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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to use the theoretical frameworks of intention to revisit (Petrick, Morais, & Norman, 2001) and perceived constraints and constraint negotiation (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001) to examine the role of past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies on golfers’ intentions to revisit a public golf facility. To accomplish this aim, two investigations using one data set were conducted.

The first investigation tested and extended Petrick et al.’s (2001) model of intentions to revisit, replicating the finding that there is a positive relationship between past experience and intentions to revisit but also finding, in contrast, that satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience was not significantly related to intentions to revisit a public golf course. In addition, a positive and significant relationship was observed between perceived value and intentions to revisit. A significant relationship was also observed between satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience and perceived value. A non-significant relationship was observed between past experience and perceived value.

The primary objective of the second investigation was to use Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) theoretical framework to examine the role of motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies on golfers’ intentions to revisit public golf facilities. The results replicated the finding that there is a significant path between motivation and negotiation strategies. Motivation was not significantly related to intentions to revisit a public golf course; however, negotiation strategies fully mediated the relationship between motivation and intentions to revisit. Further, the path between constraints and negotiation was unrelated, as well as the path between constraints and intentions to revisit.

In summary, understanding the role of past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies on golfers’ intentions to revisit a public golf facility has implications for enhancing play.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Golf has evolved into a major industry since the game was first played in the early 1400s. In 2000 the golf economy in the United States accounted for over $62 billion worth of goods and services (SRI International, 2002). This includes the billions of dollars associated with annual golf travel. Further, participation has grown from 26 million adults playing a regulation round of golf in 2001 to 28 million in 2005; however, rounds played dropped from 518 million rounds in 2000 to just under 500 million rounds in 2005 (Beditz, 2006).

In line with a decrease in participation, course construction has significantly slowed in recent years. As reported at the 2005 Golf 20/20 Conference, 398 new courses opened in 2000 and only 150 opened in 2004. Additionally, there has been an increase in course closings from 32 in 2001 to an estimated 80 in 2005 (Beckwith, 2004).

With new course construction slowing and the supply of golf courses catching up with demand, competition for rounds of golf remains high. Concomitantly, public access golf facilities (i.e., daily fee or municipal) hosted over 75% of the total rounds played in 2003. This trend is also reflected in the supply of private and public courses. From 1949 to 2000, private courses declined dramatically from 50% of the market to under 25% (Koppenhaver, 2006). Given that 75% of all rounds are played on public courses and over 70% of new course construction involves public golf facilities (NGF: National Golf Foundation, 2006), investigating the relationships that influence golfers’ intentions to revisit public golf facilities is an important issue to address.
Leisure researchers have attempted to understand intentions to revisit from several perspectives. For example, researchers have focused on the relationships between past experience, perceived value, and satisfaction as they influence future intentions to revisit (Petrick et al., 2001; Yang, 2004). They have also attempted to assess perceived value as an indicator of repurchase or revisit intentions and explore the relationships between consumers’ perceptions of price, quality, and value (Petrick & Backman, 2002a; Zeithaml, 1988).

To guide the study of intentions to revisit, researchers have used a conceptual model of leisure constraints related to participation and nonparticipation (Crawford, Jackson, & Godbey, 1991; Godbey, 1985; Hubbard & Mannell, 2001; Jackson & Searle, 1985). Leisure constraints have historically been defined as those factors that intervene between leisure preferences and leisure participation (Crawford & Godbey, 1987). Early models of leisure constraints focused on participation resulting from the absence of constraints; the outcome of encountering a constraint was nonparticipation (Jackson, 2005). In the late 1980s, the leisure constraint model changed considerably to include how individuals negotiate constraints. For example, Scott (1991), in a study of contract bridge, concluded that individuals use innovative ways to negotiate the constraints they face in their daily lives. His was the first study to introduce the concept of negotiation related to leisure participation. Jackson, Crawford, and Godbey (1993) also concluded that people would rather change their participation in a leisure activity than cease participation altogether. Continued research focusing on how individuals negotiate or overcome the effects of one or more constraints (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001) will assist owners and managers as they devise marketing strategies to make programs and services more attractive to golfers and encourage their intentions to revisit.
Research regarding intentions to revisit has focused on the relationships between past experience, perceived value, and satisfaction, yet little attention has been given to the extent individuals are motivated to participate in golf and how individuals’ negotiation of constraints could potentially impact their revisiting recreation facilities such as a public golf course. In addition, limited research has focused on the determinants of golfers’ perceived value and satisfaction as they relate to intentions to revisit. The results of the proposed study will be used to address and generate a conceptual model of intentions to revisit, specifically relationships between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, motivation, constraints, constraint negotiation, and intentions to revisit among individuals who golf at a public golf facility.

**Literature Review and Theoretical Framework**

*Past Experience*

According to Virden (1992), past experience is defined as the “sum of accumulated life experience a recreationist has within a particular recreation activity or style of participation” (p. 6). From a tourism perspective, Mill and Morrison (1984) noted, “Our experiences, and the resultant generalization from them, are weighed more heavily than any information received” (p. 11). Once we visit a destination, we are more likely to repeat the behavior. In a study examining influences of past experience on individuals’ intentions to revisit, Sonmez and Graefe (1998) concluded past travel experience is a “powerful influence” on future intentions (p. 175). Repeat visitation is also perceived to reduce the risk of an unsatisfactory experience (Gitelson & Crompton, 1984). In addition, Petrick (2002b) suggested that intentions to revisit are mediated by consumers’ past experiences. A segmentation tool shown to produce measurable groups based on experience is experience use history (EUH).
Experience use history (EUH), “refers to the amount of past experience, usually measured in terms of total visits, total years of use, and frequency per year of participation with an activity and/or resource as a specific site and/or other sites” (Hammitt, Backlund, & Bixler, 2004, p. 358). EUH, which was developed by Schreyer, Lime and Williams (1984), has been shown to include past experience with a specific site and past experience with other similar sites (Hammitt & McDonald, 1983; Schreyer et al., 1984; Williams, Schreyer, & Knopf, 1990). According to Hammitt et al. (2004), “experience use history has been driven by the premise that experienced users have a substantially greater knowledge base concerning activities and/or resource places, are more familiar, and therefore have a richer cognitive, and perhaps affective, basis for evaluating resource settings and use” (p.358). This has also been validated by Schreyer et al. (1984) and Manning (1999).

In a study of river recreationists Schreyer et al. (1984) utilized an index measure comprised of three experience variables (number of trips on the study river, number of other rivers floated, and total number of river trips taken). Six types of river users were identified using three experience variables: novices (persons making their first river trip), beginners (persons with a low amount of experience on a few rivers), locals (persons with high experience on the same river but low experience elsewhere), collectors (persons who have floated a large number of rivers but have little experience on any one river), visitors (persons who have a large amount of total river running experience but little experience on the sample river), and veterans (persons with a large amount of experience on the sample river and on other rivers). Schreyer et al. concluded that although these six experience levels of recreationists did not represent ordinal levels of increasing experience, the recreationists were found to differ significantly in terms of participation motivations, perceived conflicts, and attitudes toward management practices.
Using EUH as a segmentation tool, Petrick (2002b) concluded that golf travelers with less experience were more likely to be satisfied with the golf experience than golf travelers with more experience. Although golf travelers with less experience were more satisfied, golf travelers with more experience were found to have higher intentions to revisit. From a tourism perspective, first-time visitors are more likely to switch to other destinations than repeat visitors (Kozak, 2001). This finding suggests that golf course managers should focus their marketing efforts on golf travelers with less experience since they are more unsure of their intentions to revisit (Petrick, 2002b). According to Petrick and Kozak, more research is needed to further develop the EUH construct, especially in a tourism context.

Since the extent of previous experience is an indicator of the decisions concerning future behavior, more research is needed to investigate the relationship between past experience and intentions to revisit. An approach promoted by Virden (1992) involves segmenting individuals by their experience level. “Golf, tennis, fitness facilities and outdoor recreation activities such as hiking, horseback riding and wind surfing provide prime examples for past experience based marketing” (Virden, 1992, p. 7).

Perceived Value

Researchers have found that perceived value for price paid is a recognized construct of intentions to revisit (Parasuraman & Grewal, 2000; Petrick et al. 2001; Zeithaml, 1988). According to Zeithaml and Bitner (1996), “perceived value is the consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a service based on perceptions of what is received and what is given” (p. 498). In a study designed to gain insight into consumer perceptions of value, Zeithaml (1988) identified four definitions of value: (1) value is low price, (2) value is whatever one wants in a product, (3)
value is the quality that the consumer receives for the price paid, and (4) value is what consumers get for what they give. The majority of past research on perceived value has focused on the fourth definition: value is what consumers get for what they give (Bojanic, 1996; Petrick, 2002a; Zeithaml, 1985). The diversity in meanings of value highlights the difficulty in conceptualizing and measuring perceived value in research. In addition, Zeithaml et al. (1996) concluded that although what is received and what is given varies across consumers, purchase decisions will be based on perceived value, not on the price paid. For the purpose of this study, I will focus on value as what customers get for what they give because it considers all the benefits, as well as the sacrifices (money, time, effort) they receive from the golfing experience. Thus, it would be anticipated in this study that golfers' intentions to revisit will be greater if their perceptions of what is received are higher than what is given (i.e., perceived value).

From a tourism perspective, travelers attach a great deal of importance to their perceptions of value (Kashyap & Bojanic, 2000). Using a sample of vacationers visiting a destination, Petrick et al. (2001) found that perceived value is a good predictor of intentions to revisit a destination. In addition, Parasuraman and Grewal (2000) concluded that the construct of perceived value is the most important indicator of intentions to repurchase or revisit.

The measurement of consumer satisfaction should also accompany perceived value (Petrick et al. 2001). According to Woodruff (1997), “if consumer satisfaction measurement is not backed up with in-depth learning about customer value and related problems that underlie their evaluations, it may not provide enough of the customer’s voice to guide managers in how to respond” (p. 139).
Monetary and Non-Monetary Costs

Researchers have concluded that perceived value for price paid is significantly associated with intentions to revisit. Thus, public golf facilities “may add value by improving perceived price (by adding desired amenities) or lowering perceived price (by reducing monetary or non-monetary costs)” (Kashyap & Bojanic, 2000, p. 49). Monetary costs include both direct and indirect costs (O’Sullivan & Spangler, 1998). The direct cost of the golf experience is the fee associated with playing the golf course. The indirect costs are the expenditures for equipment, clothing, transportation, and meals, if necessary. Non-monetary costs “consist of opportunity and intrinsic prices paid for participating in an experience” (O’Sullivan & Spangler, 1998, p. 113). Opportunity costs refer to time and effort required by the experience. Intrinsic costs refer to association, social, psychological, and sensory costs of the experience. Thus, demand is not just a function of monetary price (Zeithaml & Bitner, 1996). “Anything that can be built into products to reduce time, effort, and search costs can reduce perceived sacrifice and thereby increase perceptions of value” (Zeithaml, 1988, p. 18). Due to time requirements, the golf experience is considered to have a high non-monetary price. Hence, a better understanding of consumers’ perceptions of monetary and non-monetary costs as they relate to the golf experience will add to the intentions to revisit research.

According to Godbey (2005), non-monetary costs may be related to perceived constraints. He argues that constraints impacting perceptions of value stem from a speeding up of the pace of life and the increasing number of goods and experiences from which people may choose. Time commitments, a non-monetary example of “price,” are the most frequently communicated constraint to leisure, followed by family obligations and the expense of participation (Scott, 2005). According to Graves (2005), 62% of golfers who left the game cited
“do not have time to play” as the reason. This is not surprising as many consumers, especially women, consider time an important commodity (Scott & Jackson, 1996). In addition, 38% cited family obligations and 29% suggested the game was too costly. This study will advance the perceived value research by addressing the relationship between perceived value and intentions to revisit with a sample of individuals who golf at a public facility. How golfers integrate non-monetary costs such as time and effort into evaluations of the golf experiences and how they influence intentions to revisit will also be addressed.

Consumer Satisfaction

According to Oliver (1997), “satisfaction is the consumer’s fulfillment response. It is a judgment that a product or service feature, or the product or service itself, provided (or is providing) a pleasurable level of consumption-related fulfillment, including levels of under- or over-fulfillment” (p. 13). Oliver’s definition recognizes that satisfaction is an end state of a psychological process and can only be determined with a reference to a standard. For example, golfers may relate their satisfaction to their performance or score, as it relates to “par” (i.e., the predetermined number of strokes required to complete a golf hole, a round of golf, or a tournament). From a tourism perspective, Petrick and Backman (2002) found that, “customer satisfaction is highly correlated with intentions to revisit” (p. 257). This relationship has also been validated by McDougall and Levesque (2000).

Consumer satisfaction has most commonly been understood on the basis of expectancy disconfirmation (Oliver, 1980; Oliver & DeSarbo, 1988). This conception is also referred to as the disconfirmation paradigm, which occurs when there are differences between what one receives and what he or she wanted to receive in an experience (Burns, Graefe, & Absher, 2003;
Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1994). The expectancy disconfirmation process is derived from two processes: the development of expectations of the experience and the disconfirmation judgment when individuals compare their experience against their expectations. Expectations influence satisfaction because they provide a standard or reference of product performance. According to Oliver (1997), “an expectation is an anticipation of future consequences based on prior experience, current circumstances, or other sources of information” (p. 68). Oliver (1980) further articulated that consumers feel satisfied when they compare their perceptions to their expectations. Thus, it would be anticipated in this study that golfers will be satisfied if their experience is greater than individuals’ expectations (i.e., positive disconfirmation).

Dissatisfaction, on the other hand, will occur if experience is less than expectations (i.e., negative disconfirmation).

