



MHRHOV
Master Thesis 2012



“You can always become better.” – Tiger Woods

By Maxim Mukhamodeev



**FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
NORWEGIAN SCHOOL OF HOTEL MANAGEMENT**

MASTER'S THESIS

STUDY PROGRAM: Master of Science in International Hotel and Tourism Leadership	THIS IS WRITTEN IN THE FOLLOWING SPECIALIZATION / SUBJECT: Consumer Behavior IS THE ASSIGNMENT CONFIDENTIAL? Yes
TITLE: Going golfing in Norway: Consumer motivation	

AUTHOR		ADVISOR:
Student number:	Name:	PROFESSOR TORVALD ØGAARD
210711	MAXIM FATIKHOVICH MUKHAMODEEV	Faculty of Social Sciences

ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF 2 BOUND COPIES OF THESIS	
Stavanger, / 2012	Signature administration

EXAMINATION FORM FOR MASTER'S THESIS
Norwegian School of Hotel Management

Study Program: MSc in International Hotel and Tourism Leadership

Specialization: _____

Year: 2012

Is the assignment confidential? NO X **YES** until: 01 month 06 year 2014

To be completed by the department

Thesis submitted in 2 copies: _____ (date)

Signature of receiving department _____

Author:

Student number:	Name:
210711	Maxim Fatikhovich Mukhamodeev

Title

Going golfing in Norway: Consumer motivation

This assignment has been rated: _____
letter

Sensor:

Place/date Signature

Advisor:

Place/date Signature

Exam results registered in the database:

Place/date Signature

Acknowledgements

This paper work is the final result of the Master's degree in International Hotel and Tourism Leadership from the University of Stavanger. The idea for this thesis was taken from an existing environment in the Rogalnd region which has a great deal of golf courses. It was interesting and challenging to investigate the current topic gaining new knowledge and meeting interesting people every day. The process of accumulating this paper, however, has been made easier by very appreciated help from different people.

Firstly, I would like to thank my mentor and supervisor, Torvald Øgaard, who really was the best guide in the study process. His support was felt in every step of the research, and his valuable comments on how the progression of the investigation should follow were right on time. Special thanks should be delivered to Mr. Richard R. David, manager at the Sola Golfklubb, for his great contribution in the project and help with collecting the data.

I would like to thank my family and friends for their support during this long and hardworking period of time, your consideration and understanding were really helpful, especially at the moments when I was about to give up with the research.

Stavanger, June 2012

Maxim Mukhamodeev

Table of Content

Acknowledgements.....	4
List of Figures.....	7
List of Tables.....	7
ARTICLE.....	10
Abstract.....	11
Executive Summary.....	12
Introduction.....	13
Contemporary Condition of Golf.....	14
Sport Consumer Behavior.....	15
Motivation Theory Research.....	17
Methods.....	20
Data Collection.....	20
Measurement Instrumentation.....	20
Data Analysis.....	22
Results.....	23
Sample Characteristics.....	23
Results of the Measurement Model Test.....	23
Discussion and conclusions.....	25
References.....	29
Appendix.....	32
RESEARCH NOTES.....	34
Theory Overview.....	35

Hypotheses	37
Methods	39
Sample Statistics	39
Results	40
Descriptive Statistics	40
Overall Difference Tests	40
Discussion	402
Conclusion and Recommendations	44
References	45
APPENDICES	50
Guidelines for Submitting an Article	51
Table 7. Golf participants' motivations by numbers of rounds: mean (SD), F-statistics and p-value	52
Table 8. Golf participants' motivations by past experience (EUH): mean (SD), F-statistics and p-value	53

List of Figures

Figure 1. Implementation of McDonald et al.'s scale to Holt's typology.....

Figure 2. Metaphors for consuming.....

List of Tables

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for participants' demographic attributes (n=126).....

Table 2. Factor loadings (β) and Cronbach's alphas (α) of metaphors.....

Table 3. Regression values of metaphors.....

Table 4. Factor loadings (β) Cronbach's alphas (α), and χ^2/df values for motivation scale..

Table 5. Means and standard deviations for golf participation motivation.....

Table 6. Golf participants' motivations by gender: mean (SD), F-statistics and p-value.....

Table 7. Golf participants' motivations by numbers of rounds: mean (SD), F-statistics and p-value.....

Table 8. Golf participants' motivations by past experience (EUH): mean (SD), F-statistics and p-value.....

Going Golfing in Norway: Consumer Motivation

In 2005, *Golf Digest* magazine calculated that the countries with most golf courses per capita, starting with the best endowed were: Scotland, New Zealand, Australia, Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland, Canada, Wales, United States, Sweden, and England (countries with fewer than 500,000 people were excluded). Apart from Sweden, all of these countries have English as the main language, even though the number of courses in new territories is increasing rapidly. In Norway, this situation is quite similar actually. Golf has become one of the most popular sports in past few years – the statistics indicates continuous growth of number of golf courses every year. Norway is attracting golfers from other parts of Europe to participate in the youth', grown-up's, and senior's championships throughout the whole year (Golfforbundet, 2010).

Such rapid attention that Norway receives shouldn't be left unnoticed. The importance of knowing what are the motives and reasons for playing the game is rather crucial. This knowledge is useful for arranging and building the industry in correct and successful manner. Managers of the golf courses are aware of this rapid growth, but have no concrete data in their hands to analyze and perform right decisions to improve the economic effect of their business. One of the main purposes for this study though was at to investigate the dispersion of motives among golf players based on their past experience and gender. However, while examining the relevant literature it was discovered that relatively little research was conducted on the consumer behavior of participants in golf. Therefore it was decided to split up the study into two main parts – article and supporting results.

In the article, the main effort was directed towards explaining the reasons behind golf players' consumption. In this research, the theoretical model of consumer behavior was

challenged to find out its validity. The second part was dedicated to explanation and expansion of the theory, disclosing additional results of the experiment, and stating the corresponding conclusions.

ARTICLE

Abstract

Golf development has been quite rapid in the past years all over the world. The purpose of this study is to analyze the validity and reliability of Motivation Sport Consumer scale proposed by McDonald et al. and its applicability to Holt's typology of consumption metaphors. The results of reliability tests and factor analysis confirm that the present instrumentation has demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties overall to accurately and reliably measure motivations of sport consumption behavior. It is also considered that the suggested model of implementing McDonald et al.'s instrumentation to Holt's typology is valid and should be used in following researches

Key words: motivation, consumer behavior, golf, Norway.

Executive Summary

For the past decade the number of the golf players has not been changed significantly, the number of golf courses in Norway had been steadily increasing and achieved 184 golf courses in 2012 (Golfforbundet, 2010). This leads to the natural competition among golf courses for attracting golfers to the individual sites. Knowing the reasons and assessing the motives, managers would be able to better employ any changes needed to attract and retain their customers.

A more broad and comprehensive framework is necessary to describe the universe of actions that constitute consuming. A typology offered by Holt (1995) was chosen an appropriate theoretical base for classifying consumer behavior of golf players. The current research used the model that proposes 13 motivational factors derived from instrumentation by McDonald et al. which could be explained by four metaphors of consuming behavior from the typology of Holt.

The results confirm that the present instrumentation has demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties overall to accurately and reliably measure motivations of sport consumption behavior (acceptable factor loadings and Cronbach's alpha coefficients over .70). it is considered that the suggested model of implementing McDonald et al.'s instrumentation to Holt's typology is valid and should be used in following researches.

The development of existing instrumentation advances the study of sport participants by providing a tool for measuring the psychological motivations that influence sport consumptions with regard to their structures and purposes of action (Holt's typology). The current revised Motivations of Sport Consumption scale will allow academics and practitioners to better understand the impact of psychological motives on participating in golf and which factors are more important for them.

Introduction

Norway being one of the Nordic countries was always associated with winter sports like skiing, biathlon, skateboarding and so forth. Interesting fact about Norway is that although it has a population of just about 5 million people, nearly each third person out of hundred plays golf. This information is offered by Norwegian National Golf Federation (Golfforbundet, 2010), however, it is believed that more people might be active golf players without holding a membership with the federation. One gets rather amazed when noticing that there are about 20 golf courses in 50-km radius around one's neighborhood. Unfortunately there is only 5-6 months of appropriate weather conditions in their homeland for game. Moreover, the eagerness to play has gone to the extent that Norwegians brought snow golfing to have the opportunity to play this game at anytime.

