispanic	7.7%	19.7%
Asian	4.7%	4.5%
Other	2.0%	3.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

In terms of education, 40% of our sample had no college education, 20.8% had some college, 32.5% were college graduates and 6.7% held a post-graduate degree. This represents a slightly different picture from the national demographics of casino gamblers presented in the Harrah's study (2002). In this study, 48% had no college education, 27% had some college, 16% were college graduates and 9% held a post-graduate degree. The educational attainment figures for the state of Nevada are: 48.6% high school graduates or less, 27% have some college, 18.3% have an associate or Bachelor's degree, and 6.1% have post-graduate work (Census Bureau, 2000). According to these figures, it appears that the Las Vegas local gambler has a higher than average educational attainment level when compared to the overall population in Nevada as well as the national figures for gamblers as presented in Harrah's study (2002). For a tabulated comparison, see Table 3.

Table 3
Educational Attainment Comparisons

Category	Our Sample	Harrah's study (2002)	Nevada
No college education	40.0%	48%	48.6%
Some college	20.8%	27%	27.0%
College Educated	39.2%	25%	24.4%
Undergraduate degree	32.5%	16%	18.3%
Post graduate degree	6.7%	9%	6.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The age distribution of our sample is presented in Table 4 and the yearly household income before taxes in Table 5. According to the 2000 Census, the median household income in Nevada was $44,581, which appears to be somewhat higher than our sample.

Table 4
Age Groups

Age Group	Frequency	Percent
18-24	31	4.5%
26-34	105	15.6%
35-44	140	20.8%
45-54	136	20.2%
55-64	115	17.1%
65 and over	146	21.8%
Total	673	100.0%

Table 5
Yearly Household Income

Income Category	Frequency	Percent
$10,000 or less	50	7.4%
$10,001- $20,000	37	5.5%
$20,001- $30,000	68	10.0%
$30,001- $40,000	73	10.8%
$40,001- $50,000	47	6.9%
$50,001- $60,000	61	9.0%
$60,001- $70,000	45	6.6%
$70,001- $80,000	38	5.6%
$80,001 and over	117	17.3%
Total	536	100.0%

Gaming Behavior

Because information regarding individual spending on gambling was not available to us, we focused our discussion on gambling frequency. In the following, we present our findings regarding the relationship of various demographic characteristics with gambling frequency.

We found no relationship between gaming frequency and education level, gender, income, home ownership, or ethnicity. Significant group differences, however, were identified among the various age groups, whether respondents had children living with them or not, and between the marital status groups of married versus widowed individuals. Our findings were as follows: we found significant differences in gaming frequency among the different age groups, $F(6,669)=8.508$, $p<0.001$ (see Table 6). Gamblers aged 65 or older and those between 55 and 64 years of age played significantly more frequently than those who were younger than 44 years of age. Those between 45 and 54 years of age played significantly more frequently than those who were between the ages of 25 and 44. Finally, those between 35 and 44 years of age played significantly less frequently than those who were older than 45 years of age. Similarly, the LVCVA's study shows that "older residents (aged 50 or older), tend to gamble more often than younger residents (under 50 years old)" (p. 14). Not surprisingly, this study also found retired individuals to be more likely to gamble more frequently than non-retired residents.

Similarly, Moore (1995) identified retired locals who are 65 or older to be the residents who gamble the most.

Table 6
Gaming Frequency by Age Group

		18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65& over
1	More than 5 times a week	1	6	3	9	9	8
2	About twice a week	1	8	13	21	21	41
3	About once a week	4	11	14	29	25	33
4	About twice a month	6	18	21	28	23	15
5	About once a month	9	19	32	18	13	16
6	About once every two months	1	13	11	7	8	8
7	About 4 times a year	2	22	24	12	4	12
8	About twice a year	7	8	22	12	12	13
Total		31	105	140	136	115	146
Mean Gaming Frequency		5.16	4.93	5.18	4.13	3.96	3.87

The ranking on this question can be seen in table 1: 1="more than 5 times per week" and 8="about twice a year" thus a higher score means less frequent gambling.

There was a significant difference in terms of marital status and gambling frequency only for the widowed and married respondents ($F(5,668)=2.304$, $p<0.05$). Widowed respondents (mean = 3.8) gambled significantly more frequently than married respondents (mean = 4.59). This difference, however, may be related to age of the respondent more than to marital status. In addition, respondents who reported having children living at home gambled significantly less frequently (mean = 4.85) than respondents who had no children living with them (mean = 4.18), $t(676)=-4.189$, $p<0.001$, possibly because child care responsibilities allow for less free time to engage in leisure activities such as gambling. This trend was also identified in the LVCVA study (2001/2002), showing that "residents without children living at home gamble more frequently than those who have children" (p. 15). In summary, our data indicate that of the local gamblers, those most likely to gamble are older, widowed individuals who do not have children living with them. While limited, this information could prove useful to casino-marketing executives.

Of the local gamblers, those most likely to gamble are older, widowed individuals who do not have children living with them.