The effects expectations have on satisfaction, however, have been widely debated. Spreng, Mackenzie, and Olshavsky (1996) suggested that a consumer’s “desires” or “ideal standard” should be measured when attempting to document the effect of expectations on satisfaction. Hamilton, Crompton, and More (1991), on the other hand, indicated that the desires of the individual, not their expectations, should be measured. Crompton and Mackay (1989) argued that it is not enough to measure expectations in determining satisfaction. Individual attributes must also be identified. Barsky (1992) concluded that there is not enough evidence to support that expectations are directly related to satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Rather than measure the mathematical difference between expectations and performance, some researchers have focused on the performance-only attributes of the experience to measure satisfaction (Babakus & Boller, 1992; Carman, 1990; Oliver & DeSarbo, 1988). These researchers found that an expectation score was not necessary in determining satisfaction levels,
and that performance-only measures had a more direct effect on overall satisfaction. “The simplified performance-measures-only model seems capable of providing important answers about visitors’ desired conditions and the extent to which they are actually experienced” (Absher, 1998, p. 41).

Burns et al. (2003) also found that performance-only measures of satisfaction are generally better predictors of satisfaction. In a study of water-based recreationists at various lakes, for example, Burns et al. examined the relationships between customer service attributes, dimensions of satisfaction and overall satisfaction. They concluded that the satisfaction-only item scores within the satisfaction dimensions were better predictors of overall satisfaction. They also suggested that because recreation is a highly intangible activity, further research should continue to examine performance-only measures of satisfaction. The proposed study will advance leisure satisfaction research by utilizing the performance-only measures of satisfaction in a model addressing intentions to revisit with a sample of individuals who golf at a public facility.

*Leisure Constraints Theory*

The focus of leisure constraints research is to “investigate factors that are assumed by researchers and/or perceived or experienced by individuals to limit the formation of leisure preferences and/or inhibit or prohibit participation and enjoyment in leisure” (Jackson, 2000, p. 62). Researchers have identified three types of constraints. According to Crawford and Godbey (1987), the three types of constraints are *intrapersonal, interpersonal*, and *structural*. Intrapersonal constraints involve internal psychological conditions such as personality, attitude, or mood. They are conceptualized as the most powerful because they may precede the
motivation for participation (Raymore, Godbey, Crawford, & von Eye, 1993). Interpersonal constraints arise out of interaction with others, such as family members, friends, coworkers, and neighbors (e.g., not being able to play golf because of family work schedules). Structural constraints entail lack of opportunities or the cost of activities that result from external conditions in the environment (e.g., the cost involved to play golf). Structural constraints are perceived as having the least effect on participation. Crawford, Jackson, and Godbey (1991) theorized that the three categories of constraints are hierarchically related, i.e., intrapersonal constraints must first be overcome, followed by interpersonal and, lastly, structural constraints. Regarded as the major leisure nonparticipation theory, the model of hierarchical constraints is based on Crawford and Godbey’s (1987) early work, which was further extended by Jackson et al. in 1993.

In the early 1980s, models of leisure constraints focused on participation resulting from the absence of constraints. The outcome of encountering a constraint was deemed to be nonparticipation (Jackson, 2005). By the late 1980s the model changed considerably to account for how individuals negotiate constraints. For example, Kay and Jackson (1991) suggested that “despite constraint,” people manage to modify their participation in their chosen leisure activity, rather than non-participation. In addition, Scott (1991), in a study of contract bridge, concluded that individuals use innovative ways to negotiate the constraints they face in their daily lives. The idea that people may negotiate through constraints obtained more credence when Shaw, Bonen, and McCabe (1991) found that individuals who are more constrained participate more frequently in physically active leisure pursuits than those who are less constrained. Higher participation was associated with respondents who reported some kind of perceived constraint. Building upon ideas from Kay and Jackson (1991) and Scott (1991), Jackson et al. (1993) provided additional
support that individuals would rather modify their participation than not participate. Thus, constraints do not necessarily mean less leisure.

With respect to individuals’ response to constraints, Jackson et al. (1993) proposed a three-category typology of people: (1) individuals who react by not participating in their desired activity (reactive response); (2) others, despite experiencing a constraint, who do not reduce or change their participation at all (successful proactive response); and (3) others who participate, but in an altered manner (partly successful proactive response).

Using a structural equation model to test the interactions between constraints, motivation, negotiation and participation, Hubbard and Mannell (2001) provided support for the constraints typology and clarified the role of motivation in individuals’ response to constraints. They found that the presence of a constraint “appears to directly trigger negotiation efforts that can mitigate the negative effects of the constraints” (p. 158).

Using a sample of golfers, Petrick, Backman, Bixler, and Norman (2001) analyzed why golfers participate and the constraints that must be negotiated in order to participate. They concluded that golfers with different experience use histories differ on both their motivations and constraints for playing golf. According to Coalter, Dowers and Baxter (1995), the relationship between frequency of sport participation or experience use history and perception of constraints is an important one that should continue to be studied.

In addition to experience use history, individuals’ personal and situational characteristics may impact their ability to negotiate constraints. For example, Hubbard and Mannell (2001) emphasized, “whether or not motivation is an immediate antecedent and plays a stronger direct role in countering the effects of constraints, when other types of leisure activities, motives, and circumstances are involved, is unclear and will have to be determined by future research” (p.
Despite consistent theoretical development, leisure constraint research has not focused on the relationship between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, constraints, constraint negotiation, and intentions to revisit among recreationists. This study will advance leisure constraints research by addressing these relationships with a sample of individuals who golf at a public facility.

**Intentions to Revisit**

To date there continues to be little understanding about an individual’s intentions to revisit a destination. In a recreation or tourism context, much of the research regarding intentions to revisit has focused on the influences of satisfaction (Petrick et al., 2001; Petrick & Backman, 2002b; Spreng et al., 1996); perceived value (Kashyap & Bojanic, 2000; Petrick & Backman, 2002a); quality (Baker & Crompton, 2000); and past experience (Kozak, 2001; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Petrick et al., 2001). For example, in a study examining the relationships between tourist satisfaction, previous visits, and intentions to revisit, Kozak (2001) documented a positive relationship between the number of previous visits to the destination and intentions to revisit. His findings paralleled those of Petrick et al. (2001) and Harris and Uncles (2007).

In addition, Kozak and Rimmington (2000) concluded that overall satisfaction had a significant relationship with intentions to revisit and satisfied tourists were most likely to recommend future visits to friends and relatives. And, Woodruff (1997) suggested that the measurement of satisfaction be accompanied by a measurement of perceived value to better guide managers in how to respond to customers.

To achieve and retain a competitive advantage, understanding how perceived value influences intentions to revisit would also be helpful. For example, in a tourism study
investigating the relationship between perceived value and intentions to revisit, Kashyap and Bojanic (2000) concluded that perceived value was significantly associated with revisit intentions. Based on this finding they argued that managers should focus their efforts on the perception of value and the satisfaction attributes that have the greatest impact on value.

In summary, past experience has proven to be the best predictor of intentions to revisit; however, perceived value and satisfaction are also predictors of intentions to revisit. Investigating the relationships that influence golfers’ interest in and intentions to revisit public golf facilities remains an important issue to address, especially with the supply of golf courses catching up with the demand of golfers.

**Research Purpose, Hypotheses, and Questions**

The purpose of this study was to use the theoretical frameworks of intention to revisit (Petrick et al., 2001) and perceived constraints and constraint negotiation (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001) to examine the role of past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies on golfers’ intentions to revisit a public golf facility. Petrick et al.'s (2001) modified intention to revisit model (Figure 1.1) and Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) hypothesized constraint-effects-mitigation model of the constraint negotiation process (Figure 1.2) were used as guiding frameworks.
**Figure 1.1.** Petrick et al.’s (2001) modified model of intentions to revisit.

**Figure 1.2.** Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) hypothesized constraint-effects-mitigation model of the constraint negotiation process modified to include intentions to revisit.
The following hypotheses were addressed:

H1. Past experience will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H2. Satisfaction will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H3. Perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H4. Controlling for past experience and satisfaction, perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H5. Past experience and satisfaction will be significantly and positively related to perceived value.

H6. Perceived constraints will be significantly and negatively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H7. Negotiation strategies will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H8. Motivation will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H9. Perceived constraints and motivation will be significantly and positively related to negotiation strategies.

Definitions

Past experience is defined as the “sum of accumulated life experience a recreationist has within a particular recreation activity or style of participation” (Virden, 1992, p.6). Past experience will be measured by the number of years playing golf, how many rounds of golf played in the past 12 months, the number of rounds played in the past 12 months at the public golf course, and how many different golf courses played in the past 12 months.
“Perceived value is the consumers’ overall assessment of the utility of a service based on perceptions of what is received and what is given” (Zeithaml & Bitner, 1996, p. 498).

Satisfaction is the “consumers fulfillment response. It is a judgment that a product or service feature, or the product itself, provided (or is providing) a pleasurable level of consumption-related fulfillment, including levels of under-or over-fulfillment” (Oliver, 1997, p. 13).

Constraint: “The state of being checked, restricted, or compelled to avoid or perform some action” (Constraint, 2008).


Motivation: The factors that encourage leisure behavior know as motives (Carroll & Alexandris, 1997)

Intentions to revisit: How likely an individual is to do the following in the next 12 months: (a) play golf at the public golf course, (b) utilize the practice facilities, (c) take a golf lesson at the public golf course, and (d) purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public golf course.
Broader Impacts of the Proposed Research

This more comprehensive approach to studying intentions to revisit has the potential to enhance knowledge about the factors that contribute to individuals’ decisions to participate in one type of recreation activity—golf. This is critical on two fronts. Theoretically, the results will broaden our understanding of factors that may have an impact on perceived constraints to participation as well as negotiation of those constraints. In addition, limited attention has been given to the relationship between perceived constraints and intention to revisit. Thus, the results of this research will broaden our understanding of the impact perceived constraints can have on an individual’s level of participation in a recreation activity. From an applied perspective, the results of this study will help managers at public golf courses develop strategic initiatives to maintain or perhaps enhance play.
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CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

The method used to investigate the role of past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies on golfers’ intentions to revisit a public golf facility will be addressed in the following sections: Sample, Data Collection, Measures, and Analysis of Data.

Sample
Nine hundred and eighty non-members who played golf at a public golf course from March 1, 2006 through August 1, 2007 comprised the study sample. Because members have expressed their intentions to revisit through the purchase of a membership, non-members were chosen as a representative sample of golfers whose intentions to revisit are unknown. In addition, members are more frequent users playing more rounds on average than non-members (43 vs. 25) and represent a different market (NGF, 2007).

Data Collection
Every golfer was sent an e-mail message introducing the study (Appendix A). A total of 172 emails were returned as undeliverable and removed from the sample (new n=808). One week after the initial introductory e-mail was distributed, a follow-up e-mail with a link to the on-line questionnaire was sent out (Appendix B). This was followed one week later by a reminder e-mail to all non-respondents (Appendix C). As an
incentive to participate, study participants who chose to be included were entered into a drawing for rounds of golf at the public golf course.

Measures

The variables of interest in this study were past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, motivation, perceived constraints, constraint negotiation strategies, intentions to revisit, and sample characteristics. Loyalty is another closely related construct; however, it was not addressed in this study. The actual items used to address each variable can be referenced in Appendix C, the questionnaire.

Past Experience

Past experience was measured using a modified version of Petrick, Morais, and Norman’s (2001) and Schreyer, Lime, and Williams’ (1984) measures of past behavior. Participants were asked how many years they have been playing golf, how many rounds of golf they played in the past 12 months, the number of rounds they played the past 12 months at the public golf course, and how many different golf courses they played in the past 12 months.

Perceived Value

Similar to Petrick and Backman (2002), overall perceived value was measured using a single item, 5-point scale with values ranging from 1 (extremely poor) to 5 (extremely good). Respondents were asked to rate the value received for fees paid during their round(s) of golf at the public golf course.
Satisfaction

According to Burns, Graefe, and Absher (2003), Babakus and Boller (1992), Carman (1990), and Oliver and DeSarbo, (1988), performance-only measures of satisfaction have generally been better predictors of satisfaction. Therefore, individuals were asked, "On average, how satisfied were you with the following aspects of your round(s) of golf at the [public golf course]?") Individuals responded to 19 items including, affordability/value of the course, overall condition of the golf course, condition of the greens, course design/layout, individual performance, tee time availability, interaction with playing partners, the pace of play, customer service, condition of golf carts, the club house, golf shop, the 19th hole food and beverage service, locker room, friendliness/service of staff, on-course restrooms, on-course drinking water, on-course food and beverage service, and overall quality of experience at the public golf course. The satisfaction measures were modified from those used by the National Golf Foundation (2005), as well as Wills (2002). Individuals were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with each item using a 5-point scale ranging from "very dissatisfied" (1) to "very satisfied" (5). Contrary to Petrick et al. (2001), a 5-point scale was used, rather than a 10-point scale, to remain consistent with the measure of perceived value.

Perceived Constraints.

To measure perceived constraints, the Hubbard and Mannell (2001) Leisure Constraint Scale was modified from its original list of 32 items. Items referencing workplace exercise programs (14 items) were omitted and replaced by items specific to golf. In addition, the wording of several statements was slightly altered to make them more specific to golf. A total of 18 constraint statements were included in the modified
scale. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the constraint statements using a 5-point Likert-type scale with values ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Six (6) intrapersonal, five (5) interpersonal, and seven (7) structural constraint domains were included and measured by calculating mean scores for each of the three constraint types. Higher perceived constraint scores reflected the number of constraints reported and the extent to which each was perceived as constraining. The Constraint Negotiation Scale has sufficient reliability, with a coefficient alpha of .72 (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001).

**Constraint Negotiation Strategies**

To measure constraint negotiation strategies, Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) Negotiation Strategies Scale was modified by omitting items referencing workplace exercise programs and by adding specific items related to golf. Respondents were asked to respond to the items using a 5-point Likert-type scale with values ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very Often). Negotiation strategies included time management (5 items), skill acquisition (4 items), interpersonal coordination (4 items), and financial resources and strategies (5 items). Mean scores were calculated for each negotiation strategy. Higher mean scores indicated greater use of the constraint negotiation strategies. Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) Negotiation Strategies Scale has good reliability, with a coefficient alpha of .89 for the full scale.