Although golf players' number is quite high, new golf courses are being built nearly every year and the game has become extremely popular among people of all age groups. Marketers and golf course administrators do not seem aware of the golfers' motives to play. Given current economic conditions and a the saturated market, it is more likely that sport organizations need to market themselves not only to their traditional consumers, but also beyond these, in order to increase their customer base (Tokuyama & Greenwell, 2011). To date, little empirical research has been undertaken to better understand this sport and its growth. Much remains to be understood regarding the motivations of golf consumers. This study adds to the knowledge of sport consumer behavior by examining motives for playing the game. In addition to understanding which motivations sport consumers possess, this study seeks to understand how those motivations connect to behavior.

Contemporary Condition of Golf

Golf development has been quite rapid in the past years all over the world. Especially after 2009 when golf was finally approved as an Olympic sport in 2016 and 2020 by the International Olympic Committee membership, during the IOC's 121st Session. According to the International Association of Golfing Tour Operators, the global golf tourism market is worth over \$17 billion (The Global Golf Tourism Organisation, 2011). On a world basis, 56 million people play golf worldwide: 26.7 million in the United States, 5 million in Canada, 5.5 million in continental Europe, 14 million in Japan, and 3.8 million in the United Kingdom. United States is the leading market in terms of golf as a sport– it is thought to contribute with over \$60 billion to the economy. Europe (aside from the UK) is not a mature golf market; this sport it is still mainly pursued by the elite few, with a return worth \$20 billion (The Global Golf Tourism Organisation, 2011).

In continental Europe the participation rates in golf are low, but are increasing steadily, For example, French participation rates are increasing between 5-8% per year. Overall, European market demonstrates the most growth potential in terms of golfing holidays. Consumers are predominantly male, with the majority being middle aged (40-55) or retired (55+). Professional and managerial groups dominate golfing sector (The Global Golf Tourism Organisation, 2011).

Currently there are more than 32 000 golf courses all over the world and nearly 7 000 in Europe (www.ega-golf.ch, 2012). Considering that each course averaging 30 hectares, we are looking at almost 1 million hectare of land that has been converted to one game. About 70 million liters of water are needed to keep each course green and lush for a year (Third World Network). This means more than US\$25-billion industry includes property development, airlines, the hotel industry, resort and tour operators, television and sports programming, glossy

publications and chemical manufacturers. Genetically engineered grass has even entered the scene as a purported solution to less chemical use on the turf.

While the number of the golf players has not been changed significantly, the number of golf courses in Norway had been steadily increasing in the last decade and achieved 184 golf courses in 2012 (Golfforbundet, 2010). This leads to the natural competition among golf courses for attracting golfers to the individual sites. Simultaneously it becomes more and more important for managers to identify what motivates golfers to play. Knowing the reasons and assessing the motives, managers would be able to better employ any changes needed to attract and retain their customers.

Norwegian golf market represents a significant opportunity to grow and generate substantial revenues for the municipality and golf courses themselves. Given the high fixed development costs associated with golf courses, golf managers need to understand what motivates visitor, in order to improve profitability and competitiveness. As a niche product offering, golf's ability to attract certain types of visitors may lead to higher returns for the course. Barely little investigation on this issue was carried out in Norway therefore the current study is directed to analyze differences in the motivation of Norwegian golfers to play.

Sport Consumer Behavior.

The field of consumer behavior continues to examine consumption in many forms and contexts. Consumer behavior research has emerged from a variety of disciplines and now stands on its own as a separate discipline while maintaining its link to other fields (Funk, Mahony, & Havitz, 2003). Within the universal field of consumer behavior, much research was done to look for the consumer behavior related to the services and products offered by the sport and leisure industry.

Kwon, Trail, and Anderson (2005) suggested that some people are engaged in participating and watching their favorite sport because they have a strong social-psychological connection with a team, coach, player, university, community, level of sport, and/or type of sport. The authors call these connections points of attachment (Woo, Trail, Kwon, & Anderson, 2009). As the concepts of motives and points of attachment have become popular, researchers have been examining relationships among motives and points of attachment (Fink, Trail, & Anderson, 2002; Robinson, Trail, & Kwon, 2004; Robinson & Trail, 2005).

Furthermore previous studies have found psychological commitment to be a promising predictor of various behavioral characteristics, including future intention, duration of being a fan, frequency of attending sporting events, purchase of season tickets, and frequency of sport participation (Iwasaki & Havitz, 2004; Kim, Scott, & Crompton, 1997; Mahony, Madrigal, & Howard, 2000).

Aforementioned studies were regarding highly tailored fields with particular dimensions of how people consume. A more broad and comprehensive framework is necessary to describe the universe of actions that constitute consuming. A typology offered by Holt (1995) can be an appropriate theoretical base for classifying consumer behavior of golf players. In his research (Holt, 1995, pp 2-3) four dimensions of consuming are centered: consuming as experience (consumers' subjective, emotional reactions to consumption objects), consuming as integration (how consumers acquire and manipulate object meanings), consuming as classification (process in which objects act to classify their consumer), and consuming as play (autotelic, interpersonal consumer actions). It is questionable whether this typology is suitable for explaining the motivations of golf players, because there may be significant differences between golf and other

traditional sports genres. Consequently, more research is needed in order to improve our understanding of the motivation of golf participants.

Motivation Theory Research

In general, we should know the definition of motivation because it plays an important role in consumer behavior. Simply saying, motivation notion refers to the direction and intensity of one's efforts (Weinberg & Gould, 2011). Motivations are also a "collective term for processes and effects with common parameters: in a particular situation, a person chooses a certain behavior for its expectant results" (Gnoth, 1997). According to Mowen and Minor cited via (Cianfrone, Zhang, & Ko, 2011), motivation is defined as "an activated state within a person—consisting of drive urges, wishes, and desires— that leads to goal directed behavior."

A lot of research was conducted to understand the nature of people's motivation to engage in sport. Different instrumentations were implemented by the researchers, while investigating the motives of people keen on sport. A number of scholars used the Sport Motivation Scale to find out sportsmen's motivation adopted by Pelletier et al, 1995 (Alexandris et al., 2002; Tsorbatzoudis et al., 2006; Gillet, Berjot, & Gobance, 2009; Burtscher, 2011). Only some of studies were targeting golf industry. For example, the study by Alexandris et al. (2002) aimed to investigate the influence of constraint dimensions on intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation and amotivation among golfers in Greece.

One could also mention Sport Fan Motivation Scale (Wann, 1995), among others. This is based on the existing conceptual literature within sport sociology (Sloan, 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993, Wann, 1995). Kahle et al. (1996) proposed a scale supported by Kelman's (1958) functional theory of attitudinal influence. Trail & James (2002) introduced the Motivational

Scale for Sport Consumption based on review of the sport sociological theories by Wann (1995), Sloan, (1989) and Trail, Anderson, & Fink, (2000).

While the literature on motivation theory is extensive and diverse, much consumer research originated from need-based theories, primarily Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1970), or goal-based theories, including the mean-end chains theory, social identity theory, behavioral decision theory, and attitude theory. These seminal motivation theories have strongly influenced how sport motivation is investigated (Cianfrone, Zhang, & Ko, 2011).

McDonald et al. (2002) investigated motivational factors of sport spectator and participant with implementing the Maslow's human needs hierarchy. The authors observed 13 motivation constructs (i.e. physical fitness, risk taking, stress reduction, aggression, affiliation, social facilitation, self-esteem, competition, achievement, skill mastery, aesthetics, value development and self-actualization) for participants in nine popular sports (baseball, basketball, bowling, fishing, football, golf, softball, tennis and volleyball) in the US. It was found that except for two factors, achievement and self-esteem, sports participants varied significantly on 11 of the 13 motivational factors across all profiled sports. Considering golf among other sport types, the results pointed out that skill mastery and stress release were the highest important motives for players.

Robinson, Trail, and Kwon (2004) examined the motives of professional golf spectators on the basis of gender and tour (e.g., PGA, LPGA, and PGA Senior) in the belief that the unique aspects of golf spectatorship (e.g., spectator mobility, length of event, etc.) could explain the results of McDonald et al.'s (2002) study. Later Ko et al. (2008) continued their research by applying the same methods as McDonald et al. (2002) used to investigate the consumer motivation for watching and participating in active sport.