Gaming Behavior and Visiting Friends and Family

The impact of visitors on the gambling behavior of locals was already identified in the LVCVA study (2001/2002), indicating that among local residents, 17% went gambling ***only*** when out-of-towners were visiting and 8% gambled both with visitors and during other times (LVCVA, 2001/2002, p.26). We add further detail to the relationship between the local host and his or her visiting friends and family in terms of gambling behaviors. We examined two main aspects of this interaction. First, we looked at the impact of visiting friends and relatives on the spending behaviors of local gamblers. The question asked was whether local gamblers spend more than they usually do on gambling, when they are hosting visiting friends and relatives. Our second question was whether local gamblers influence the gaming behavior of their visiting friends and relatives. More specifically, do they tell their visitors where to go to play? This behavior of recommending a place of business is referred to in the professional literature as word-of-mouth communication. It is considered important because, on average, individuals who are satisfied with a product or service will tell six others about their positive experience (Hart, et al., 1990). We further accentuate our discussion by contrasting the behaviors of those categorized as gamblers with those categorized as non-gamblers.

In our sample, non-gamblers were significantly less likely to have hosted visiting friends and family within the past three months when compared to gamblers ($t(1092)=4.68$, $p< 0.0001$). In fact, 52.5% of those who were categorized as gamblers hosted a visiting friend or family member compared with only 35.7% of non-gamblers who hosted visiting friends and relatives. The visitors of hosts categorized as gamblers in our study, were more likely to gamble than the visitors of hosts categorized as non-gamblers ($t(401)= 2.12$, $p<0.04$). About 89.7% of the visitors hosted by our respondents who were categorized as gamblers, went gambling and spent an average of $958.70 (ranging from $15-$20,000, standard deviation: $2,118.10) while in the Las Vegas area. On the other hand, only 12.6% of the visitors of hosts categorized as non-gamblers participated in casino gambling, spending an average of $1,320.20 (ranging from $5-$45,000, standard deviation: $6230.10). When asked whether they went gambling with their visiting friends and relatives, 65.8% of our sample responded affirmatively. They also reported having spent an average of $252.20 more than they usually do on gambling (ranging from $5-$6,500, standard deviation: $626.70) while their visitors were in town.

When asked whether they went gambling with their visiting friends and relatives, 65.8% of our sample responded affirmatively.

When compared to non-gamblers, those categorized as gamblers were more likely to tell their visiting friends and family about casinos and casino gambling in the Las Vegas area ($t(287)=3.02$, $p<0.004$). About 62.9% of our respondents categorized as gamblers told their visiting friends and relatives about casinos and casino gambling, as compared to only 35.7% of the respondents categorized as non-gamblers. Approximately 82.7% of the hosted visitors wanted to visit a casino and 44.1% of our respondents suggested their friends and family visit a casino. Most of the locals categorized as gamblers (59.9%) suggested visiting a casino on The Strip. Others suggested visiting Downtown casinos (8.9%), casinos on the Boulder Strip (14%) or other off-Strip casinos (17.2%).

Earlier in this paper, we indicated that most of the locals identified as gamblers reported doing most of their gambling on the Boulder Strip and other locations throughout the valley rather than on The Strip corridor or Downtown. However, when visiting friends and family members are in town, locals suggest these visitors go to casinos located on The Strip. This is not surprising given the tourist attractions available on The Strip for sightseeing, fine dining, and shows. Such information may be especially valuable for casinos located on The Strip given the fact that locals, who usually do not gamble in these properties, frequent them when they accompany visiting friends and family members. Offering special promotions to locals then, is likely to not only attract locals, but also attract their visiting friends and relatives.

On the other hand, the fact that local gamblers are more likely to head to The Strip when entertaining visiting friends and family should be of some concern for locals' casinos. These casino companies should make a conscious effort to encourage locals to continue gambling at their properties, even when friends and family members are visiting. Not doing so means that these properties lose not only the gambling dollars of the local gambler, but also the dollars gambled by visiting friends and family. This is especially important given our above mentioned finding that local gamblers tend to spend, on average, approximately $252 more than they usually do on gambling when accompanying a visiting friend or family member to a casino. We could identify only one locals' casino that rewarded locals for bringing in family or friends to gamble with them and sign up for a slot club promotion (Dancer & Compton, 2000). Such promotions could help locals' casinos protect their investment in building long term relationships with local gamblers especially given the tight competition for local gamblers among Las Vegas valley casinos (Anderson, 1998).

The fact that local gamblers are more likely to head to The Strip when entertaining visiting friends and family should be of some concern for locals' casinos.

Summary

This study is limited in terms of its recommendations because we do not possess information regarding individual spending on gambling. We can not therefore offer comparisons across groups of gamblers in terms of spending. Our data do, however, offer some insight based on group gambling frequency and behaviors of gamblers as hosts. In addition, our results are not generalizable because the scope of our study is limited to Las Vegas only. It can nevertheless provide some valuable insights to casino managers and marketers in this metropolitan area.