**Motivation**

Nine motivation items were modified based on Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) original scale, as well as from informal discussions with members and staff of a public golf course to focus on golf. Individuals were asked to indicate to the degree to which
they agree with the following: “I play golf or would like to play more golf because...” (a) it is good for my health, (b) I enjoy the company of my friends, (c) I enjoy the competition with myself, (d) I enjoy the competition with my playing partners, (e) I like meeting new people, (f) of the challenge of the game, (g) it improves my skills, (h) I enjoy being outdoors, (i) it provides me with enjoyment/pleasure, and (j) Other. The response options ranged from “Not at All” (1) to “Very Much” (5).

**Intentions to Revisit**

Using Petrick et al.’s (2001) intentions to revisit question as a model, respondents were asked to indicate how likely (i.e., 1=extremely unlikely to 5=extremely likely) they were to do the following in the next 12 months: (a) play golf at the public golf course, (b) utilize the practice facilities at the public golf course, (c) take a golf lesson at the public golf course, and (d) purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public golf course. They were also asked how many rounds of golf they expect to play at the public golf course during the next 12 months. To more accurately correlate intentions to actual behavior in a public golf context, "the next 12 months" was used as a time frame rather than Petrick et al.'s (2001) "within the next two years."

**Sample Characteristics**

Respondents were asked how many golf lessons they have taken in the past 12 months, and if they have an established United States Golf Association (USGA) handicap. If a USGA handicap was established, respondents were asked to note their current handicap. If they did not have an established USGA handicap, respondents were asked their average score for an 18-hole round of golf.
In addition, questions regarding socio-demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, employment status, highest level of education, total gross household income, and marital status) were included in the survey. In addition, questions focused on average number of hours a week dedicated to work, and number of children living at home (if applicable) were included, as suggested by Hubbard and Mannell (2001).

**Analysis of Data**

The data were analyzed through the use of SPSS 16.0 for Macintosh and LISREL 8.7 for Windows. Hierarchical regression was used to examine the relationships between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction and intention to revisit. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to test the relationships between motivation, perceived constraints, negotiation strategies, and intentions to revisit.
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ORIENTATION TO CHAPTER 3

Chapter 3 is written as a stand-alone manuscript to be submitted in consideration for publication in the *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, a peer-reviewed journal. (Note: Appendices D through G contain supplemental information that is not traditionally incorporated into a manuscript, but may be of interest to the reader.)

The purpose of the study described in Chapter 3 is to examine the relationships between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, and intentions to revisit among individuals who golf at a public golf facility. The following hypotheses are addressed:

H1. Past experience will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H2. Satisfaction will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H3. Perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H4. Controlling for past experience and satisfaction, perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H5. Past experience and satisfaction will be significantly and positively related to perceived value.
CHAPTER 3

HOW DO PAST EXPERIENCE, PERCEIVED VALUE, AND SATISFACTION INFLUENCE INTENTIONS TO REVISIT A PUBLIC GOLF COURSE?

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, and intentions to revisit among individuals who golf at a public facility. Non-members who played golf at a public golf course from March 1, 2006 through August 1, 2007 comprised the study sample (N=808). Results revealed (a) components of past experience and perceived value were significantly related to intentions to revisit a public golf course, (b) overall satisfaction was not significantly related to intentions to revisit; and (c) only satisfaction with the overall experience was significantly related to perceived value. Further, only “number of rounds played in the last 12 months” consistently contributed to the variance explained when the four individual items comprising the intentions to revisit index were treated as dependent variables. The implications of these findings for the intentions to revisit conceptual framework as well as for public golf course managers are discussed.
Introduction

Golf participation grew from 37 million golfers in 2001 to 40 million in 2005, but rounds played dropped from 518 million rounds to just under 500 million rounds (Beditz, 2006). Further, golf course construction significantly slowed and courses closed. As reported at the 2006 Golf 20/20 Conference, only 135 new golf courses opened in 2006 compared to 284 in 2001. Additionally, there was an increase in course closings from 32 in 2001 to an estimated 140 in 2006 (Beditz, 2006). This represents a “net zero” golf course supply growth. For the first time in over 50 years golf course supply growth has fallen below the rate of population growth (Koppenhaver, 2006).

These trends are alarming to public recreation and parks departments, many of whom manage public golf courses, which represent 73% of the overall market, host over 75% of total rounds played, and have an average revenue of over $1.9 million (NGF: National Golf Foundation, 2006a). Given the important economic and social benefits (e.g., socialization, social capital) generated through public golf courses as well as the increased competition they face (NGF, 2006b), researchers must study the variables that contribute to individuals' intentions to revisit.

Leisure researchers have attempted to understand intentions to revisit. For example, they have focused on the relationships between past experience, perceived value, and satisfaction as they influence future intentions to revisit a tourism destination (Petrick, Morais, & Norman, 2001; Yang, 2004). They have also assessed perceived value as an indicator of repurchase or revisit intentions and explored the relationships between consumers’ perceptions of price, quality, and value (Petrick & Backman, 2002a; Zeithaml, 1988). Researchers have not, however, focused on intentions to revisit public
golf courses. This is unfortunate for a number of reasons. First, golf is a competitive industry requiring in-depth and up-to-date knowledge of the needs and behaviors of existing and potential consumers. Second, the types of experiences being sold by public and commercial entities are different and as such, the expectations and behaviors of their consumers also may differ (Kotler, Roberto, & Lee, 2002; Kyle, Mowen, Absher, & Havitz, 2006). Third, managers of public golf courses (e.g., public recreation and park departments) must generate revenue through their golf operations. Hence, knowing what variables affect golfers’ intentions to revisit will assist them in their strategic marketing initiatives. Fourth, little research has been conducted on intentions to revisit in a public recreation context. Thus, extending the research on intentions to revisit in a public recreation context is important.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The purpose of the proposed research is to examine the relationships between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, and intentions to revisit among individuals who golf at a public facility. Thus, the literature reviewed and the theoretical framework proposed include past experience, perceived value and satisfaction, and how they may relate to intentions to revisit public golf facilities.

Past Experience

According to Virden (1992), past experience is defined as the “sum of accumulated life experience a recreationist has within a particular recreation activity or style of participation” (p. 6). Mill and Morrison (1984) noted these past experiences or, “our
experiences, and the resultant generalization from them, are weighed more heavily than any information received” (p. 11). In a study examining influences of past experience on individuals’ intentions to revisit, Sonmez and Graefe (1998) concluded past travel experience is a “powerful influence” on future intentions. Repeat visitation is also perceived to reduce the risk of an unsatisfactory experience (Gitelson & Crompton, 1984). In addition, Petrick (2002) suggested that intentions to revisit are mediated by consumers’ past experiences.

A segmentation tool shown to produce measurable groups based on experience is experience use history (EUH), which “refers to the amount of past experience, usually measured in terms of total visits, total years of use, and frequency per year of participation with an activity and/or resource as a specific site and/or other sites” (Hammitt, Backlund, & Bixler, 2004, p. 358). EUH, developed by Schreyer, Lime and Williams (1984), includes past experience with a specific site as well as with other similar sites (Hammitt & McDonald, 1983; Schreyer et al., 1984; Williams, Schreyer, & Knopf, 1990). According to Hammitt et al. (2004), “experience use history has been driven by the premise that experienced users have a substantially greater knowledge base concerning activities and/or resource places, are more familiar, and therefore have a richer cognitive, and perhaps affective, basis for evaluating resource settings and use” (p. 358). This has also been validated by Schreyer et al. (1984) and Manning (1999).

In a study of river recreationists Schreyer et al. (1984) utilized an index measure comprised of three experience variables (i.e., number of trips on the study river, number of other rivers users had floated, and total number of river trips taken). Six types of river users were identified using these experience variables: novices (persons making their first
river trip), beginners (persons with a low amount of experience on a few rivers), locals (persons with high experience on the same river but low experience elsewhere), collectors (persons who have floated a large number of rivers but have little experience on any one river), visitors (persons who have a large amount of total river running experience but little experience on the sample river), and veterans (persons with a large amount of experience on the sample river and on other rivers). Schreyer et al. concluded that although these six experience levels of recreationists did not represent levels of increasing experience, the recreationists did differ significantly in terms of participation motivations, perceived conflicts, and attitudes toward management practices.

Using EUH as a segmentation tool, Petrick (2002a) concluded that golf travelers with less experience were more likely to be satisfied with the golf experience than golf travelers with more experience. Although golf travelers with less experience were more satisfied, golf travelers with more experience were found to have higher intentions to revisit. Kozak (2001), on the other hand, documented that first-time visitors are more likely to switch to other destinations than repeat visitors. This finding suggests that golf course managers should focus their marketing efforts on golf travelers with less experience since they are more unsure of their intentions to revisit (Petrick, 2002a). Further, since the golf industry is experiencing an increase in the number of golfers and a simultaneous decrease in rounds being played, public golf course managers could also benefit by focusing their attention on the first-time golfer to encourage intentions to revisit.

Since the extent of previous experience is an indicator of the decisions concerning future behavior, more research is needed to investigate the relationship between past
experience and intentions to revisit. Virden (1992) suggested that to improve leisure experience and facility marketing, segmenting individuals by their experience level can benefit leisure service providers. Virden (1992) further articulated that “golf, tennis, fitness facilities and outdoor recreation activities such as hiking, horseback riding and wind surfing provide prime examples for past experience based marketing” (p. 7). The proposed study will address the relationships between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, and intentions to revisit among individuals who golf at public facilities.

Perceived Value

Perceived value for price paid is a recognized construct of intentions to revisit (Parasuraman & Grewal, 2000; Petrick et al., 2001; Zeithaml, 1988). According to Zeithaml and Bitner (1996), “perceived value is the consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a service based on perceptions of what is received and what is given” (p. 498). In a study designed to gain insight into consumer perceptions of value, Zeithaml (1988) identified four definitions of value: (1) value is low price, (2) value is whatever one wants in a product, (3) value is the quality that the consumer receives for the price paid, and (4) value is what consumers get for what they give. The majority of past research on perceived value has focused on the fourth definition: value is what consumers get for what they give (Bojanic, 1996; Petrick, 2002a; Zeithaml, 1985). The diversity in meanings of value highlights the difficulty in conceptualizing and measuring perceived value in research. In addition, Zeithaml et al. (1996) concluded that although what is received and what is given varies with each consumer, purchase decisions will be based on perceived value, not on the price paid. For the purpose of this study, I will focus on value as what customers get for what they give because doing so accounts for all the
benefits as well as the sacrifices (money, time, effort) they receive from the golfing experience. Thus, it would be anticipated in this study that golfers' intentions to revisit will be greater if their perceptions of what is received are higher than what is given (i.e., perceived value).

From a tourism perspective, travelers attach a great deal of importance to their perceptions of value (Kashyap & Bojanic, 2000). Using a sample of vacationers visiting a destination, Petrick et al. (2001) found that perceived value is a good predictor of intentions to revisit a destination. In addition, Parasuraman and Grewal (2000) concluded that the construct of perceived value is the most important indicator of intentions to repurchase or revisit.

*Satisfaction*

The measurement of consumer satisfaction should also accompany the study of perceived value (Petrick et al., 2001). According to Woodruff (1997), “if consumer satisfaction measurement is not backed up with in-depth learning about customer value and related problems that underlie their evaluations, it may not provide enough of the customer’s voice to guide managers in how to respond” (p. 139).

According to Oliver (1997), “satisfaction is the consumer’s fulfillment response. It is a judgment that a product or service feature, or the product or service itself, provided (or is providing) a pleasurable level of consumption-related fulfillment, including levels of under- or over-fulfillment” (p. 13). Oliver’s definition recognizes that satisfaction is an end state of a psychological process and can only be determined with a reference to a standard. For example, golfers may relate their satisfaction to their performance or score, as it relates to “par” (i.e., the predetermined number of strokes required to complete a
golf hole, a round of golf, or a tournament). From a tourism perspective, Petrick and Backman (2002b) found that, “customer satisfaction is highly correlated with intentions to revisit” (p. 257). The relationship between consumer satisfaction and intentions to revisit has also been validated by McDougall and Levesque (2000).

Consumer satisfaction has most commonly been understood on the basis of expectancy disconfirmation (Oliver, 1980; Oliver & DeSarbo, 1988). This conception is also referred to as the disconfirmation paradigm, which occurs when there are differences between what one receives and what he or she wanted to receive in an experience (Burns, Graefe, & Absher, 2003; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1994). The expectancy disconfirmation process is derived from two processes: the development of expectations of the experience and the disconfirmation judgment when individuals compare their experience against their expectations. Expectations influence satisfaction because they provide a standard or reference of product performance. According to Oliver (1997), “an expectation is an anticipation of future consequences based on prior experience, current circumstances, or other sources of information” (p. 68). Oliver (1980) further articulated that consumers feel satisfied when they compare their perceptions to their expectations. Thus, it would be anticipated in this study that golfers will be satisfied if their experience is greater than individuals’ expectations (i.e., positive disconfirmation). Dissatisfaction, on the other hand, will occur if experience is less than expectations (i.e., negative disconfirmation).

The effects expectations have on satisfaction, however, has been widely debated. Spreng, Mackenzie, and Olshavsky (1996) suggested that a consumer’s “desires” or “ideal standard” should be measured when attempting to document the effect of
expectations on satisfaction. Hamilton, Crompton, and More (1991), on the other hand, indicated that the desires of the individual, not their expectations, should be measured. Crompton and Mackay (1989) argued that it is not enough to measure expectations in determining satisfaction. Individual attributes must also be identified. Barsky (1992) concluded that there is not enough evidence to support that expectations are directly related to satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Rather than measure the mathematical difference between expectations and performance, some researchers have focused on the performance-only attributes of the experience to measure satisfaction (Babakus & Boller, 1992; Carman, 1990; Oliver & DeSarbo, 1988). These researchers found that an expectation score was not necessary in determining satisfaction levels, and that performance-only measures had a more direct effect on overall satisfaction. “The simplified performance-measures-only model seems capable of providing important answers about visitors’ desired conditions and the extent to which they are actually experienced” (Absher, 1998, p. 41).