		PURPOSE OF ACTION	
		Autotelic Actions	Instrumental Actions
STRUCTURE OF ACTION	Object Action	Consuming as Experience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-actualization - Self-esteem - Stress release - Leisure 	Consuming as Integration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Achievement - Value development - Aesthetics
	Interpersonal Actions	Consuming as Play <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Physical fitness - Skill mastery - Competition 	Consuming as Classification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social facilitation - Affiliation - Status

Figure 1. Implementation of McDonald et al.'s scale to Holt's typology.

A research by Kilpatrick et al. (2005) has also offered similar instrumentation – Exercise Motivation Inventory – that also measures 14 factors representing a wide range of motivations for engaging in physical activity. However, this inventory is oriented mainly to measure the difference between exercise and sport participation and is barely useful for the current study.

This review of the related literature suggests that sport participation and consumption motives should be viewed as a multidimensional construct composed of a broad range of both environmental as well as psychological elements, and that understanding consumers at levels deeper than mere demographic profiles is important to brand positioning and marketing communications practice. It points towards the importance of understanding the resulting motivations for participation in such sport and fitness activity as golf in the development of segmentation and marketing communication strategies, as well as the importance of reducing these multiple dimensions in a structured approach in order to better interpret and understand the findings (Rohm, Milne, & McDonald, 2006). The current research will use the model that

proposes 13 motivational factors derived from instrumentation by McDonald et al. which could be explained by four metaphors of consuming behavior from the typology of Holt in the way represented in Figure 1.

Subsequently the current study will seek for the following associated hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The Sport Consumption Motivation Scale by McDonald et al. (2002) is a reliable and valid measurement instrument for examining golf players' motivation.

Hypothesis 2: The Typology of Consumption Practices performed by Holt (1995) is a useful and appropriate framework in analyzing sport motivation theory.

Methods

Data Collection

The questionnaire first was uploaded to the "Kwik surveys" online web platform (<http://kwiksurveys.com>) offering arrangement of the surveys free of charge. Later, a small printed invitation with the description of the research and a link to the survey was prepared. Also with contribution of Sola Golfklubb Administration, the link to the survey was sent by means of their newsletter. In the same time the researcher was collecting the data from audience who attended golf courses in Stavanger region, including Stavanger Golfklubb, Sola Golfklubb, Sandnes Golfklubb, Sola Strand Golfklubb. Respondents were invited to participate in the investigation by offering them invitation. Around 300 invitations were distributed at the golf courses and approximately 600 were sent by newsletter. The researcher collected 126 usable questionnaires (an approximate 14% return rate).

Measurement Instrumentation

In order to measure motivation of golf players, the researcher revised and used McDonald's et al. (2002) Sport Consumption Motivation Scale. The reported reliability of the

scale was adequate. More specifically, the Cronbach's alphas of the original instrumentation ranged from $\alpha=0.67$ to $\alpha=0.94$. The convergent validity of the original scale was established using exploratory factor analysis (principal axis factoring with varimax rotation). As a result, 13 constructs were reduced to a four-factor solution with over .3 item loadings (Mc Donald, Milne, & Hong, 2002).

In the present study, author used a modified version of the instrumentation proposed by Ko, Park, & Claussen (2008). They adopted the scale according to the suggestions made by a panel of experts so that to establish content validity. Moreover a pilot test, an internal consistency measure and corrected item-to-item correlations were performed by Ko, Park, & Claussen. The Cronbach's alphas and Average Variance Extracted were in an acceptable ranges (alphas from .70 and AVE's above .50). For all this reasons it was concluded that revised version is more suitable for the purposes of this current study.

From the research by Petrick et al. (2001) it was decided that two more factors explaining motivation of golfers could be added to the instrumentation, that are leisure and status. Given the notion that golf is recommended as a relatively risk-free form of exercise (Lane & Jarett, 2005), the two constraints offered by McDonald et al. – risk taking and aggression – were taken off the survey and research area. In order to check the influence of the predicted metaphors for consuming an overall assessment part containing three items retrieved from Hennessey et al. (2008) were included in the final version of the scale.

The format of the survey instrument was a 7-point Likert measurement format ranging from "Strongly disagree" (1) to "Strongly agree" (7). The questionnaire consisted of two parts. First, respondents were asked to fill out the demography-related questions (age, gender, education) and level of experience in golf. The second part included questions about

motivational factors that were relative to participation in playing golf. The revised survey instrument consisted of totally 43 items representing 13 motivational factors (each having 3 items) and 1 factor (3 items) measuring overall satisfaction with the game.

Next, a pilot test was employed to test the reliability and readability of the modified instrumentation scale. Ten golf players from one of the golf courses were asked to fulfill the questionnaire right away on the course. Their remarks on the understandability of the questions and overall judgment of participation procedure were taken into consideration. Afterwards Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the reliability of existing scales. The results indicated adequate figures of over .70 which confirmed the reliability of the instrumentation.

Data Analysis

All the analyses were calculated by using SPSS version 15.0 (Pallant, 2007). To examine hypotheses, series of factor analysis were employed. The results of the factor analysis test would determine how well the indicators capture their specific constructs (Ko, Park, & Claussen, 2008). In addition, for each subscale, internal consistency measure (Cronbach's alpha) and convergent validity measures (factor loadings) were computed. Cronbach's alpha values greater than .70 are considered to be reliable (Nunnally, 1978). Convergent validity is evidenced if each indicator's loading on its posited underlying construct is significant (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). The chi-square values divided by the degrees of freedom as a frame of reference were also included, because most of fit indices in the SEM literature are in some form functions of the chi-square value (Ko et al., 2008). According to Kline (1998) a chi-square ratio between 1 and 2 for small samples typically reflects a good fit.

Moreover regression analyses were performed to check the influence of each and all of four metaphors of consuming (consuming as experience, consuming as integration, consuming as play, and consuming as classification) on overall satisfaction with golf playing.

Results

Sample Characteristics

Descriptive statistics were calculated to identify sample characteristics. The sample was composed of 128 respondents, with 16% female (n=21) and 84% male (n=107). The age of participants ranged from 18 to 75 with a mean of 46.5. Respondents were spread across having secondary school education (4%), high school/college education (19%), graduated from university as bachelor (39%), Master-graduated (36%), and having PhD/Doctoral degree (2%). According to the past experience in the game overwhelming majority was represented by veterans (44%), the other types were allocated as follows: infrequents – 14.3%, loyal-infrequents – 7.9%, collectors – 19%, locals – 7.9%, and visitors – 6.3% (classification was retrieved from Petrick et al., (2001). Most of the subjects (59%) have been playing golf for more than 25 rounds per year, 38% were playing between 6 and 25 rounds, and only 3% were playing less than 6 rounds. The detailed demographic information is shown in Table 1.

Results of the Measurement Model Test

Table 4 presents factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha, and χ^2/df values of each metaphor and factor. The chi-square ratios were acceptable for three metaphors (ranging from 1.35 to 1.54). Experience metaphor has obtained 0.79 which is nearly close to 1. The Cronbach's alpha reliability check has shown alpha coefficients of over .70 values for all factors except for Status (.69). Factor loading values (β) ranged from .44 to .97. With the exception of eight items, these values exceeded the 0.70 cut-off, indicating that less than 20% of the variance associated with

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for participants' demographic attributes (n=126)

VARIABLES	CATEGORY	FREQUENC Y	PERCENTAGE (%)	CUMULATIV E (%)
AGE	18-30	16	12.7	12.7
	31-40	30	23.8	36.5
	41-50	30	23.8	60.3
	51-60	32	25.4	85.7
	OVER 60	18	14.3	100.0
GENDER	MALE	106	84.1	84.1
	FEMALE	20	15.9	100.0
EDUCATION	SECONDARY SCHOOL	5	4.0	4.0
	HIGH SCHOOL/COLLEGE	24	19.0	23.0
	GRADUATE/BACHELO R	49	38.9	61.9
	POST GRADUATE/MASTER	46	36.5	98.0
	DOCTORAL/PhD	2	1.6	100.0
PAST EXPERIENCE	INFREQUENTS	18	14.3	14.3
	LOYAL-INFREQUENTS	10	7.9	22.2
	COLLECTORS	24	19.0	41.3
	LOCALS	10	7.9	49.2
	VISITORS	8	6.3	55.6
	VETERANS	56	44.4	100.0
NO. OF ROUNDS	LESS THAN 5	4	3.2	3.2
	6-25	49	38.9	42.1
	OVER 25	73	57.9	100.0

the items was error (Ko et al., 2008). In general, the results support that scale items showed good convergent validity. The scale used in this study also can be regarded as having an acceptable reliability.