Our data indicate that the locals categorized as gamblers tend to be older, widowed individuals, who do not have children living at home. This information could prove useful to casino-marketing executives in terms of developing advertising messages catered to a specific demographic group as well as selecting avenues through which these gamblers could be reached most effectively. In addition, it appears that locals categorized as gamblers tend to act as good-will ambassadors to the Las Vegas casino industry. Not only do they recommend visiting a casino more frequently than those categorized as non-gamblers, they are also more likely to accompany visiting friends and family to a casino and gamble themselves.

While locals appear to prefer casinos that are off The Strip for their gambling, when they are entertaining visiting friends and relatives, they are more likely to recommend a visit to The Strip. Therefore, building a relationship with local gamblers could provide some significant benefits to Strip casinos. Locals' casinos, on the other hand, should actively reward local gamblers for bringing their visiting friends and family with them rather than taking them to The Strip. Failing to do so could mean that locals' casinos lose the gambling dollars of the local gambler and those of his or her visiting friends and family to The Strip properties. Taking into account that gamblers usually have a gambling budget in mind (Jones, 2004), dollars spent elsewhere are eating into that budget.

Our findings indicated that locals not only provide recommendations to their visitors on specific casinos to visit, they also join them. The local gambler brings in more gamblers and tends to play more when hosting those gamblers. Therefore, attracting locals, and rewarding them through promotions, could entice local residents to visit specific locations when they have friends and family members visiting. As mentioned above, only one such promotion was identified in the local press (Dancer & Compton, 2000). Locals' casinos could offer Las Vegas residents who gamble, other incentives to be enjoyed with visiting friends and family, such as, price reduced show tickets or restaurant discounts. This could possibly encourage local gamblers to bring their visiting friends and family to their regular casino rather than accompanying them to The Strip. Some locals' casinos feature attractions similar to those on The Strip such as gourmet restaurants and production shows, and could therefore be able to offer attractive alternatives to The Strip.

Endnote

This research was part of a larger study on the impact of visiting friends and relatives on local hosts' tourist-like behaviors, and was made possible by a grant from the Las Vegas Convention & Visitors Authority, and an Applied Research Initiative grant from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

References

Anderson, S. F. (1998). A different kind of bet on Las Vegas: Crescent focuses on a gaming market for locals, not tourists. *Business Week*, 3584, p. 124.

Bojanic, D. C., & Voli, P. K. (1992). Customer interchange of tourist attractions: A look at the 'locals'. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, 1(2), 45-58.

Burns, D. (2002, April 3). Emergence of local casino called boon to customers. *Las Vegas Review Journal*, p. D3.

Clark County Residents Survey. (2001/2002). *Survey of leisure activities and gaming behavior*. Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority.

Compton, J., & Dancer, B. (2004, July 2). Player's edge: Summer promotions try to lure locals to casinos. *Las Vegas Review Journal*, p. 8J.

Dancer, B., & Compton, J. (2000, January 28). Showboat offers local gamblers a variety of promotions. *Las Vegas Review Journal*, p. 23J.

Harrah's Survey (2002). *Profile of the American casino gambler*. Retrieved March 2003 from http://www.harrahs.com/about_us/survey/

Hart, C. W. L., Heskett, J. L., & Sasser, W. E., Jr. (1990). The profitable art of service recovery. *Harvard Business Review*, *90*(4), 148-156.

Jones, C. (2004, February 10). Visitors bringing less money coming to town, Las Vegas tourism officials find. *Knight Ridder Tribune Business News*, p. 1.

Moore, T. (1995). The local gambler? He's, uh-h-h, different. *Las Vegas Business Press*, *12*(15), p.1.

Morrison, A. M., Braunlich, C. G., Cai, L. A., & O'Leary, J. T. (1996). A profile of the casino resort vacationer. *Journal of Travel Research*, *35*(2), 55-61.

Roehl, W. S. (1996). Competition, casino spending, and use of casino amenities. *Journal of Travel Research*, *34*(3), 57-62.

Roehl, W. S. (1998). The changing economic geography of the casino industry in Nevada and Atlantic City. In *Casino gambling in America: Origins, trends and impacts*. K. J. Meyer-Arendt, & R. Hartmann, Eds. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.

Simpson, J. (2003, July 27). Dynamics help locals market flourish. *Las Vegas Review Journal*. Retrieved August 2004 from www.reviewjournal.com/lvrj_home/2003/Jul-27-Sun-2003/business/21801896.html.

U.S. Census Bureau, (2000). *Profile of selected social characteristics: 2000*. Retrieved May 2004 from http://factfinder.census.gov.

Weissenstein, M. (1999, September 10). Planners ok Spring Valley gaming project, *Las Vegas Review Journal*, p. A1.

Article submitted: 9/15/03 (preliminary evaluation)
Editorial exchange: indefinite
Sent to peer review: 6/14/04
Reviewer comments sent to author: 7/28/04
Author's revised version received: 8/24/04
Article accepted for publication: 8/24/04