Burns et al. (2003) also found that performance-only measures of satisfaction are generally better predictors of satisfaction. In a study of water-based recreationists at various lakes, for example, Burns et al. (2003) examined the relationships between customer service attributes, dimensions of satisfaction and overall satisfaction. They concluded that the satisfaction-only item scores within the satisfaction dimensions were better predictors of overall satisfaction. They also suggested that because recreation is a highly intangible activity, further research should continue to examine performance-only measures of satisfaction. The proposed study will advance leisure satisfaction research by
utilizing the performance-only measures of satisfaction in a model addressing intentions to revisit with a sample of individuals who golf at public facilities.

**Intentions to Revisit**

Service businesses are extremely interested in repatronage or repurchase behavior (i.e., intentions to revisit) (Harris & Uncles, 2007). This is reflected in their efforts to: increase repeat purchases through frequent buyer programs, engender customer loyalty through the creation of on-going relationships, and minimize brand switching (Dagger & Sweeney, 2006; Mittal, Viskas, & Kamakura, 2001; Verhoef, 2003). In a recreation or tourism context, much of the research regarding intentions to revisit has focused on the influences of satisfaction (Petrick & Backman, 2002b; Petrick et al., 2001; Spreng, Mackenzie, & Olshavsky, 1996); perceived value (Kashyap & Bojanic, 2000; Petrick & Backman, 2002a); quality (Baker & Crompton, 2000); and past experience (Kozak, 2001; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Petrick et al., 2001). For example, in a study examining the relationships between tourist satisfaction, previous visits, and intentions to revisit, Kozak (2001) documented a positive relationship between the number of previous visits to the destination and intentions to revisit. His findings paralleled those of Petrick et al. (2001) and Harris and Uncles (2007).

In addition, Kozak and Rimmington (2000) concluded that overall satisfaction had a significant relationship with intentions to revisit and satisfied tourists were most likely to recommend future visits to friends and relatives. And, Woodruff (1997) suggested that the measurement of satisfaction be accompanied by a measurement of perceived value to better guide managers in how to respond to customers.
To achieve and retain a competitive advantage, understanding how perceived value influences intentions to revisit would also be helpful. For example, in a tourism study investigating the relationship between perceived value and intentions to revisit, Kashyap and Bojanic (2000) concluded that perceived value was significantly associated with revisit intentions. Based on this finding they argued that managers should focus their efforts on the perception of value and the satisfaction attributes that have the greatest impact on value.

In summary, past experience has proven to be the best predictor of intentions to revisit; however, perceived value and satisfaction are also predictors of intentions to revisit. This type of information is important to the golf industry as understanding the relationships between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, and intentions to revisit can help managers to develop marketing strategies upon which their growth and survival depends.
Research Purpose and Hypotheses

To examine the relationships between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, and intentions to revisit among individuals who golf at public facilities, I utilized Petrick et al.'s (2001) intention to revisit model (Figure 3.1) as a guiding framework.

Figure 3.1 Petrick et al.’s (2001) model of intentions to revisit.
Based on the review of literature, my hypotheses are:

H1. Past experience will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H2. Satisfaction will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H3. Perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H4. Controlling for past experience and satisfaction, perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H5. Past experience and satisfaction will be significantly and positively related to perceived value.

Petrick et al. (2001) examined the relationship between past experience, satisfaction, perceived value and vacationers’ intentions to revisit an entertainment destination. They hypothesized that past behavior and satisfaction would be antecedents of perceived value and all three would be related to intention to revisit. In this study, the first three hypotheses were modified to reflect Petrick et al.’s (2001) conceptual framework within the context of golf. The fourth hypothesis was added to account for the effect past experience and satisfaction may have on the relationship between perceived value and intentions to revisit. A fifth hypothesis was also added to examine the role of past experience and satisfaction on perceived value.

**Broader Impacts of the Proposed Research**

This comprehensive approach to studying intentions to revisit has the potential to enhance knowledge about the factors that contribute to individuals’ decisions to
participate in one type of recreation activity—golf. This is critical on two fronts. First, competition for leisure time is increasing and theoretically, the results will broaden our understanding of factors that may have an impact on participation. Second, we have an opportunity to understand in greater detail the relationship between past experience, perceived value, and satisfaction as they relate to intentions to revisit. This will broaden our understanding of the golf experience. From an applied perspective, the results of this study will help managers at public golf courses develop strategic initiatives to maintain, or perhaps, enhance play.

Methods

Respondents and Procedure

Nine hundred and eighty golfers (non-members) who played golf at a public golf course in the Northeastern United States from March 1, 2006 through August 1, 2007 comprised the study sample. Since members had already expressed their intentions to revisit through the purchase of a membership, non-members were chosen as a representative sample of golfers whose intention to revisit is unknown. Every golfer was sent an e-mail message introducing the study. A total of 172 e-mails were returned as undeliverable and removed from the sample (new n=808). One week after the initial introductory e-mail was distributed, a follow-up e-mail with a link to the on-line questionnaire was sent out. This was followed one week later by a reminder e-mail to all non-respondents. As an incentive to participate, study participants who chose to be included were entered into a drawing for two groups representing four rounds of golf each at the public golf course.
**Instrumentation**

The constructs of interest in this study were past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, and intentions to revisit.

**Past Experience.** Past experience was measured using a modified version of Petrick et al.’s (2001) and Schreyer et al.’s (1984) measures of past behavior. Participants were asked how many years they have been playing golf, how many rounds of golf they played in the past 12 months, the number of rounds they played in the past 12 months at the public golf course, and how many different golf courses they played in the past 12 months.

**Perceived Value and Satisfaction.** Perceived value and satisfaction are expected to influence intentions to revisit. Hence, similar to Petrick and Backman (2002a), overall perceived value was measured using a single item, 5-point scale with values ranging from 1 (extremely poor) to 5 (extremely good). Respondents were asked to rate the value received for fees paid during their round(s) of golf at the public golf course.

According to Burns et al. (2003), Babakus and Boller (1992), Carman (1990), and Oliver and DeSarbo (1988), performance-only measures of satisfaction have generally been better predictors of satisfaction. Therefore, individuals were asked, "On average, how satisfied were you with the following aspects of your round(s) of golf at the [public golf course]?") Individuals responded to 19 items including, affordability/value of the course, overall condition of the golf course, condition of the greens, course design/layout, individual performance, tee time availability, interaction with playing partners, the pace of play, customer service, condition of golf carts, the club house, golf shop, the 19th hole food and beverage service, locker room, friendliness/service of staff, on-course
restrooms, on-course drinking water, on-course food and beverage service, and overall quality of the experience at the public golf course. The satisfaction items included were modified from the NGF as well as satisfaction items proposed by Wills (2002). Individuals were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with each item using a 5-point scale ranging from "very dissatisfied" (1) to "very satisfied" (5). Contrary to Petrick et al. (2001), a 5-point scale was used, rather than a 10-point scale, to remain consistent with the measure of perceived value.

*Intentions to Revisit.* Using Petrick et al.'s (2001) intentions to revisit question as a model, respondents were asked to indicate how likely (i.e., 1=extremely unlikely to 5=extremely likely) they were to do the following in the next 12 months: (a) play golf at the public golf course, (b) utilize the practice facilities at the public golf course, (c) take a golf lesson at the public golf course, and (d) purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public golf course. They were also asked how many rounds of golf they expect to play at the public golf course during the next 12 months. To more accurately correlate intentions to actual behavior in a public golf context, "the next 12 months" was used as a time frame rather than Petrick et al.'s (2001) "within the next two years."

In an effort to profile respondents, they were asked how many golf lessons they have taken in the past 12 months, and if they have an established United States Golf Association (USGA) handicap. If a USGA handicap was established, respondents were asked to note their current handicap. If they did not have an established USGA handicap, respondents were asked their average score for an 18-hole round of golf.

In addition, questions regarding socio-demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, employment status, highest level of education, total gross household income, and marital
status) were included in the survey. Questions focused on average number of hours a week dedicated to work, and number of children living at home (if applicable) were also included.

Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed and relationships examined through the use of SPSS 16.0 for Macintosh. H1 through H5 were tested using hierarchical regression analysis.

Results

Three hundred sixty-nine individuals completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of forty-six percent. Eighty-four percent of the respondents who responded to the question about gender (n=342) were male. This was representative of the original sample, which was comprised of 882 men (90%) and 98 (10%) women. Nationally, 78% of golfers are male and 22% are female (NGF, 2003). In addition, respondents ranged in age from 19 to 79 years old, with a mean age of 38 (SD=14.6). The majority of the sample was married (59%), followed by single/never married (39%) Approximately 72% of the respondents reported working full-time, while 12% work part-time, and 17% were either retired or unemployed. Over 80% of the sample reported having a college or university education; 42% of which had attained a graduate-level degree. During 2006 the majority of the sample (65%) had a household income of $60,000 or more; 38% of this segment reported a household income of $100,000 and over.

In terms of their past experience with golf in general and the public golf course in particular (Table 3.1), respondents indicated they have been playing golf on average for
15 years (range = 1 to 60 years). In the past 12 months they played an average of 27 rounds of golf; only 10, however, were played at the public golf course. In addition, they played, on average, seven different golf courses. Further, the average 18-hole score was 96. Of the nearly 26% of respondents who reported a USGA handicap index, 56% indicated their handicap was between 0-14.

Table 3.1. Past experience of golfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Experience</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years playing golf (n=371)</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>1-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounds of golf past 12 months (n=371)</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>1-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounds at public course in past 12 months (n=370)</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>1-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different golf courses played past 12 months (n=371)</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf lessons in past 12 months (n=371)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 18-Hole Score (n=262)</td>
<td>96.08</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>73-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established USGA Handicap (n=369)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, Current USGA Handicap (n=94)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perceived value and satisfaction individuals' associated with the public golf course as well as intentions to revisit were also assessed. The results indicated that the value received for fees paid was "good," overall (Mean=3.70, SD=0.74). Over 68% of the golfers rated the value received for fees paid as “good” or “extremely good.” Consistent with Petrick et al. (2001), one measure of satisfaction was used in the follow-up analyses (responses to the other satisfaction items are available in Appendix H). The item, “satisfaction with overall quality of the experience” was used as an overall measure of satisfaction (Spreng, Mackenzie, & Olshavsky, 1996). The results indicated that overall
satisfaction with the quality of the experience was “somewhat satisfied” (Mean=4.04, SD=0.86). Over 78% rated their overall satisfaction as “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied.”

When asked about their future intentions regarding the public golf course, respondents were most likely to return to "play golf" (M=4.30, SD=0.94) or "utilize [the] practice facilities" (M=3.75, SD=1.25) (Table 3.2). They were less likely to return to the public golf course to "purchase equipment and/or clothing" (M=2.70, SD=1.19) or "take a golf lesson" (M=2.02, SD=1.07).

Table 3.2. Intentions to revisit a public golf course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Intention</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely 1</th>
<th>Unlikely 2</th>
<th>Neither Unlikely or Likely 3</th>
<th>Likely 4</th>
<th>Extremely Likely 5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play Golf</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize Practice Facilities</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Equipment and/or Clothing</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td><strong>26.9</strong></td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a Golf Lesson</td>
<td><strong>40.9</strong></td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to addressing the hypotheses, two tasks were performed: correlation analysis and computation of an overall intentions to revisit index. Correlation analysis was performed on the independent/predictor variables (i.e., number of years played, rounds played at the public golf course, number of different courses played, perceived value and overall satisfaction) as well as the dependent variables (i.e., intention to play at the public golf course, intention to use practice facilities, intention to take a lesson, and
intention to purchase equipment/clothing). As noted in Table 3.3, intention to purchase equipment/clothing at the public golf course was significantly and positively correlated with all other variables. Intention to take a lesson was significantly correlated with all but “years played.” And, significant correlations were also observed with the two other “intention” items.
Table 3.3. Means, standard deviations, and correlations of proposed variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Take</th>
<th>Purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years played</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounds played at public golf course</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of different courses</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.168**</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>-.160**</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.502**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT¹ to play at public golf course</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to use Practice facilities</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.713**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to take a lesson</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>-.108**</td>
<td>.166**</td>
<td>.135*</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to purchase equipment/clothing</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.118*</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.200**</td>
<td>.153**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
¹=IT=Intention to…
In addition, a new dependent variable was computed. The means of all the intentions to revisit items were added together to create an overall mean representing intentions to revisit. Then, all independent variables were entered into a hierarchical regression model in order of theoretical importance: past experience (i.e., number of years playing golf, number of rounds played at the PSU Golf Courses in past 12 months, and number of different golf courses played in the past 12 months) as blocks one through three; satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience as block four; and perceived value as the final block. During the first three steps of the model (Table 3.4), the three past experience items accounted for approximately 15% of the variance in intention to revisit a public golf course. In addition, as noted in Table 3.5, the number of rounds played at the public golf course was significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit ($\beta=.019, p<.001$). Therefore, H1 (i.e., past experience will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course) is accepted.

The introduction of satisfaction at step four tested satisfaction’s ability to predict intentions to revisit (Table 3.4). A positive and significant relationship was observed between satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience and intentions to revisit. By adding the one item measure of “satisfaction” to the equation, the variance in intentions to revisit increased by approximately three percent ($R^2= .024, F= 9.82, p<.001$).

The introduction of perceived value during the final step tested the theory of perceived value’s ability to predict intentions to revisit. As shown in Table 3.4, adding perceived value to the equation resulted in a one percent change in the variance in intention to revisit a public golf course ($R^2= .014, F= 5.66, p<.05$). Also, the regression coefficient for the perceived value variable (see Table 3.5) was statistically significant ($\beta=.134, p<.05$). A positive and significant relationship was observed between perceived value and intentions to revisit. However, when perceived value was added to the model, satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience was no longer significant. Thus, according to the final model, H2 (i.e., satisfaction will be
significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course) is not accepted, and H3 (i.e., perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course) is accepted.