Next series of factor analysis for four consumer metaphors was performed. After the analysis of first metaphor (Experience) it was revealed that the four factors forming the metaphor split into two parts with Self-actualization and Self-esteem making one component, and Stress release and Leisure making another one. Also the third analysis for the Play metaphor exposed

that Physical fitness factor was deforming the proposed factor structure. Moreover the Cronbach's alpha coefficients computed for these two metaphors were .69 for Experience and .42 for Play. Therefore it was concluded to leave only two factors in each of the Experience and Play metaphors. Repeated factor analyses and reliability check were executed (Table 2). Also a following regression analysis of the four revised metaphors was employed for verification of influence of them on Overall Satisfaction factor. Extracted three factors (Leisure, Stress release, and Physical fitness) were combined into one component and its characteristics were also included in the analysis. The results are represented in Table 3.

Table 2. Factor loadings (β) and Cronbach's alphas (α) of metaphors

METAPHOR		FACTOR	β	α
EXPERIENCE	<i>SELF-DETERMINATION</i>	SELF-ACTUALISATION	.86	.85
		SELF-ESTEEM	.86	
	<i>MENTAL WELL BEING</i>	LEISURE	.72	.59
		STRESS RELEASE	.56	
		PHYSICAL FITNESS	.56	
INTEGRATION		ACHIEVEMENT	.52	.69
		VALUE DEVELOPMENT	.79	
		AESTHETHICS	.67	
PLAY		SKILL MASTERY	.72	.68
		COMPETITION	.72	
CLASSIFICATION		SOCIAL FACILITATION	.84	.71
		AFFILIATION	.91	
		STATUS	.61	

Discussion and conclusions

The present study aimed to identify the answer for these two issues: challenge the validity and reliability of McDonalds et al.'s sport motivation scale, and its applicability to Holt's typology of consumer behavior.

Table 3. Regression values of metaphors

METAPHOR		FACTOR	R ²
EXPERIENCE	<i>SELF-DETERMINATION</i>	SELF-ACTUALISATION	.021
		SELF-ESTEEM	
	<i>MENTAL WELL BEING</i>	LEISURE	.129
		STRESS RELEASE	
		PHYSICAL FITNESS	
INTEGRATION	ACHIEVEMENT	.043	
	VALUE DEVELOPMENT		
	AESTHETHICS		
PLAY	SKILL MASTERY	.094	
	COMPETITION		
CLASSIFICATION	SOCIAL FACILITATION	.057	
	AFFILATION		
	STATUS		

Motivations of Sport Consumers scale was incorporated with two important factors that could explain motives of golf players – Leisure and Status, and deleting two useless factors which showed poor significance at previous study (Mc Donald et al., 2002) – Aggression and Physical risk. The gathered version indicated good construct validity as indicated by the close fit of the model to the data (chi-squared values are appropriate), and also by convergent validity (factor loadings in acceptable ranges). The internal consistency of the scale was within acceptable values, with the alpha values for all but one factor exceeding the .70 cutoff. The results confirm that the present instrumentation has demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties overall to accurately and reliably measure motivations of sport consumption behavior.

The next step was to challenge the Holt's model of metaphors typology. The factor analyses exposed interesting results in the proposed model. While internal association of the factors within each of metaphors after excluding inappropriate items, have returned good values (factor loadings), a further regression analysis showed a weak influence on Overall satisfaction

factor. Moreover, the findings disclosed that Experience metaphor has splitted into two parts – first having Self-actualisation and Self-esteem (being a self-determinant factors) on one hand, and Leisure, Physical fitness, and Skill mastery (forming mental well being factors) on the other. This could be explained by the unique characteristics of golf players who separate these two sub-metaphors.

A slight influence of metaphors on Overall satisfaction probably could be explained if we look at the results of motivation means. Overall satisfaction has the highest mean of 6.61 out of 7 points and lowest standard deviation of this mean (0.81) that tells about very high total pleasure of players receiving at the game. The regression analysis could not be well performed with so small variance of results in dependent variable (Overall satisfaction). The confirmation of this prediction is partially verified by regression coefficient disclosed by the mental well-being sub-metaphor (includes first, second, and fifth highest means with corresponding $R^2 = .129$). Consequently, recommendation for further researchers is to expand the scale measuring Overall satisfaction to at least 11 points in Likert scale, which can probably increase the varinace among the factor. Despite the mentioned problems in gathering necessary outcomes, it is considered that the suggested model of implementing McDonald et al.'s instrumentation to Holt's typology is valid and should be used in following researches.

Present study used a sample which was stricted to one region and had low return rate (14%) which could be considered as a limitation. Also the problem of misunderstanding of the questions is an issue since the Questionnaires were in English and participants were Norwegian citizens. And surely the Overall satisfaction factor should be investigated broadly in order to have opportunity to conduct better analyses.

The development of existing instrumentation advances the study of sport participants by providing a tool for measuring the psychological motivations that influence sport consumptions with regard to their structures and purposes of action (Holt's typology). Previous researches were done on a group of sport types whereas the current study was directed towards golf participation motivations only. The current revised Motivations of Sport Consumption scale will allow academics and practitioners to better understand the impact of psychological motives on participating in golf and which factors are more important for them.

References

- Alexandris, K., Tsorbatzoudis, C., & Grouios, G. (2002). Perceived Constraints on Recreational Sport Participation: Investigating their Relationship with Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation and Amotivation. *Journal of Leisure Research* , 34 (3), 23-252.
- Anderson, J., & Gerbing, D. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin* , 103, 411-423.
- Cianfrone, B., Zhang, J., & Ko, Y. (2011). Dimensions of motivation associated with playing sport video games. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal* , 2 (1), 172-189.
- Funk, D., Mahony, D., & Havitz, M. (2003). Sport consumer behavior: Assessment and direction. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 12 (4), 200-205.
- Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism motivation and expectation formation. *Annals of tourism Research* , 24 (2), 283-304.
- Golfforbundet. (2010). *Norges Golfforbundet Arsrapport*.
- Hennessey, S., MacDonald, R., & MacEachern, M. (2008). A framework for understanding golfing visitors to a destination. *Journal of Sport and Tourism* , 13 (1), 5-35.
- Holt, D. (1995). How consumers consume: A typology of consumption practices. *Journal of Consumer Research* , 22 (1), 1-16.
- Kahle, L., Kambara, K., & Rose, G. (1996). A functional model of fan attendance motivations for college football. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 5 (4), 51-60.
- Kelman, H. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* , 2, 51-60.

- Kilpatrick, M., Hebert, E., & Bartholomew, J. (2005). College students' motivation for physical activity: Differentiating men's and women's motives for sport participation and exercise. *Journal of American College Health* , 54 (2), 87-94.
- Kline, R. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Ko, Y., Park, H., & Claussen, C. (2008). Action Sports Participation: Consumer Motivation. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship* , 9 (2), 111-124.
- Kwon, H., Trail, G., & Anderson, D. (2005). Are multiple points of attachment necessary to predict cognitive, affective, conative, or behavioral loyalty? *Sport Management Review* , 8, 255-270.
- Lane, A. M., & Jarett, H. (2005). Mood Changes Following Golf Among Senior Recreational Players. *Journal of Sport Science and Medicine* , 4, 47-51.
- Ling, C. Y. (n.d.). Retrieved from Third World Network: www.twinside.org.sg
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd Edition ed.). New York: Harper & Row Publishers Inc.
- Mc Donald, M., Milne, G., & Hong, J. (2002). Motivational Factors for Evaluating Sport Spectator and Participant Markets. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 11 (2), 100-113.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd Edition ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Operators, I. A. (2011). Retrieved 1997, from The Global Golf Tourism Organisation: www.iagto.com
- Petrick, J., Backman, S., Bixler, R., & Norman, W. (2001). Analysis of golfer motivations and constraints by experience use history. *Journal of Leisure Research* , 33 (1), 56-70.

- Robinson, M., Trail, G., & Kwon, H. (2004). Motives and points of attachment of professional golf spectators. *Sport Management Review* , 7, 167-192.
- Rohm, A., Milne, G., & McDonald, M. (2006). A Mixed-Method Approach for developing market segmentation typologies in the sports industry. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 15 (1), 29-39.
- Tokuyama, S., & Greenwell, T. (2011). Examining similarities and differences in consumer motivation for playing and watching soccer. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 20 (3), 18-156.
- Trail, G., & James, J. (2002). The Motivational Scale for Sport Consumption: Assessment of the scale's psychometric properties. *Journal of Sport Behavior* , 24 (1), 108-127.
- Wann, D. (1995). Preliminary validation of the Sport Fan Motivation Scale. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* , 19, 377-396.
- Weinberg, R., & Gould, D. (2011). *Foundations of Sport and Exercise Psychology* (5th Edition ed.). Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Woo, B., Trail, G., Kwon, H., & Anderson, D. (2009). Testing models of motives and points of attachment among spectators in college football. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 18 (1), 38-53.
- www.ega-golf.ch. (2012). Retrieved from European Golf Association.

Appendix

Table 4. Factor loadings (β) Cronbach's alphas (α), and χ^2/df values for motivation scale

CONSUMING METAPHORS	χ^2/df	FACTOR AND ITEM	β	α
EXPERIENCE	0.79	SELF-ACTUALIZATION		.92
		GOLF HELPS ME TO ACHIEVE MY POTENTIAL	.93	
		GOLF HELPS ME ACCOMPLISH THINGS	.93	
		GOLF HELPS ME GROW AS A PERSON	.83	
		SELF-ESTEEM		.86
		GOLF MAKES ME FEEL CONFIDENT ABOUT MY ABILITIES	.97	
		GOLF GIVES ME A FEELING OF SELF-ASSURANCE	.86	
		GOLF MAKES ME FEEL THAT I AM A SPECIAL PERSON	.67	
		STRESS RELEASE		.92
		GOLF IS AN EXCELLENT REMEDY FOR ME IF I AM TENSE, IRRITABLE AND ANXIOUS	.66	
		GOLF MAKES ME FEEL LESS STRESSED THAN I DID BEFORE I STARTED	.75	
		GOLF HELPS ME TO REDUCE STRESS	.83	
		LEISURE		.78
		I AM PLAYING GOLF BECAUSE IT IS RELAXING	.82	
		I AM HAVING FUN WHILE PLAYING GOLF	.71	
I PLAY GOLF BECAUSE IT IS OUTDOORS AND IN A NATURAL AREA	.65			
INTEGRATION	1.35	ACHIEVEMENT		.89
		I WOULD BE WILLING TO WORK ALL YEAR TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN GOLF	.92	
		I HAVE A STRONG DESIRE TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN GOLF	.85	
		MY GOAL IS TO BE OUTSTANDING IN GOLF	.81	
		VALUE DEVELOPMENT		.71
		GOLF TEACHES ME LESSONS THAT I MAY NOT LEARN ELSEWHERE	.79	
		GOLF HELPS ME TO UNDERSTAND THE VALUE OF HARD WORK AND DEDICATION	.68	
		GOLF HAS HELPED MAKE ME THE KIND OF PERSON I AM	.60	
		AESTHETICS		.82
		GOLF IS ONE WAY IN WHICH I CAN EXPRESS MYSELF	.83	
		I PUT A BIT OF MY OWN PERSONALITY INTO MY GOLF TRAINING AND COMPETITIONS	.80	
I ENJOY THE ARTISTRY INVOLVED IN PERFORMING GOLF	.74			
PLAY	1.44	PHYSICAL FITNESS		.93

(continued)

Table 4. Factor loadings (β) Cronbach's alphas (α), and χ^2/df values for motivation scale (continued)

CONSUMING METAPHORS	χ^2/df	FACTOR AND ITEM	β	α
		I PARTICIPATE IN GOLF BECAUSE IT IMPROVES MY PHYSICAL FITNESS	.92	
		I PARTICIPATE IN GOLF BECAUSE I FEEL IT KEEPS ME HEALTHY	.90	
		I PARTICIPATE IN GOLF TO STAY PHYSICALLY FIT	.86	
		SKILL MASTERY		.86
		GOLF IS CHALLENGING BECAUSE IT IS A DIFFICULT ACTIVITY TO MASTER	.89	
		I ENJOY PARTICIPATING IN GOLF BECAUSE THE SKILLS ARE DIFFICULT TO MASTER	.85	
		IT TAKES A HIGH DEGREE OF SKILL ON MY PART TO ATTAIN THE MASTERY I EXPECT IN GOLF	.76	
		COMPETITION		.76
		COMPETITION IS THE BEST PART OF PARTICIPATING IN GOLF	.86	
		THE BETTER THE OPPONENTS, THE MORE I ENJOY GOLF COMPETITIONS	.74	
		GOLF HELPS ME TO DEVELOP A COMPETITIVE WORK ETHIC	.59	
		CLASSIFICATION	1.54	SOCIAL FACILITATION
I ENJOY PLAYING GOLF BECAUSE IT GIVES ME CHANCE TO FORM SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS	.85			
PARTICIPATION IN GOLF WITH A GROUP HELPS ME TO LEARN SOCIAL SKILLS	.77			
MY ENJOYMENT OF GOLF DEPENDS ON SHARING THE EXPERIENCE WITH OTHER PEOPLE	.49			
AFFILIATION				.84
I FEEL A BOND WITH THE PEOPLE WHO PLAY GOLF	.86			
THERE IS A CERTAIN CAMARADERIE AMONG THE PEOPLE WHO PARTICIPATE IN GOLF	.83			
PARTICIPATING IN GOLF MAKES ME FEEL LIKE I BELONG TO A SPECIAL GROUP	.73			
STATUS				.69
I AM COMING HERE TO PLAY A HIGH STATUS SPORT	.81			
I FEEL THAT I AM AROUND THE SPECIAL TYPE OF PEOPLE WHO PLAY GOLF	.79			
BEING WITH MY BUSINESS COLLEGUES IS ONE OF THE REASONS I AM HERE	.44			
OVERALL SATISFACTION		OVERALL SATISFACTION		.88
		I WILL PLAY GOLF AGAIN	.96	
		I WILL RECOMMEND THE GAME TO OTHERS	.93	
		I LOVE PLAYING GOLF	.71	

RESEARCH NOTES

Theory Overview

Sport consumer behavior is considered to be a recently new component in the broader field of consumer behavior study. Much research is carried out all over the world in this discipline, in attempting to test theories from a number of scientific areas in both controlled and naturalistic settings in order to examine sport consumers. Stewart, Smith and Nicholson (2009), present a comprehensive review of the various typologies that have been used by researchers to examine sport consumers.

Despite the advances made by in this relatively new area of study, research in sport consumer behavior continues to face issues and challenges similar to more established disciplines (Funk, Mahony, & Havitz, 2003). In fact, because of its interdisciplinary nature, sport consumer behavior research tends to be even more susceptible to challenges such as standardizing variables, establishing a tradition of replication, exploiting the advantages of longitudinal designs, misuse of measurement instruments borrowed from other disciplines, lack of attention to reliability and validity, single shot instead of programmatic studies, and confusion of correlation with causation (Wells, 1993).

In the article it was stated that Holt's theory of consumer behavior (1995) could be a suitable typological framework to parcel the motivational factors according to their similarities. The author implements three different approaches for understanding consumer behavior and adds one more dimension. The Figure 2 shows the prediction made in the theory.

According to that theory all consumers display the aforementioned dimensions in a varying degree pursuant to their peculiarities and personal qualities. Holt's study was based on the observations of baseball spectators which played a role of consumers. Moreover in his research Holt verifies the metaphors and successfully attains to apply them in developing an

Figure 2. Metaphors for consuming

		PURPOSE OF ACTION	
		Autotelic Actions	Instrumental Actions
STRUCTURE OF ACTION	Object Action	Consuming as Experience	Consuming as Integration
	Interpersonal Actions	Consuming as Play	Consuming as Classification

alternative conception of materialism (acting as a unit of consumer behavior) as a style of consuming (Holt, 1995). The current study however tries to challenge the typology with regard to the McDonald et al.'s instrumentation of motivation constructs.

Motivation research is quite broad and to date it became an independent field of study. Motivation for sport participation is also richly covered in the literature. A number of researches as was mentioned earlier are based on the Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

The Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs framework proposes five categories of human needs that account for much of human behavior: A) physiological, B) safety, C) social, D) esteem, and E) self actualization (Maslow, 1970). Maslow theorizes that these needs are arranged hierarchically with individuals working their way further through the hierarchy as needs are satisfied. These needs are of two kind: deficiency needs and growth needs (Mc Donald, Milne, & Hong, 2002). Because each of these five general needs, with the exception of safety needs, have been proposed in the sport literature as motivating factors for sport participation and

spectatorship, Maslow's hierarchy seems to be an appropriate base upon which to build a theory of sport activity (Mc Donald, Milne, & Hong, 2002).