Finally, when controlling for past experience and satisfaction (see Tables 3.4 and 3.5), perceived value had a positive and significant relationship to intentions to revisit ($\beta = .134, p < .05$). As a result, H4 (i.e., controlling for past experience and satisfaction, perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course) was accepted.

In summary, 17% of the variance in intentions to revisit was accounted for by a combination of the predictor variables studied. More specifically, the variance in intentions to revisit the public golf course was primarily accounted for by number of rounds played at the public golf course and perceived value.

Table 3.4 Hierarchical regression analysis of a set of predictor variables explaining variance in intentions to revisit the public golf course (N = 340)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{adj}$</th>
<th>$R^2_{change}$</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>56.90†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Experience</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>9.82†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>5.66*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, † p<.001

Table 3.5 Hierarchical regression equation using a set of predictor variables to explain variance in scores for intentions to revisit the public golf course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>7.54†</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Overall Quality</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>3.13†</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, † p<.001
H5 was also tested using hierarchical regression. In this instance, however, the dependent variable was perceived value. All independent variables were entered into the model in order of theoretical importance: past experience (i.e., number of years playing golf, number of rounds played at the PSU Golf Courses in past 12 months, and number of different golf courses played in the past 12 months) as blocks one through three and satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience as block four. The results are highlighted in Tables 3.6 and 3.7. Only overall satisfaction had a positive and significant relationship to perceived value ($\beta=.503, p \leq .001$). As a result, H5 (i.e., past experience and satisfaction will be significantly and positively related to perceived value) was partially accepted.

In summary, 25% of the variance in perceived value was explained by the predictor variables. However, this was due almost entirely to satisfaction.

Table 3.6 Hierarchical regression analysis of a set of predictor variables explaining variance in perceived value at the public golf course (N = 340)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{\text{adj}}$</th>
<th>$R^2_{\text{change}}$</th>
<th>$F_{\text{change}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses Played</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Overall Quality</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>114.72†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p \leq .001$

Table 3.7 Hierarchical regression equation using a set of predictor variables to explain variance in scores for perceived value at the public golf course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses Played</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Overall Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p \leq .001$
Additional analyses were conducted with the four items comprising the intentions to revisit index to determine if the separate models would reveal different results. Hierarchical regressions for each intention to revisit variable (i.e., intention to play golf at the public golf course, intention to utilize the practice facilities at the public golf course, intention to take a golf lesson at the public golf course, and intention to purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public golf course) were computed.

When the dependent variable was “intention to play golf at the public golf course in the next 12 months,” positive and significant relationships were observed with number of rounds played at the course ($\beta=.261$, $p<.001$) and satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience ($\beta=.135$, $p<.001$) (Tables 3.8 and 3.9). Number of rounds played accounted for eight percent while satisfaction explained three percent of the variance in intention to play golf at the public golf course. The final regression model, including only the significant predictor variables (i.e., number of rounds played and satisfaction) had an adjusted $R^2$ of .106, suggesting that 11% of the variance in intentions to play golf at the public golf course was accounted for by the number of rounds played at the study course and satisfaction.

Table 3.8 Hierarchical regression analysis of a set of predictor variables explaining variance in intention to play golf at the public golf course in the next 12 months (N = 340)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{ADJ}$</th>
<th>$R^2_{Change}$</th>
<th>$F_{Change}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>28.31†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses Played</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Experience</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>12.98†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p<.001$
Table 3.9 Hierarchical regression equation using a set of predictor variables to explain variance in scores for intention to play golf at the public golf course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>5.32†</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>5.38†</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses Played</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Overall Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p \leq .001$

When the dependent variable was “intent to utilize the practice facilities at the public golf course in the next 12 months,” a positive and significant relationship was observed with the number of rounds played at the public course, only ($\beta = .286, p \leq .001$) (Tables 3.10 and 3.11). The final regression model suggested that eight percent of the variance ($R^2 = .084$) in intentions to utilize the practice facilities at the public golf course was accounted for by the number of rounds played at the study course.

Table 3.10 Hierarchical regression analysis of a set of predictor variables explaining variance in intention to utilize the practice facilities at the public golf course in the next 12 months (N = 340)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{Adj}$</th>
<th>$R^2_{Change}$</th>
<th>$F_{Change}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>30.26†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses Played</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Experience</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† $p \leq .001$
Table 3.11 Hierarchical regression equation using a set of predictor variables to explain variance in scores for intention to utilize the practice facilities at the public golf course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td>- .022</td>
<td>- .412</td>
<td>- .014</td>
<td>- .272</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>5.50†</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>5.57†</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses</td>
<td>- .100</td>
<td>- 1.91</td>
<td>- .099</td>
<td>- 1.89†</td>
<td>- .099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Played</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p ≤ .001

In addition, positive and significant relationships were observed with number of rounds played at the public course (β=.304, p ≤ .001) and perceived value (β=.119, p ≤ .05) when the dependent variable was, “intent to take a golf lesson at the public golf course in the next 12 months” (Tables 3.12 and 3.13). Number of rounds on its own explained approximately 10% of the variance in the dependent variable. Perceived value explained an additional one percent of overall variance. A negative and significant relationship was also observed between the number of different golf courses played and intent to take a golf lesson at the public golf course in the next 12 months (β=-.105, p ≤ .05). When the final model was run with the significant predictor variables only (i.e., number of rounds played at the course, number of different golf courses played, and perceived value), the final adjusted $R^2$ was .119.
Table 3.12 Hierarchical regression analysis of a set of predictor variables explaining variance in intention to take a golf lesson at the public golf course in the next 12 months (N = 340)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² ADJ</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>37.36†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses Played</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>4.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Experience</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>4.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, †p<.001

Table 3.13 Hierarchical regression equation using a set of predictor variables to explain variance in scores for intention to take a golf lesson at the public golf course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-978</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.841</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>6.11†</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>6.19†</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses Played</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Overall Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-2.11*</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, †p<.001

The final hierarchical regression analysis focused on intent to purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public golf course as the dependent variable (Tables 3.14 and 3.15). Positive and significant relationships were observed between the number of years playing golf (β=.122, p≤.05); number of rounds played at the public course (β=.218, p≤.001); the number of different golf courses played in the past 12 months (β=.167, p≤.05); perceived value (β =.152, p≤.05); and intent to purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public course in the next 12 months. The greatest percentage of variance explained was aligned with number of rounds played at the public golf course ($R^2 = .058$). The remaining significant predictor variables provided an additional one to three percent of the explained variance. The final model, including significant
predictor variables, had a final adjusted $R^2$ of .124, suggesting that 12% of the variance in intentions to purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public golf course was accounted for by the predictor variables.

Table 3.14 Hierarchical regression analysis of a set of predictor variables explaining variance in intention to purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public golf course in the next 12 months (N = 340)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Multiple $R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{ADJ}$</th>
<th>$R^2_{Change}$</th>
<th>$F_{Change}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>4.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>21.01†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses Played</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>9.23†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Experience</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>9.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>6.56*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, † p≤.001

Table 3.15 Hierarchical regression equation using a set of predictor variables to explain variance in scores for intention to purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public golf course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Step 1 Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Step 2 Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Step 3 Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Step 4 Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Step 5 Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Playing Golf</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>2.39*</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>1.92*</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>2.39*</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rounds Played at Course</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>4.58†</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>4.56†</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>4.39†</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>4.25†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Different Courses Played</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Overall Quality</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>3.04*</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>3.13*</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>3.23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>3.12*</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, † p≤.001
Discussion and Conclusions

To date, much of the intention to revisit research has been conducted in a tourism context (Kashyap & Bojanic, 2000; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Petrick et al., 2001; Yang, 2004). Given the important economic and social benefits often generated through public golf courses, as well as the increase in competition they face, I chose to build off of the previous research and examine the relationships between past experience, perceived value, satisfaction and intentions to revisit among individuals who golf at public facilities. Figure 3.2 represents a modified conceptual model accounting for the results of this study.

Figure 3.2 Modified model for golfers’ intentions to revisit a public golf course

The results suggest that, overall, golfers’ past experience is significantly related to intentions to revisit. This finding parallels that of previous research carried out by Petrick et al. (2001) and Sonmez and Graefe (1998), who found past experience to be the best predictor of intentions to
revisit. In particular, “number of rounds played at the public golf course,” one measure of past experience, was positively and significantly related to intentions to revisit. Thus, the results challenge the notion of using a single operational index to measure the extent of recreational past experience (EUH). This is surprising given Virden’s (1992, p. 6) contention that past experience is the “sum of accumulated life experience” with an activity such as golfing. The results also challenge Kozak’s (2001) and Petrick et al.’s (2002a) argument that first-time visitors should be targeted by golf course managers because they may be more responsive to promotional campaigns. In this study, there was no significant relationship between years playing golf and overall intentions to revisit. However, an exception was observed with “intentions to purchase equipment and/or clothing…” As experience playing golf increased, so too did intention to purchase equipment and/or clothing. Future research should analyze each individual past experience measure and its relationship with future intentions in an effort to extend our understanding of the factors that best explain intention to revisit and provide information that will aide public golf course managers in understanding their customers.

Petrick et al. (2001) found intentions to revisit were influenced by satisfaction. These study results indicate that satisfaction continues to be a predictor of intentions to revisit. Further, when investigating the relationships between past experience, satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience, and perceived value, satisfaction was a good predictor of perceived value. As satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience increased, so too did perceived value. However, opposite of Petrick et al. (2001), I did not find a relationship between past experience and perceived value.

Petrick et al. (2001) argued that frequency of visits was directly related to perceptions of value. The higher number of visits would result in higher perceptions of value. His results concluded that perceived value was influenced more by past experience than satisfaction. This study indicates that past experience, specifically the number of rounds played at the public golf
course, does not have a significant relationship with perceived value. Value was more influenced by satisfaction. This may be due to the high level of satisfaction with over 80% of the sample responding either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied,” and relating satisfaction to perceived value. This may also be a result of the high number of rounds played by the recipients at the study course and having already judged perceived value. An additional issue raised by this finding is tied to the relationship between past experience and satisfaction. Since satisfaction is a predictor of perceived value and both past experience and perceived value are significantly related to intentions to revisit, future research should examine the relationship between past experience and satisfaction when attempting to document perceptions of value. From an applied perspective, managers at public golf facilities should focus on satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience rather than past experience if they are interested in influencing intentions to revisit.

According to Woodruff (1997), the measurement of satisfaction should be accompanied by a measurement of perceived value to better guide managers in how to respond to customers. A positive and significant relationship was observed between perceived value and intentions to revisit. As perceived value increased, so too did intentions to revisit the public golf course. This finding parallels that of previous research carried out by Petrick et al. (2001), Parasuraman and Grewal (2000), and Zeithaml (1988), who found perceived value to be a predictor of intentions to revisit. However, when the individual intention to revisit items were treated as separate dependent variables, perceived value was significantly related to “intention to take a golf lesson…” and “intention to purchase equipment and/or clothing…,” only. This may be due to a number of factors. First, Zeithaml (1988) has argued that there are multiple definitions of perceived value; value for fees paid being one of them. If respondents had been asked to rate, for example, the quality they received for the price paid, perhaps the results would have been different. Second, the sample was comprised of individuals who golf at one public golf course.
Logically, individuals’ perceptions of “value” would vary by golf course. Third, approximately two-thirds of the sample rated the value received for fees paid as “good” or “extremely good.” According to Zeithaml (1988), what is received (i.e., high quality, convenience, quantity/volume) and what is given (i.e., time, money, effort) varies among consumers. Thus, value is highly personal. In this study context one could interpret the results to suggest that golfers at public courses who are pleased with the value they receive for fees paid have higher intentions to purchase golf lessons and equipment and/or clothing. Studies of the relationship between perceived value and intentions to revisit should be further studied at various public courses to (a) address the discrepancy between this study’s finding and those of earlier researchers, and (b) help managers document whether perceptions of perceived value should be manipulated in an effort to maintain and, perhaps, increase golf participation.

Additionally, managers interested in increasing their teaching opportunities and influencing individuals’ intentions to purchase equipment and/or clothing should focus their efforts on creating positive perceptions of value. One suggestion to increase perceptions of value is for managers to focus on value for time invested (e.g., what golfers get for their time). Kennedy (2006) provided additional suggestions that also related to increasing perceptions of value: market golf as family friendly so golf is perceived as a family game; make the golf facility a meeting point for other activities; stress the importance of golf in business – a way to connect better with customers; position golf as a healthy activity; and promote golf as a means to strengthen relationships. Since overall satisfaction had a positive and significant relationship to perceived value, managers should also focus on overall satisfaction initiatives.

Although past experience and perceived value were positively related to intentions to revisit (Figure 3.2), the low $R^2$ indicates that other explanatory variables may exist. For example, time and money are often cited as constraints to leisure; however, they are not directly addressable by public golf facility managers. Areas that are addressable include creating social opportunities for
golfers such as leagues; the opportunity to pay and play 3-hole, 6-hole and 9-hole rounds of golf; and the opportunity to walk instead of ride in a golf car. In addition, golf can be intimidating and embarrassing. According to the National Golf Foundation (2007), 60% of women and 30% of men feel embarrassed at their lack of skill or knowledge of the game/etiquette. Given that my sample was primarily male, additional research with a larger sample of women might reveal that intrapersonal constraints such as embarrassment might help to explain variance in intentions to revisit a public golf course.

Unlike many recreational activities, golf takes approximately four to five hours to complete an 18-hole round. Thus, time may be an intervening variable in other golf contexts (e.g., courses located in urban areas). The time dilemma is often cited as the main reason for not participating in golf (Graves, 2005). According to the Golf 20/20 segmentation report (2001), time and family obligations are the two major barriers facing the golf industry. “Most occasional golfers state they would play more if they had more time, and most non-players with interest in playing report lack of time as the one reason why they are not current players” (p.14). This study was conducted with a sample of fairly seasoned golfers; on average they have been playing golf for 15 years and played an average of 27 rounds of golf in the past 12 months. Thus, they may have already accepted that golf is a time intensive activity and planned for it accordingly. In addition, the public course in this study was easily accessible. Very little commute time was added to the overall time commitment golfers needed to make to play golf. One would expect that golfers who live in other environments (e.g. cities, suburban areas) might respond differently to the issue of time.