Sports consumption motivation scale was agreed to be an appropriate tool for measuring the motivation factors of golf players in Norway. It should be mentioned, nevertheless, that the instrumentation proposed by McDonald et al. was criticized in some paper works. For instances, Wann et al. (2008) complain about the lack of attention to economic and family motivation in the research area. The economic issue was included in the present study by adding Status factor to the instrumentation. Family motivation analysis was not introduced in the research since the work by Petrick et al. (2001) showed that family factor hasn't shown a significant difference in factor motivations.

Another concerns were raised for consideration by Trail & James (2002). First of all, convergent validity was one of the problems that was met by the authorrs In the present study a scale offered by Ko et al. (2008) was implemented, which was a revised version of McDonald et al.'s instrumentation. In their study it was clearly proven that the convergnet validity is on a high level. The other claims were regarding inability to use the scale to the spectator moitivation assessment, however current investigaation was vectored towards participant motivation and simultaneously has no problems with that issue. Overall conclusion was therefore to apply the revised and supplemented Sport Consumption Motivation Scale (Table 4).

Hypotheses

It is essential for sports marketers to identify the desires of sports consumers because motivation is a significant determinant of sports participation (Mc Donald, Milne, & Hong, 2002).

The results of studies into the differences in motives of male and female sport participants are rather ambiguous. For example, Dietz-Uhler et al. (2000) found that females were more likely to be sport fans for social reasons (i.e., spend time with family and friends). However, James and Ridinger (2002) found that men scored higher on the family motive, as well as achievement, aesthetics, knowledge, and empathy. Robinson and Trail (2005) found only one difference between males and females, females scored higher on the knowledge motive than men.

Perhaps these conflicting outcomes are the results of different measurement tools, or the measurement of different sports (e.g., basketball versus football), but it seems apparent gender plays a role in differences in motives for participating in sport (Fink & Parker, 2009). As Robinson and Trail (2005, p. 59) suggest, these gender differences, "...would imply, for example, that either males and females have innately different motives, or that society implicitly or explicitly teaches males and females to have different motives".

Alderson (1955) implied that studying consumer motivation is to determine whether past experience influences current decision making. Several researchers (Williams et al., 1990; Petrick et al., 2001) have contended that an individual's past experience can mediate their present leisure behavior. That's why we chose 'participants past experience' as a factor that can affect the motivation to play golf, therefore two more research questions were developed to guide this research:

- 3) What motivates people to participate in playing golf?
- 4) Are there differences among motivational factors of golf players based on gender and past experience?

Methods

Sample Statistics

The current study researched for respondents' previous experience as one of the independent variables. The measurement of the experience was based on the two scales.

The subset of data from the survey that is used in this paper is formed on the response to the question concerning the number of rounds of golf that the respondent played anywhere in the last 12 months. The scale was derived from the study by Hennessey et al. (2008). The authors first used seven options provided for the question: 1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-10, 11-20, 21-25, and over 25. For the purpose of that paper, later the seven options were reduced to three: 5 or less, 6-25, and over 25. The first group are considered *occasional* golfers and are termed so for the paper. The second group are termed *moderate* golfers for the paper. The final group are heavy golfers and are termed *dedicated* for the paper. Table 1 provides a summary of the survey numbers.

The second scale was operationalized according to the Experience Use History obtained from Petrick et al. (2001). They introduced six categories of golf players that are:

- 1) Infrequents – golfers with low experience on few courses.
- 2) Loyal-Infrequents – golfers with low experience but majority on the study course.
- 3) Collectors – golfers who had played many courses, little experience on any one.
- 4) Locals – golfers with high experience on study course only.
- 5) Visitors – golfers with high total experience, but little experience on study course.
- 6) Veterans – golfers with high total experience on many courses.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 5 contains summated means and standard deviations for each of the 13 factors of motivation and overall satisfaction factor. The means for each construct ranged from 2.51 for Status to 6.61 for Overall Satisfaction. Standard deviations ranged from 0.81 to 1.65. It is interesting to express that in general, Leisure was rated as the most important motivation factor for the subjects, and Overall Satisfaction with the game was also very highly pointed. This results support the idea of adding this factor to the instrumentation scale. The outcomes also specified that Stress Release, Skill Mastery and Social Facilitation were the next three most important motivation factors, respectively. On the other hand, the lowest mean scores were for Status, Self Esteem, and Achievement.

Overall Difference Tests

In order to check the variance across genders and past experience a couple of one-way ANOVA tests were performed. Gender differences (p values) on eight dependent variables (Skill mastery, Social facilitation, Affiliation, Aesthetics, Competition, Value development, Status and Achievement) were significant ($p < .05$), while the other five factors were non-significant ($p > .05$; see Table 6). Males constantly have shown higher means for nearly all the factors (except for leisure, difference is .01) than have female participants.

In addition, significant difference was found among the six experience types of players on four factors (Achievement, Social facilitation, Affiliation, and Skill mastery). Loyal-infrequents, locals and veterans have shown alike results on nearly all factors. The similar statistics was gathered from participants with regard to the number of rounds played. Four motivational factors were significantly different here (Achievement, Self- actualization, Affiliation, and

Table 5. Means and standard deviations for golf participation motivation

FACTOR AND ITEMS	MEAN	SD
LEISURE	6.13	0.83
STRESS RELEASE	5.14	1.50
SKILL MASTERY	5.11	1.35
SOCIAL FACILITATION	4.91	1.29
PHYSICAL FITNESS	4.51	1.65
AFFILIATION	4.30	1.39
AESTHETICS	4.13	1.41
COMPETITION	3.99	1.41
SELF-ACTUALISATION	3.95	1.45
VALUE DEVELOPMENT	3.89	1.31
SELF-ESTEEM	3.55	1.42
ACHIEVEMENT	3.54	1.57
STATUS	2.51	1.14
OVERALL SATISFACTION	6.61	0.81

Table 6. Golf participants' motivations by gender: mean (SD), F-statistics and p-value

MOTIVATION	MALE	FEMALE	F	p
LEISURE	6.12 (0.84)	6.13 (0.83)	0.24	.79
SKILL MASTERY	5.28 (1.24)	4.22 (1.61)	5.58**	.00
STRESS RELEASE	5.21 (1.41)	4.75 (1.91)	0.85	.43
SOCIAL FACILITATION	5.05 (1.24)	4.18 (1.33)	4.00*	.02
PHYSICAL FITNESS	4.56 (1.69)	4.30 (1.45)	0.46	.63
AFFILIATION	4.43 (1.34)	3.72 (1.49)	3.03*	.05
AESTHETICS	4.32 (1.32)	3.18 (1.52)	7.27**	.00
COMPETITION	4.16 (1.22)	3.22 (2.00)	5.01**	.01
VALUE DEVELOPMENT	4.04 (1.25)	3.17 (1.40)	4.68*	.01
SELF-ACTUALISATION	4.02 (1.41)	3.67 (1.64)	1.44	.24
ACHIEVEMENT	3.76 (1.56)	2.42 (1.11)	7.09**	.00
SELF-ESTEEM	3.60 (1.41)	3.37 (1.51)	0.83	.44
STATUS	2.62 (1.16)	1.93 (0.86)	3.45*	.03
OVERALL SATISFACTION	6.66 (0.77)	6.28 (0.95)	1.97	.14

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Aesthetics). Golfers who played more than 25 rounds a year have steadily shown the highest results nearly among all factors except for Status. The results are represented in Table 7 and Table 8.

Discussion

Overall, the results suggest that regardless of gender or past experience, Leisure was selected as the most important motive why participants play golf. Players were also attracted by opportunity to release their stress while golfing and possibility to master their playing skills. These results support previous researches (e.g. Mc Donald et al., 2002 and Petrick et al., 2001). Three of these four factors (Leisure, Physical fitness, and Skill mastery) compose one of the sub-metaphors which was mentioned in the article – mental well-being. People are highly motivated by these factors to be a participant in the game to be in a good shape and in a good mood.

Social factors like Social facilitation and Affiliation are also important for golfers. Being with like-minded people was on the second place among the group of factors. However Status was the factor having lowest means, which implies that players do not look on the hierarhial component of the game. This results is contrary to the previous results gathered by Petrick et al. who insisted on adding this factor to the scale. Probably this is only a case in Norway (which is more than socialistic country).