In summary, this study provides empirical support for relationships between past experience, perceived value, and intentions to revisit. Since competition for rounds of golf is increasing, golf managers should consider the following action steps. First, since “number of rounds played at the public golf course” was positively and significantly related to each dependent variable when
tested separately and was clearly the best predictor of intentions to revisit, managers should focus on opportunities to encourage more rounds from “core golfers.” According to the NGF, golf’s best customers drive the success of the industry. They account for the majority of rounds played and golf spending. Golf’s best customers are “core golfers” who are 18 years of age or older and play 8 or more rounds each year. They represent 91% of all rounds played and 87% of all golf related spending (NGF, 2007). Managers should give core golfers a time-conscious reason to play more at their facility by creating 3-hole, 6-hole, and 9-hole round opportunities to encourage more play. Second, since the number of rounds played at the study course was the best predictor of intentions to revisit, managers should create a program to reward those who recommend the facility and bring others to play (e.g., “play free if you bring a group of three”). Third, efforts to increase teaching opportunities should focus on perceptions of value. Golfers with higher perceptions of value had higher intentions to take a golf lesson. Fourth, merchandising opportunities should focus on golfers with more experience (e.g., years playing golf, number of rounds played, number of different golf courses played).
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The purpose of this study, as described in Chapter 4, is to examine the relationships of motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies on golfers’ intentions to revisit a public golf facility. The following hypotheses are addressed:

**H1.** Perceived constraints will be significantly and negatively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

**H2.** Negotiation strategies will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

**H3.** Motivation will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

**H4.** Perceived constraints and motivation will be significantly and positively related to negotiation strategies.
CHAPTER 4

HOW DO MOTIVATION, PERCEIVED CONSTRAINTS, AND NEGOTIATION STRATEGIES INFLUENCE INTENTIONS TO REVISIT A PUBLIC GOLF COURSE?

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies among individuals who golf at a public facility. Non-members who played golf at a public golf course from March 1, 2006 through August 1, 2007 comprised the sample (N=808). Results revealed (a) the relationship between motivation and negotiation strategies was significant, (b) motivation was not significantly related to intentions to revisit a public golf course, and (c) negotiation strategies fully mediated the relationship between motivation and intentions to revisit. Further, constraints and negotiation were unrelated; the same was true of constraints and intentions to revisit. The implications of these findings for the perceived constraints and constraint negotiation conceptual framework as well as for public golf course managers are discussed.
Introduction

Golf represents an important sector within the leisure industry, accounting for over $62 billion worth of goods and services in the United States (SRI International, 2002). Participation in golf has grown from 37 million golfers in 2001 to 40 million in 2005, despite the fact that rounds played dropped from 518 million rounds to just under 500 million rounds in the same time period (Beditz, 2006).

Further, golf facilities are in competition for individuals’ available leisure time. According to Koppenhaver (2006), recreation participation has decreased approximately 9% in the United States since 2000. Americans are participating less in “time consuming” recreational activities like golf and choosing to engage in recreational activities that are more “time certain,” such as fitness training. The Center for the Advancement of Health (2006) has documented motivations and perceived constraints as important factors in adults’ maintenance of activities. In addition, leisure researchers have used a model of leisure constraints to understand participation and non-participation (Alexandris & Carroll, 1997; Hubbard & Mannell, 2001). Unknown, however, is to what extent golfers’ utilize the constraint negotiation process as it relates to intentions to revisit a public golf facility. Understanding such relationships may help to inform leisure professionals who would like to maintain or increase individuals’ participation in activities such as golf. This study used the theoretical framework of perceived constraints and constraint negotiation (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001) to examine the role of motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies on golfers’ intentions to revisit a public golf facility.
Study Background

A Model of Intentions to Revisit

Petrick et al. (2001) proposed a theoretical model to guide research related to the factors that influence individuals’ decision to revisit a destination or particular facility. They suggested, as did other researchers, that past experience (Kozak, 2001; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Petrick et al., 2001); perceived value (Kashyap & Bojanic, 2000; Petrick & Backman, 2002a); and satisfaction (Petrick et al., 2001; Petrick & Backman, 2002b; Spreng, Mackenzie, & Olshavsky, 1996) are associated with individuals’ intentions to revisit.

A Model of Leisure Constraints and Negotiation Strategies

The focus of leisure constraints research is to “investigate factors that are assumed by researchers and/or perceived or experienced by individuals to limit the formation of leisure preferences and/or inhibit or prohibit participation and enjoyment in leisure” (Jackson, 2000, p. 62). Crawford, Jackson, and Godbey (1991) proposed a hierarchical constraints model to understand pathways to individuals’ participation in leisure activities. They argued that there are three types of constraints, intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural. Intrapersonal constraints involve internal psychological conditions such as personality, attitude, or mood. They are conceptualized as powerful because they may precede the motivation for participation (Raymore, Godbey, Crawford, & von Eye, 1993). Interpersonal constraints arise out of interaction with others, such as family members, friends, coworkers, and neighbors (e.g., not being able to play golf because of family work schedules). Structural constraints entail lack of opportunities or the cost of activities that result from external conditions in the environment (e.g., the cost involved to play golf). Structural constraints are thought to have the least effect on participation. Crawford et al. (1991) theorized that the three categories of constraints are hierarchically related, i.e.,
intrapersonal constraints must first be overcome, followed by interpersonal and, lastly, structural
constraints.

With respect to individuals’ response to constraints, Jackson, Crawford, and Godbey (1993) proposed a three-category typology of people: (1) individuals who react by not participating in their desired activity (reactive response); (2) others, despite experiencing a constraint, who do not reduce or change their participation at all (successful proactive response); and (3) others who participate, but in an altered manner (partly successful proactive response). Based on Jackson et al.’s (1993) propositions, Hubbard and Mannell (2001) found support for a “constraint-effect-mitigation” model after testing four competing models focusing on the roles of motivation, constraints, and negotiation strategies on leisure participation. Their results suggested that the presence of a constraint negatively influences participation and at the same time “appears to directly trigger negotiation efforts that can mitigate the negative effects of the constraints” (p. 158). Therefore, constraints have a positive influence on the use of negotiation resources and strategies. Due to negotiation efforts, individuals with more constraints may actually participate more than people with fewer constraints (Kay & Jackson, 1991; Shaw, Bonen, and McCabe, 1991).

Hubbard and Mannell (2001) concluded that further research on motivation, constraints, and negotiation strategies is necessary with other populations and leisure activities, such as golf, to determine the generalizability of their results.

Motivation and Constraint Negotiation

Although Hubbard and Mannell (2001) concluded that constraints had a positive influence on the use of negotiation strategies, the strength and effectiveness of the negotiation efforts depends on the negative effects of the constraint itself and motivation to participate. Carroll and Alexandris (1997) concluded that motivation was positively related to activity participation and constraints were negatively related. They suggested, “that highly motivated
individuals are less likely to perceive high levels of constraints, and are more likely to participate in sports” (p.296). However, negotiation was not included in their model and “participation is likely the result of a process involving links between not only constraint and motivation, but also negotiation” (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001, p.147).

Hubbard and Mannell (2001) also tested motivation to participate in leisure and the role of negotiation in the constraint negotiation process. They concluded that motivation had an indirect effect, through negotiation, on participation. “People who are more highly motivated to participate expend greater use on negotiating and are more successful at starting, maintaining, or increasing their level of participation” (p.159). Thus, negotiation strategies mediated the relationship between motivation and participation. However, due to its non-significance, the direct path between motivation and participation was removed from their final model.

To help clarify the relationships between motivation, constraints, and negotiation and their influences on recreational participation, Petrick, Backman, Bixler, and Norman (2001) analyzed why golfers participate and the constraints that must be negotiated in order to participate. They concluded that golfers with different experience use histories differ on both their motivations and constraints for playing golf. Further, Coalter, Dowers and Baxter (1995) suggest that the relationship between frequency of sport participation, motivation, and perception of constraints, is an important one that should continue to be studied.

Despite consistent theoretical development, constraint research has not focused on the relationship between motivation, constraints, negotiation strategies, and intentions to revisit among recreationists. This study will advance leisure constraints research by addressing these relationships with a sample of individuals who golf at a public facility.
Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this study was to use the theoretical framework of (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001) to examine the role of motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies, on golfers’ intentions to revisit a public golf facility. Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) hypothesized constraint-effects-mitigation model of the constraint negotiation process (Figure 4.1) was used as a guiding framework.

**Figure 4.1.** Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) hypothesized constraint-effects-mitigation model of the constraint negotiation process modified to include intentions to revisit.
There were four hypotheses related to the study purpose:

H1. Perceived constraints will be significantly and negatively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H2. Negotiation strategies will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H3. Motivation will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

H4. Perceived constraints and motivation will be significantly and positively related to negotiation strategies.

Methods

Respondents and Procedure

Nine hundred and eighty golfers (non-members) who played golf at a public golf course in the Northeast United States from March 1, 2006 through August 1, 2007 comprised the study sample. Since members have expressed their intentions to revisit through the purchase of a membership, non-members were chosen as a representative sample of golfers whose intention to revisit a public golf facility is unknown. Every golfer was sent an e-mail message introducing the study. A total of 172 emails were returned as undeliverable and removed from the sample (new n=808). One week after the initial introductory e-mail was distributed, a follow-up e-mail with a link to the on-line questionnaire was sent out. This was followed one week later by a reminder e-mail to all non-respondents. As an incentive to participate, study participants who chose to be included, were entered into a drawing for two groups representing four rounds of golf each at the public golf course.
Measures

The variables of interest in this study were perceived constraints, motivation, negotiation strategies, and intentions to revisit.

Perceived Constraints. To measure perceived constraints, the Hubbard and Mannell (2001) Leisure Constraint Scale was modified from its original list of 32 items. Items referencing workplace exercise programs (14 items) were omitted and replaced by items specific to golf. In addition, the wording of several statements was slightly altered to make them more specific to golf. A total of 18 constraint statements were included in the modified scale. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the constraint statements using a 5-point Likert-type scale with values ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Six (6) intrapersonal, five (5) interpersonal, and seven (7) structural constraint items were included and measured by calculating mean scores for each of the three constraint types (see Table 4.1). Higher perceived constraint scores reflected the number of constraints reported and the extent to which each was perceived as constraining (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001).

Motivation. The following nine items were derived from Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) original scale as well as from informal discussions with members and staff of a public golf course: “I play golf or would like to play more golf because…(a) it is good for my health, (b) I enjoy the company of my friends, (c) I enjoy the competition with myself, (d) I enjoy the competition with my playing partners, (e) I like meeting new people, (f) of the challenge of the game, (g) it improves my skills, (h) I enjoy being outdoors, (i) it provides me with enjoyment/pleasure, and (j) Other.” The response options ranged from “Not at All” (1) to “Very Much” (5).
**Negotiation Strategies.** To measure constraint negotiation strategies, Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) Negotiation Strategies Scale was modified by omitting items referencing workplace exercise programs (see Table 4.1). Respondents were asked to respond to the items using a 5-point Likert-type scale with values ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very Often). Negotiation strategies included time management (5 items), skill acquisition (4 items), interpersonal coordination (4 items), and financial resources and strategies (5 items). Mean scores were calculated for each negotiation strategy. Higher mean scores indicated greater use of the constraint negotiation strategies.

**Intentions to Revisit.** Using Petrick et al.’s (2001) intentions to revisit question as a model, respondents were asked to indicate how likely (i.e., 1=extremely unlikely to 5=extremely likely) they were to do the following in the next 12 months: (a) play golf at the public golf course, (b) utilize the practice facilities at the public golf course, (c) take a golf lesson at the public golf course, and (d) purchase equipment and/or clothing at the public golf course. They were also asked how many rounds of golf they expect to play at the public golf course during the next 12 months. To more accurately correlate intentions to actual behavior in a public golf context, "the next 12 months" was used as a time frame rather than Petrick et al.’s (2001) "within the next two years."

In an effort to profile respondents they were asked how many golf lessons they have taken in the past 12 months, and if they have an established United States Golf Association (USGA) handicap. If a USGA handicap was established, respondents were asked to note their current handicap. If they did not have an established USGA handicap, respondents were asked their average score for an 18-hole round of golf.

In addition, questions regarding socio-demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, employment status, highest level of education, total gross household income, and marital
status) were included in the survey. In addition, questions focused on average number of hours a week dedicated to work, and number of children living at home (if applicable) were included as suggested by Hubbard and Mannell (2001).
### Table 4.1. Constraint and Negotiation Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales and Subscales</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constraints</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>I feel uncomfortable playing golf with members of the opposite sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(within the individual)</td>
<td>I would play more golf if my family thought it was alright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would play more golf if my friends thought it was alright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would play more golf if I did not feel self-conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not in good enough shape to play more golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would play more golf if it did not require a lot of skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>I do not have friends with whom to play more golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(social considerations)</td>
<td>The people I know usually do not have time to play more golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The people I know usually do not have enough money to play more golf with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The people I know usually have too many family obligations to play more golf with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The people I know usually do not have enough skills to play more golf with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>I would play more golf if the golf course were not crowded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(conditions of the environment)</td>
<td>I would play more golf if the golf course were convenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am too busy with other activities to play more golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would play more if other golfers were more highly skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would play more golf if other golfers were more aware of golf etiquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It costs too much to play more golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would play more golf if it did not take so much time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiation Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>I set aside time to golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prioritize what I want to do and make golf a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to work golf in around my other commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I get up early or stay up later to make time to play golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to play in off-peak times when facilities are less busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Acquisition</td>
<td>I try to improve my golfing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I play golf despite an injury or physical/health condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I take golf lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I obtain treatment for an injury or health conditions so I can play golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Coordination</td>
<td>I try to find people with whom to play golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I arrange rides with friends to play golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I play golf with people my own age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to meet people with similar interests in golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources and Strategies</td>
<td>I borrow equipment to play golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to budget my money in order to play golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I save money to participate in golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I play golf more close to home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I improvise with the equipment and/or clothes I have to play golf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Items were rated using 5-point Likert-type response formats with values ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).
2. Items were rated using 5-point Likert-type response formats with values ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very Often).
Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed through the use of SPSS 16.0 for Macintosh and LISREL 8.7 for Windows. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to examine the relationships of the constraints-effects-mitigation model on intentions to revisit. “SEM analysis provides the researcher with a variety of overall measures (fit indices) of how much the relationships hypothesized to exist among the measured variables as specified by a model (implied covariances) differ from those relationships actually found in the data (covariances)” (Hubbard & Mannell, 2001, p. 154). According to Bollen (1989), the smaller the difference, the better fit of the model to the data.