Also competitive and self-determinance issues turned out to be less important among all other factors. This result suggest that golf is attractive to people not because it provide participants with an opportunity to develop their personal intangible improvements or to achieve fundamental need of being the first among others, but because golf offers them opportunities to enjoy preferred recreational activity with friends.

In addition, the profile of the participants in the current investigation revealed that there are significant differences between males and femaler, as well as among groups regarding past experience. With respect to gender difference, male have shown higher results on most of the factors, and significant difference were noticed among eight motivations. Possible limitation here

is that the male participation in the game is prevailing in a higher degree than female (84% of males in comparison with 16% of females). It is not possible to say that golf is a men's sport but majority is occupied by males. Nonetheless, both males and females have shown very high results on Leisure, Physical fitness, and Skill mastery which should be indicated by sport marketers when attempting to attract participants of both sexes, and focus heavily on these factors.

With regard to level of past experience, participants who played for more than 25 rounds per year have shown higher levels of motivations on five motivational factors than less playing groups. The interesting results were discovered in this respect since more experienced players are more motivated in the factors that are totally didn't receive high rates (Achievement, Aesthetics, Competition, Self-actualisation, and Self-esteem). The outcome from here is obvious that the more people play the more they motivated by the factors related with the game itself and self-determination.

Social motivational factors have become more important for the golfer who had high experience on the course field and overall high experience. Which can be interpreted as more experienced people are interested in playing not because of the game itself but also with the supporting surrounding people. Totally these two groups of players (Locals and Veterans) have shown higher ratings for almost all factors.

The most interesting result is that despite the gender and past experience all participant have expressed very high Overall satisfaction with the golf itself. This is a good trending point for the marketers who must see a still growing and steadily emerging cluster of consumers who are eager for special equipment and supporting goods.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Generally, the results of this study contribute to a better understanding of golf participants that can be used to develop consumer profiles. Additionally, the results revealed that the items for the added motivational factors are reliable and conceptually valid and useful. The model of Consuming metaphors is a functional tool to perform research on with application of McDonald et al.'s Motivations Sport Consumer scale. It was found that Leisure is considered the most important aspect of golf participation among 13 different factors. The results showed that the mean score of Leisure scale was the highest for both genders with no significant difference. Therefore Leisure should be added to the original motivation scale in conducting research on the Motivation of golfers.

Past experience was an important indicator of difference within motivational factors – the more experienced people playing the more overall motives they possess. Overall satisfaction with the game has expressed the highest values explaining the great approval and pleasure with golf.

Ultimately, sports marketers may utilize the results of current study and future similar researches to predict the consumption behavior of golf participants and to develop effective marketing strategies (market segmentation, differentiation programmes, service decisions etc.) to satisfy the needs and wants of golf consumers. However the limitation of the present study as was mentioned in the article is that the subjects were chosen only from a particular region and within a small period of time that could affect the results. Further investigation of golf consumer motivation should be performed with larger sample size and more differentiated throughout the country to better understand this particular sport type.

References

- Alderson, W. (1955). A functionalist approach to consumer motivation. Consumer behavior and motivation. *Marketing Symposium* (pp. 6-24). University of Illinois.
- Anderson, J., & Gerbing, D. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin* , 103, 411-423.
- Burtscher. (2011). Validation of a German version of the Sport Motivation Scale (SMS28) and motivation analysis in competitive mountain runners. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* , 112 (3), 807-820.
- Dietz-Uhler, B., Harrick, E., End, C., & Jacquemotte, L. (2000). Sex differences in sport fan behavior and reasons for being a sport fan. *Journal of Sport Behavior* , 23 (3), 219.
- Fink, J., & Parker, H. (2009). Spectator motives: Why do we watch when our favorite team is not playing? *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 18 (4), 210-217.
- Fink, J., Trail, G., & Anderson, D. (2002). An examination of team identification: Which motives are most salient to its existence? *International Sports Journal* , 6, 195-207.
- Funk, D., Mahony, D., & Havitz, M. (2003). Sport consumer behavior: Assessment and direction. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 12 (4), 200-205.
- Gillet, N., Berjot, S., & Gobance, L. (2009). A motivational model of performance in the sport domain. *European Journal of Sport Science* , 9 (3), 151-158.
- Golfforbundet. (2010). *Norges Golfforbundet Arsrapport*.
- Hennessey, S., MacDonald, R., & MacEachern, M. (2008). A framework for understanding golfing visitors to a destination. *Journal of Sport and Tourism* , 13 (1), 5-35.
- Holt, D. (1995). How consumers consume: A typology of consumption practices. *Journal of Consumer Research* , 22 (1), 1-16.

- Iwasaki, Y., & Havitz, M. (2004). Examining relationships between leisure involvement, psychological commitment and loyalty to a recreation agency. *Journal of Leisure Research* , 36 (1), 45-72.
- James, J. D., & Ridinger, L. L. (2002). Female and male sport fans: A comparison of sport consumption motives. *Journal of Sport Behavior* , 25 (3), 260.
- Kahle, L., Kambara, K., & Rose, G. (1996). A functional model of fan attendance motivations for college football. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 5 (4), 51-60.
- Kelman, H. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* , 2, 51-60.
- Kilpatrick, M., Hebert, E., & Bartholomew, J. (2005). College students' motivation for physical activity: Differentiating men's and women's motives for sport participation and exercise. *Journal of American College Health* , 54 (2), 87-94.
- Kim, S. S., Scott, D., & Crompton, J. L. (1997). An exploration of the relationships among social psychological involvement, behavioral involvement, commitment, and future intentions in the context of birdwatching. *Journal of Leisure Research* , 29 (3), 320-341.
- Kline, R. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Ko, Y., Park, H., & Claussen, C. (2008). Action Sports Participation: Consumer Motivation. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship* , 9 (2), 111-124.
- Kwon, H., Trail, G., & Anderson, D. (2005). Are multiple points of attachment necessary to predict cognitive, affective, conative, or behavioral loyalty? *Sport Management Review* , 8, 255-270.
- Ling, C. Y. (n.d.). Retrieved from Third World Network: www.twinside.org.sg

Mahony, D. F., Madrigal, R., & Howard, D. (2000). Using the Psychological Commitment to Team (PCT) scale to segment sport consumers based on loyalty. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 9 (1), 15-25.

Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd Edition ed.). New York: Harper & Row Publishers Inc.

Mc Donald, M., Milne, G., & Hong, J. (2002). Motivational Factors for Evaluating Sport Spectator and Participant Markets. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 11 (2), 100-113.

Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd Edition ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Operators, I. A. (2011). Retrieved 1997, from The Global Golf Tourism Organisation:
www.iagto.com

Petrick, J., Backman, S., Bixler, R., & Norman, W. (2001). Analysis of golfer motivations and constraints by experience use history. *Journal of Leisure Research* , 33 (1), 56-70.

Robinson, M., & Trail, G. (2005). Relationships among spectator gender, motives, points of attachment, and sport preference. *Journal of Sport Management* , 19, 58-80.

Robinson, M., Trail, G., & Kwon, H. (2004). Motives and points of attachment of professional golf spectators. *Sport Management Review* , 7, 167-192.

Rohm, A., Milne, G., & McDonald, M. (2006). A Mixed-Method Approach for developing market segmentation typologies in the sports industry. *Sport Marketing Quarterly* , 15 (1), 29-39.

Sloan, L. (1989). The Motives of Sport Fans. In J. Goldstein (Ed.), *Sports, games and play: Social and psychological viewpoints* (2nd Edition ed., pp. 175-240). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Tokuyama, S., & Greenwell, T. (2011). Examining similarities and differences in consumer motivation for playing and watching soccer. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 20 (3), 18-156.
- Trail, G., & James, J. (2002). The Motivational Scale for Sport Consumption: Assessment of the scale's psychometric properties. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 24 (1), 108-127.
- Trail, G., Anderson, D., & Fink, J. (2000). A theoretical model of sport spectator consumption behavior. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 3, 154-180.
- Tsorbatzoudis, H., Alexandris, K., Zahariadis, P., & Grouios, G. (2006). Examining the relationship between recreational sport participation and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and amotivation. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 103, 363-374.
- Wann, D. (1995). Preliminary validation of the Sport Fan Motivation Scale. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 19, 377-396.
- Wann, D., Grieve, F., Zapalac, R., & Pease, D. (2008). Motivational profiles of sport fans of different sports. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 17 (1), 6-19.
- Wells, W. (1993). Discovery-oriented consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19, 489-504.
- Williams, D., Schreyer, R., & Knopf, R. (1990). The effect of the experience use history on the multidimensional structure of motivations to participate in leisure activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23, 36-54.
- Woo, B., Trail, G., Kwon, H., & Anderson, D. (2009). Testing models of motives and points of attachment among spectators in college football. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 18 (1), 38-53.