Several fit indices were used to address model fit. First, RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation), an absolute fit index used to determine how well the model fits the covariance matrix, was assessed. Values less than .05 suggest a good fit and values as high as .08 indicate acceptable fit of the data (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). Additionally, fit indices, including CFI (Comparable Fit Index), NNFI (Non-Normed Fit Index), IFI (Incremental Fit Index), and GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) were utilized to compare the hypothesized model to the baseline model (Byrne, 2001). Values greater than .95 indicate a close fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999), and values as low as .90 suggest an acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1995).

Results

Three hundred and sixty-nine individuals completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of forty-six percent. Of the 369 respondents, 310 (84%) were male and 32 (9%) were female (27 respondents did not respond to the gender question). This was
representative of the original sample, which was comprised of 882 men (90%) and 98 (10%) women. Nationally, 78% of golfers are male and 22% are female (NGF, 2003). Respondents ranged in age from 19 to 79 years old, with a mean age of 38 (SD=14.6). The majority of the sample was married (59%), worked full-time (72%), and had a college or university education (80%). Further, the majority of the sample (65%) had a household income of $60,000; 38% reported a household income of $100,000 and over.

In terms of their past experience with golf in general and the public golf course in particular, respondents indicated they have been playing golf on average for 15 years (range = 1 to 60 years). In the past 12 months they played an average of 27 rounds of golf—only 10 were being played at the public golf course. They played an additional seven rounds, on average, at other golf courses.

In terms of constraints, this sample was not highly constrained. The constraint sub-domain mean scores all fell below the scalar midpoint of 3 (Table 4.2). The constraint scale indicated that structural constraints were most often noted, followed by interpersonal and intrapersonal. In addition, the mean score for the total negotiation scale indicated that the sample was most likely to have used time management and interpersonal coordination strategies more often than skill acquisition and financial strategies.

As a group, the golfers indicated they were highly motivated to play golf. Playing golf for enjoyment was scored the highest, followed by competition. Golfers were less motivated to play for the health benefits and meeting new people; however, all scores were above the scalar midpoint of 3 (Table 4.2).
TABLE 4.2. Descriptive Statistics for the Constraint, Negotiation, and Motivation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>Coefficient alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constraint</strong>¹ (Total Scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiation</strong>² (Total Scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill acquisition</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong>³ (Total Scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enjoyment / Pleasure</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outdoors</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenge of the Game</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competition with Partners</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Skill Improvement</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competition with Myself</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company of Friends</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting New People</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Items were rated using 5-point Likert-type response formats with values ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).
² Items were rated using 5-point Likert-type response formats with values ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very Often).
³ Items were rated using 5-point Likert-type response formats with values ranging from 1 (Not at All) to 5 (Very Often)

When asked about their future intentions regarding the public golf course, respondents were most likely to return to "play golf" (M=4.30, SD=0.94) or "utilize the practice facilities" (M=3.75, SD=1.25). They were less likely to return to the public golf course.
course to "purchase equipment and/or clothing" (M=2.70, SD=1.19) or "take a golf lesson" (M=2.02, SD=1.07).

**Testing the Constraint-Effects-Mitigation Model**

Prior to addressing the hypotheses, tests for non-normality were performed. Histograms were performed for perceived constraints, constraint negotiations and motivation. All three showed normal distributions. In addition, correlation analyses were performed to address the relationships between perceived constraint items, negotiation strategies, and motivation items. The results suggest significant correlations among all items, but none were high enough to warrant concern for multicollinearity.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was utilized to test the first constraints-effects-mitigation model. The theoretical partially mediated model (see Figure 4.1) consisted of 16 latent variables: Perceived constraints (e.g., Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and Structural); Negotiation strategies (e.g., Time Management, Interpersonal Coordination, Skill Acquisition, and Financial Strategies); Motivation (e.g., Enjoyment, Competition, Company of Friends, Health, and Meeting New People); and Intentions to revisit (e.g., Play Golf, Practice, Lessons, and Purchase). The model tested the paths linking intentions to revisit with perceived constraints, negotiation strategies, and motivation. The model also tested the paths linking negotiation with constraints and motivation. For the theoretical model, the path linking motivation to negotiation strategies was significant (β =0.073, p < .05). However, all remaining paths were non-significant. In addition, the partially mediated model provided an inadequate overall fit of the data ($\chi^2/df = 3.71$, CFI = 0.88, RMSEA = 0.090, NNFI = 0.86, IFI = 0.89, GFI = 0.88) (Table 4.3).
A second constraint-effects-mitigation model was also tested using structural equation modeling (SEM). This fully mediated model was analyzed only including the significant predictor variables (i.e., negotiation to intent and motivation to negotiation) (Figure 4.2). All non-significant paths were removed. The paths linking motivation to negotiation strategies (β = 0.64) and negotiation to intentions to revisit (β =0.26) were statistically significant (ps ≤ .05). Forty one percent of the variance in negotiation strategies was accounted for by motivation (R² = 0.41). In addition, seven percent of the variance in intentions to revisit was accounted for by negotiation skills and motivation (R² = 0.07). The factor loadings associated with the latent variables were moderate to high. The competition motivation variable had the highest factor loading on motivation, with a βeta of 0.77, followed by the health motive (β = 0.61), and meeting new people (β =0.57). Time management strategies had the highest factor loading on negotiation with a βeta of 0.75, followed by skill acquisition (β = 0.64), interpersonal coordination (β = 0.66), and financial strategies (β = 0.55). The model provided a good overall fit of the data (X²/df = 2.74, CFI = 0.92, RMSEA = 0.072, NNFI = 0.90, IFI = 0.92, GFI = 0.91) (Table 4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>X²/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially mediated Constraints-effects-mitigation model</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully mediated Constraints-effects-mitigation model</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.92*</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.90*</td>
<td>0.92*</td>
<td>0.91*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† RMSEA good to acceptable fit ≤ .05 to .08
*CFI, NNFI, IFI, and GFI good to acceptable fit ≤ .90 to .95
Figure 4.2. Modified constraint-effects-mitigation model for golfers’ intentions to revisit a public golf course.
Discussion and Conclusions

The primary objective of this study was to use Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) theoretical framework to examine the role of motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies on golfers’ intentions to revisit public golf facilities. Figure 4.2 represents a modified conceptual model accounting for the results of this study.

This study partially replicated the results of the Hubbard and Mannell (2001) study, finding evidence for a motivation-negotiation interaction. The path between motivation and negotiation was significant. As a group, the golfers in this study indicated they were highly motivated to play golf, which in turn initiated negotiation strategies. The competition motivation variable had the highest factor loading on motivation, which was not surprising since over 84% of the respondents were male and men tend to play golf for the competition. According to Barletta (2004), women tend to focus on the enjoyment of the game, group experiences, and health/wellness.

Motivation was not significantly related to intentions to revisit a public golf course and the path was removed. This could be due in part to the high motivation scores and that the golfers in this study may have previously negotiated through constraints to participate. Without further research; however, this is simply supposition. Future research should analyze each individual motivation measure and its relationship with negotiation strategies in an effort to extend our understanding of the factors that best explain intention to revisit and provide information that will aide public golf course managers in understanding their customers.

Negotiation strategies fully mediated the relationship between motivation and intentions to revisit. According to Hubbard and Mannell (2001), “people who are more
highly motivated to participate expend a greater use of negotiating and are more successful at starting, maintaining, or increasing their level of participation” (p.159). Seven percent of the variance in intentions to revisit was accounted for by negotiation skills and motivation. Time management had the highest factor loading on negotiation, followed by interpersonal coordination. Hubbard and Mannell (2001) also found time management to be the negotiation strategy most often used; however, it was followed by skill acquisition, interpersonal coordination and financial strategies. In this study, skill acquisition may not have been as important because the sample was comprised of individuals who had, on average, 15 years of playing experience. Thus, while not necessarily highly skilled golfers (average 18 hole score = 96), they were not beginners in need of developing rudimentary skills. Petrick et al. (2001) made a similar argument, suggesting that golfers with different experience use histories vary in their level of motivation for the sport. Further, interpersonal coordination, a negotiation strategy, was utilized more than skill acquisition and financial strategies. This may be due to the social interaction of the sport. In summary, time management and interpersonal coordination as negotiation strategies make sense in a golf context because of the time commitment necessary to play a round of golf and the social aspects of the game.

Contrary to Hubbard and Mannell (2001), the path between constraints and negotiation was unrelated, as well as the path between constraints and participation, or in this case, intentions to revisit. Their results suggested that constraints negatively influence participation, and at the same time initiate negotiation efforts in order to participate. This sample was not highly constrained. Hence, it is reasonable to see non-significant paths between constraints, negotiation and intentions to revisit. Carroll and Alexandris (1997) suggested that highly motivated people are less likely to perceive high
levels of constraint. Perhaps the same can be said of the sample in this study. Future research should focus on the constraint negotiation process for golfers in different settings. Since the sample was comprised of golfers at one public facility located in a suburban area, there is a need for research that examines the ways in which the constraint negotiation process may differ for golfers who play at different types (e.g., rural, urban, city) of public golf courses.

In summary, this study provides empirical support for relationships between motivation, negotiation strategies, and intentions to revisit. Since competition for rounds of golf remains high, golf managers should consider the following action steps. First, since negotiation strategies fully mediated the relationship between motivation and intentions to revisit, managers should focus on opportunities to assist with motivating golfers through negotiation strategies. Time management was the negotiation strategy used most often, followed by interpersonal coordination, and skill acquisition. Managers should create more time-conscious opportunities to play at the facility by creating 3-hole, 6-hole, and 9-hole playing opportunities (Graves, 2005). In addition, managers should offer leagues and group clinics to assist with the interpersonal coordination and skill acquisition negotiation strategies. Second, since motivation was significantly related to negotiation skills, managers should highlight programs that focus on the noted motivation items (e.g. competition, health, meeting new people, playing golf with friends, and enjoyment) to encourage negotiation skills leading to intentions to revisit. In addition, it could help to create competitive events and/or leagues for those who are motivated to play through competition. Managers should also consider positioning golf as a healthy activity to motivate those interested in participating in golf for the health benefits (e.g. offer “walking only” times with free use of a pull-cart so golfers can still walk and not
carry their golf bag, share caloric benefits of walking 9 holes/18 holes; and marketing social events to meet new people, play golf with friends, and for the overall enjoyment of the game.
References


CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The overarching aim of this study was to examine the role of past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, motivation, perceived constraints, and negotiation strategies on golfers’ intentions to revisit the public golf facility. In this chapter I will summarize the findings and implications discussed in previous chapters and highlight the potential for future research.

Summary of Key Findings

I addressed nine hypotheses related to intentions to revisit a public golf course. Following are the results related to the hypotheses.

H1: Past experience will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

The results of the hierarchical regression analysis indicated that past experience was significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course. In particular, higher number of rounds played at the study course was associated with higher intentions to revisit. Thus, H1 was accepted.
H2: Satisfaction will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

A positive and significant relationship was observed between satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience and intentions to revisit. However, when perceived value was added to the model, satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience was no longer significant. H2 was not accepted.

H3: Perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

A positive and significant relationship was observed between perceived value and intentions to revisit a public golf course. Hence, H3 was accepted.

H4: Controlling for past experience and satisfaction, perceived value will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

After controlling for past experience and satisfaction, perceived value was significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course. H4 was accepted.

H5: Past experience and satisfaction will be significantly and positively related to perceived value.

Only satisfaction with the overall quality of the experience had a significant and positive relationship with perceived value. As a result, H5 was only partially accepted.
H6. Perceived constraints will be significantly and negatively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

Utilizing Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), the results indicated that there was not a significant relationship between perceived constraints and intentions to revisit. Thus, H6 was not accepted.

H7. Negotiation strategies will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

A significant and positive relationship was observed between negotiation strategies and intentions to revisit. H7 was accepted.

H8. Motivation will be significantly and positively related to intentions to revisit a public golf course.

The results of the structural equation modeling indicated a non-significant relationship between motivation and intentions to revisit. However, motivation had significant indirect relationships through negotiation strategies to intentions to revisit. Thus, H8 was partially accepted.

H9. Perceived constraints and motivation will be significantly and positively related to negotiation strategies.
The results of the structural equation modeling indicated that perceived constraints were not associated with negotiation strategies. Motivation, however, was significantly and positively related to negotiation strategies. H9 was partially accepted.

**Implications**

1. Golfers’ past experience is significantly related to intentions to revisit. This parallels previous research carried out by Petrick et al. (2001) and Sonmez and Graefe (1998), who found past experience to be the best predictor of intentions to revisit. However, when the individual past experience variables were reviewed, only “number of rounds played at the public course” was significantly related to intentions to revisit. Past experience was measured using a modified version of Petrick, Morais, and Norman’s (2001) and Schreyer, Lime, and Williams’ (1984) measures of past behavior in outdoor recreation. The fact that number of rounds played was the only “experience” item related to intentions to revisit challenges the notion that experience use history (i.e., EUH) is the best way to measure recreational past experience. Rather than create a categorical variable from three measures of past experience - total visits, total years of use, and frequency per year - (Hammit & McDonald, 1983; Schreyer, Lime, & Williams, 1984; Hammit, Backlund, & Bixler, 2004), in the future, researchers interested in studying past experience with sports such as golf, should continue to test the individual past experience items used in this study in an effort to assess their reliability. In addition, the results of this study suggest that little is known about what factors are influencing intentions to revisit a public golf course. In this study, past experience overall accounted for only 15% of the variance in intentions to revisit a
public golf course. What other past experience factors are influencing golfers intentions to revisit? The relationships golfers have with the golf course staff may play a role, as well as the number of years they have known the golf professional. Hence, future research must explore what other past experience items should be incorporated in studies of intentions to revisit.