Zillmann, D., & Paulus, P. (1993). Spectators: Reactions to sports events and effects on athletic performance. In R. Singer, M. Murphey, & L. Tennant (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Sport Psychology* (pp. 600-619). New York: McMillan.

APPENDICES

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING AN ARTICLE

Sport Marketing Quarterly Manuscript Submission Guidelines

1. Manuscripts submitted to *SMQ* should not be submitted to another publication while under review for *SMQ*.
2. Manuscripts submitted to *SMQ* should be written in Microsoft Word or saved in rich text format and should be submitted electronically, via email attachment, to smq@bgnet.bgsu.edu.
3. Authors' names should not appear anywhere in the manuscript. A cover sheet listing the manuscript title and the order of authors as well as the primary author's name, mailing address, preferred phone and fax numbers and email address should accompany each manuscript. If appropriate, identify if the manuscript is derived from a master's thesis or doctoral dissertation.
4. A 150-word abstract should preface each manuscript. Manuscripts should be double-spaced with 1.5-inch margins, using an easily readable 12-point font. Authors should follow the style of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* in preparing all text, tables, and figures (e.g., *italics* used to report statistical information, indented second line in references listing).
5. Tables and figures should be submitted in electronic and paper form. The Editorial Board will consult the hard copies of the tables and figures to verify content, and the production department will use the hard copies to verify formatting. Indicate the software that was used to create the figures. *Adobe Illustrator*, *CorelDraw*, *Pagemaker*, and *QuarkXPress* are the preferred software for *SMQ* figures.
6. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 pages, including text, tables, figures, charts, footnotes, and references. Each research article appearing in *SMQ* should contain a table to help guide readers toward interpretation of results.

Major Point Resulting Major Implication for From Research Inquiry Practice and/or Further

- 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
- Etc.

7. Manuscripts submitted to *SMQ* undergo double-blind review. Reviewers' comments will be returned via email attachment written in Microsoft Word or saved in rich text format. The Editor will examine all manuscripts and determine if the content is congruent with the focus of the journal. If the content of the manuscript is not congruent with *SMQ*'s focus, the Editor will return the manuscript to the author(s) with an explanation. If the content of the manuscript is congruent with *SMQ*'s focus, the Editor will determine if the manuscript should be "Previewed" or "Reviewed." The Editor will ask for a *Preview* when the manuscript has been examined and determined that there may be questions related to the concept, writing, methodology, results, discussion, or implementation. Previewers will provide the Editor with a general rationale for rejection OR disagree with the Editor's opinion, in which case a full review will be conducted. The Editor will ask for a *Review* when the manuscript has been read and determined to be of acceptable or high quality in concept, writing, methodology, results, discussion, or implementation. A *Review* will be conducted in the traditional manner.
8. The Editor will attempt to provide authors with a completed review within a 6-week period.
9. Authors warrant that the manuscript is original except for excerpts and illustrations from copyrighted works as may be included with permission of the copyright owner, such permissions to be obtained by the authors at their own expense. The manuscripts submitted to the publisher must contain the appropriate credit line, if any, required by copyright holders of material adapted or reprinted for use.
10. Authors of manuscripts accepted for publication will be required to transfer copyright to Fitness Information Technology, Inc., publisher of *SMQ*.

All inquiries about reviews related to refereed research manuscripts**should be directed to**

Jacquelyn Cuneen, EdD, Editor
smq@bgnet.bgsu.edu

Table 7. Golf participants' motivations by numbers of rounds: mean (SD), F-statistics and p-value

MOTIVATION	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3	F	p
ACHIEVEMENT	2.58 (1.71)	2.98 (1.24)	3.96 (1.63)	7.12**	.00
SELF-ACTUALISATION	3.08 (0.83)	3.63 (1.44)	4.21 (1.43)	3.29*	.04
SELF-ESTEEM	2.42 (0.92)	3.37 (1.43)	3.73 (1.41)	2.28	.11
VALUE DEVELOPMENT	2.75 (0.32)	3.81 (1.33)	4.00 (1.30)	1.89	.15
SOCIAL FACILITATION	4.67 (0.47)	4.74 (1.35)	5.03 (1.27)	0.82	.44
AFFILIATION	3.50 (1.29)	3.95 (1.36)	4.58 (1.35)	4.00*	.02
PHYSICAL FITNESS	3.50 (1.29)	4.37 (1.58)	4.65 (1.68)	1.19	.31
SKILL MASTERY	4.50 (0.58)	5.11 (1.44)	5.14 (1.32)	0.43	.65
STRESS RELEASE	5.08 (1.34)	5.05 (1.67)	5.20 (1.40)	0.14	.87
AESTHETICS	2.58 (1.26)	3.98 (1.50)	4.31 (1.32)	3.37*	.04
COMPETITION	3.17 (0.79)	3.75 (1.46)	4.19 (1.37)	2.17	.12
STATUS	2.58 (1.34)	2.51 (1.20)	2.50 (1.11)	0.10	.99
LEISURE	5.92 (1.13)	6.10 (0.77)	6.16 (0.87)	0.20	.82
OVERALL SATISFACTION	5.22 (0.51)	6.56 (0.67)	6.69 (0.85)	5.26*	.01

GROUP 1 = LESS THAN 5; GROUP 2 = 6 - 25; GROUP 3 = OVER 25

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 8. Golf participants' motivations by past experience (EUH): mean (SD), F-statistics and p-value

MOTIVATION	INFREQUENTS	LOYAL- INFREQUENTS	COLLECTORS	LOCALS	VISITORS	VETERANS	F	p
ACHIEVEMENT	2.63 (1.22)	3.60 (1.62)	2.98 (1.58)	4.23 (1.48)	3.58 (1.31)	3.95 (1.57)	2.70*	.02
SELF- ACTUALISATION	3.43 (1.59)	4.17 (0.88)	3.62 (1.32)	4.50 (1.09)	3.79 (1.31)	4.22 (1.53)	1.89	.09
SELF-ESTEEM	3.37 (1.57)	3.70 (1.20)	3.08 (1.50)	3.97 (0.88)	3.08 (1.50)	3.82 (1.40)	1.39	.22
VALUE DEVELOPMENT	3.48 (1.23)	4.20 (0.98)	3.60 (1.31)	4.10 (1.14)	3.71 (0.93)	4.14 (1.40)	1.60	.15
SOCIAL FACILITATION	4.44 (1.26)	4.77 (1.07)	4.51 (1.27)	5.40 (1.19)	5.50 (0.85)	5.17 (1.24)	3.15**	.01
AFFILIATION	4.07 (1.43)	4.23 (1.55)	3.64 (1.39)	5.13 (0.88)	3.87 (1.05)	4.62 (1.39)	2.58*	.02
PHYSICAL FITNESS	4.15 (1.77)	5.00 (1.16)	4.19 (1.57)	5.03 (1.57)	4.04 (1.91)	4.64 (1.72)	0.76	.60
SKILL MASTERY	4.67 (1.03)	4.83 (1.26)	5.08 (1.39)	5.60 (1.77)	5.25 (1.06)	5.30 (1.23)	2.17*	.05
STRESS RELEASE	4.80 (1.31)	5.60 (0.98)	4.76 (1.59)	5.53 (1.13)	5.46 (1.13)	5.29 (1.63)	1.44	.21
AESTHETICS	4.07 (1.45)	3.93 (1.61)	3.86 (1.34)	4.97 (0.40)	3.58 (1.60)	4.27 (1.43)	1.35	.24
COMPETITION	3.44 (1.55)	3.67 (1.30)	3.61 (1.38)	4.70 (1.34)	3.83 (1.07)	4.31 (1.37)	1.90	.09
STATUS	2.61 (1.29)	2.97 (1.57)	2.44 (1.01)	2.57 (0.99)	2.21 (1.18)	2.49 (1.11)	0.74	.61
LEISURE	6.06 (0.84)	6.13 (0.83)	5.85 (1.11)	6.37 (0.74)	6.25 (0.68)	6.23 (0.72)	0.87	.52
OVERALL SATISFACTION	6.52 (0.67)	6.44 (0.71)	6.15 (1.36)	6.90 (0.32)	6.79 (0.47)	6.78 (0.81)	2.21*	.05

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.