2. A positive and significant relationship was observed between perceived value and intentions to revisit. As perceived value increased, so too did intentions to revisit the public golf course. This finding parallels that of previous research carried out by Petrick et al. (2001), Parasuraman and Grewal (2000), and Zeithaml (1988), who found perceived value to be a predictor of intentions to revisit. However, when the individual intention to revisit items were treated as separate dependent variables, perceived value was significantly related to “intention to take a golf lesson...” and “intention to purchase equipment and/or clothing…,” only. This result may be due to a number of factors. First, a one-item measure focusing on value for fees paid was used to address perceived value. While this approach has proven to be valid and reliable, Zeithaml (1988) has argued that there are multiple definitions of perceived value; value for fees paid being one of them. If respondents had been asked to rate, for example, the quality they receive for the price paid, perhaps the results would have been different. Second, the sample was comprised of individuals who golf at one public golf course. Logically, individuals’ perceptions of “value” would be expected to vary by golf course. Third, approximately two-thirds of the sample rated the value received for fees paid as “good” or “extremely good.” According to Zeithaml (1988)
what is received (i.e., high quality, convenience, quantity/volume) and what is given
(i.e., time, money, effort) varies among consumers. Thus, value is highly personal.

In summary, studies of the relationship between perceived value and intentions to
revisit should be further studied at various public golf courses to (a) address the
discrepancy between this study’s finding and those of earlier researchers, and (b) help
managers document whether perceptions of perceived value should be manipulated in
an effort to maintain and, perhaps, increase golf participation.

3. The finding that satisfaction is a predictor of intentions to revisit suggests that finding
ways to increase overall satisfaction with the quality of the experience could play a
key role in future intentions to play golf. As satisfaction with the overall quality of the
experience increased, so too did intentions to revisit the public golf course, providing
support for Petrick and Backman’s (2002) and McDougall and Levesque’s (2000)
work. Kozak (2001) on the other hand, found intentions to revisit were influenced
more by satisfaction than the extent of past experience. My study results indicated the
opposite. Satisfaction in this study explained only three percent of the variance in
intentions to revisit a public golf course. Perhaps most interesting is that when
perceived value was added to the model, satisfaction was no longer significant. This
may be due to the one item measure of satisfaction with the overall quality of the
experience.

4. Further, when investigating the relationships between past experience, satisfaction
with the overall quality of the experience, and perceived value, satisfaction was a
good predictor of perceived value. As satisfaction with the overall quality of the

experience increased, so too did perceived value. However, opposite of Petrick et al. (2001), I did not find a relationship between past experience and perceived value. Thus, value was more influenced by satisfaction. This may be due to the fact that the sample may have already judged perceived value prior to participation. This may also be due to the high level of satisfaction with over 80% of the sample responding either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied,” and relating satisfaction to perceived value. Without further research; however, this is simply conjecture.

5. Additionally, managers interested in increasing their teaching opportunities and influencing individuals’ intentions to purchase equipment and/or clothing should focus their efforts on creating positive perceptions of value. One suggestion to increase perceptions of value is for managers to focus on value for time invested (e.g., what golfers get for their time). Kennedy (2006) provided additional suggestions that also related to increasing perceptions of value: market golf as family friendly so golf is perceived as a family game; make the golf facility a meeting point for other activities; stress the importance of golf in business – a way to connect better with customers; position golf as a healthy activity; and promote golf as a means to strengthen relationships. Since overall satisfaction had a positive and significant relationship to perceived value, managers should also focus on overall satisfaction initiatives.

6. The sample used time management (e.g., setting aside time for golf participation) and interpersonal coordination (e.g., finding people with whom to play golf) negotiation strategies more often than skill acquisition (e.g., trying to improve golfing skills) and
financial strategies (e.g., saving money to participate in golf). Hubbard and Mannell (2001) also found time management to be the negotiation strategy most often used; however, it was followed by skill acquisition, interpersonal coordination and financial strategies. According to Barletta (2004), “Men play golf to bond through activities and competition, while women play golf to bond through talking and collaboration…” It appears that the same pattern held true in this study. Golf is a social leisure activity and our results support the social, as well as time management strategies utilized as negotiation skills. In addition, over two-thirds of the sample indicated they were “extremely unlikely” or “unlikely” to take a golf lesson within the next year, indicating that skill acquisition was not important. Studies of the relationship between constraints and negotiation strategies and intentions to revisit should be conducted at various public golf courses.

7. As a group, the golfers in this study indicated they were highly motivated to play golf. Motivation; however, was not significantly related to intentions to revisit a public golf course. This could be due in part to the high motivation scores and that the golfers in this study previously negotiated through constraints to participate. Hubbard and Mannell (2001) also found a non-significant relationship between motivation and participation; however, motivation positively influenced negotiation strategies, which in turn, influenced participation. Future research should focus on the influence motivation has on golfer’s negotiation strategies and examine the influence on intentions to revisit.
Future Research Directions

1. The study results challenge the notion that a single, operational index can measure the extent of recreational past experience (EUH). Thus, in the future, researchers should not depend on existing scales to measure individual past experience. Instead, they should begin by uncovering through, for example, in-depth interviews, what attributes are most likely to explain intentions to revisit. These should be followed by a large scale, multi-site study (e.g., multiple public course, mix of public and private courses) in an effort to validate the results.

2. Another recommendation for future research would be to examine the constraint negotiation process for various golfers in different settings. The results of this study suggested that golfers who play golf at a public golf course are not highly constrained. Since the sample was comprised of individuals who golf at one public golf course, which is located in a suburban area, there is a need for research that examines the ways in which the constraint negotiation process may differ for golfers who play at different types (e.g., rural, urban, city) of public golf courses. In addition, future research should consider the drive time to a golf course, especially given the increasing cost of fuel. According to the NGF (2005), “three-quarters of golfers drive twenty minutes or less to the course they play most often” (p. 6).

3. Another recommendation is to examine the relationships between past experience, perceived value and satisfaction for individuals who play golf at private facilities. With new challenges facing private clubs (e.g., fewer members, national economic
conditions, higher operating expenses, creating a family experience), researchers must address what managers of private facilities can do to raise perceived value and satisfaction and lower the time commitment (Graves, 2005). Although members of private facilities have expressed their intentions to revisit through the purchase of a membership, what are the relationships between past experience, perceived value, and satisfaction in such a context?

4. Since perceived value is based on the perceptions of what is received and what is given (Zeithaml & Bitner, 1996), future research should also examine the perceived time value to explore the perceptions of what is received and what is given in terms of time. The majority of past research on perceived value has focused on value is what consumers get for what they give (Bojanic, 1996; Petrick, 2002a; Zeithaml, 1985). How does the perception of value change as it relates to the time it takes to play golf?

5. In addition, researchers should examine the constraint negotiation process and determine whether relationships between motivation, constraints, and negotiation strategies, are the same or different for individuals who play golf at private or public courses. Members at private facilities have purchased a membership, expressing their intentions to revisit; however, are there differences in the constraint negotiation process between public and private golfers? In addition, future research should also consider the influence of age and gender when examining the constraint negotiation process. How does the constraint negotiation process differ throughout stages of the life cycle? How do constraint negotiation strategies differ between women and men and how do our gender role expectations influence the negotiation process? Women
represent a powerful economic force for the golf industry. While women do not play as many rounds of golf as men, women spend more than men on a per round basis (Golf 20/20, 2001).

6. A sixth important task is to explore opportunities to position golf as a healthy leisure choice. According to the National Golf Foundation (2007), “46% of golfers are overweight (higher than the national average) and 27% are obese (lower than the national average)” (p. 9). Researchers have found that the number one reason people stop participating in golf is “lack of time,” followed by “family obligations,” and “expense” (Golf 20/20 Segmentation Study, 2001). According to Godbey (2005), “lack of time” is the number one answer given to explain why people do not participate in some activity. We feel rushed to “do it all” and factors that contribute include the endless number of goods and experiences from which to choose (Scott, 2005). In the U.S., we are in the middle of a “time crunch.” Leisure involves choice and golf course owners and managers need to assess what can be done to lower the time commitment and increase the value of the time invested. In addition, health care costs are rising and conventional health plans fail to promote good health (Yi, 2007). The ability to position golf as a healthy leisure choice is a key trend impacting the future of golf. Therefore, future research should explore the relationships between golf participation and weight reduction, thus increasing the value of the golfing experience.

7. Finally, through the use of focus groups, future research should examine past experience, perceived value, satisfaction, motivation, perceived constraints and
negotiation strategies of golfers who play golf at public courses. For example, results of the focus groups could help researchers modify the past experience statements to gain a better understanding of past experience. The results might also be of value in creating a single conceptual model of intentions to revisit involving the constraint negotiation process for individuals who golf at a public facility.

**Limitations**

- The sample was comprised of individuals who golf at one public golf course. Therefore, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to the general golfing public, nor can they be generalized to golfers at other public courses.

- The sample of golfers was primarily male. While males represent the vast majority of golfers at the study site, this gender breakdown may not hold true of all public courses. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to the general golfing population.

- The sample was comprised of fairly seasoned golfers; on average they have been playing golf for 15 years and played an average of 27 rounds in the past 12 months with approximately 10 rounds played at the study course. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to the general golfing public.

- The study course was easily accessible in a rural area. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to all public golf courses.
• As an incentive to complete the survey, a drawing was held for two (2) groups representing four (4) rounds of golf each, including a golf cart. This incentive may not have been as salient to individuals who live outside of the area and may have influenced the results.
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Appendix A – Introduction Email

Date

Dear <Insert 1st Name>:

On behalf of Penn State University Golf Courses, we are conducting a brief research study, which will aid us in our effort to continually upgrade the quality of your experiences at the Penn State Golf Courses. As a token of our appreciation, a drawing will be held for two (2) groups representing four (4) rounds of golf each, including a golf cart.

As a golfer, your comments are critical in this effort. This survey, which will be sent to you next week, should take no more than 7-10 minutes to complete. We realize it is always the busiest people who are called upon; therefore, in advance we thank you greatly for your time and considerations, and very much appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mr. Burch Wilkes,
Principal Investigator
Director, Professional Golf Management

Mr. Joe Hughes, PGA
General Manager
Penn State Golf Courses

Dr. Deborah Kerstetter,
Associate Professor
Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management
Date

Dear <Insert 1st Name>: 

Last week you received information about a research study of the Penn State University Golf Courses. Your participation will aid us in our effort to continually upgrade the quality of your experiences at the Penn State Golf Courses. As a token of our appreciation, a drawing will be held for two (2) groups representing four (4) rounds of golf each, including a golf cart.

As a golfer, your comments are critical in this effort. This survey should only take 7-10 minutes to complete. We realize it is always the busiest people who are called upon; therefore, in advance we thank you greatly for your participation.

Here is a link to the survey:  
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=3FFAiONScNzNICIUoitJRV6YXyEeD45L2KkdDvpjb4o_3d

Sincerely,

Mr. Burch Wilkes,  
Principal Investigator  
Director, Professional Golf Management

Mr. Joe Hughes, PGA  
General Manager  
Penn State Golf Courses

Dr. Deborah Kerstetter,  
Associate Professor  
Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management
Appendix C – Friendly Reminder Email

Date

Dear <Insert 1st Name>:

Last week you received information about a research study of the Penn State Golf Courses. Your participation is very important to help us create the best experiences at the Penn State Golf Courses. As a token of our appreciation, a drawing will be held for two (2) groups representing four (4) rounds of golf each, including a golf cart.

Here is a link to the survey:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

The survey should only take 7-10 minutes to complete. Your participation is completely voluntary.

Thank you for your participation! If you have any questions or comments about the study, please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Burch Wilkes at gbw104@psu.edu or 814-863-8987.

Sincerely,

Mr. Burch Wilkes,
Principal Investigator
Director, Professional Golf Management

Mr. Joe Hughes, PGA
General Manager
Penn State Golf Courses

Dr. Deborah Kerstetter,
Associate Professor
Department of Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
Appendix D – Survey Instrument

**Past Experience**

1. How many years have you been playing golf?
   - Years

2. Approximately how many rounds of golf did you play in the past 12 months?
   - Rounds

3. During the past 12 months, approximately how many rounds of golf did you play at the Penn State Golf Courses?
   - Rounds at PSU

4. Approximately, how many different golf courses have you played in the past 12 months?
   - Golf Courses

5. How many golf lessons have you taken in the past 12 months?
   - Golf lessons

6. Do you have an established USGA Handicap?
   - Yes
   - No

---

1. What is your current USGA handicap?
   - 0-14
   - 15-20
   - 21-30
   - 31 or higher

---

1. What is your average score for an 18-hole round of golf?
Perceived Value and Satisfaction

1. On average, how would you rate the value received for fees paid during your round(s) of golf at the Penn State Golf Courses?
   - Extremely Poor
   - Poor
   - Neither Poor or Good
   - Good
   - Extremely Good

2. On average, how satisfied were you with the following aspects of your round (s) of golf at the Penn State Golf Courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordability/Value of course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall condition of the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of greens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course design/layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own performance over the season at PSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tee time availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with companions over the season at PSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pace of play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of golf carts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Club House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Hole food &amp; beverage service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness/service of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-course restrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-course drinking water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-course food &amp; beverage service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of experience at the PSU Golf Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you were "very" or "somewhat" dissatisfied with the overall quality of your experience at the PSU Golf Courses, please tell us why...
# Involvement or Lack of Involvement in Golf

1. The following are reasons that people often give for their level of involvement or lack of involvement in golf. Please review each of the reasons and, on the scale provided, choose which best represents the extent to which each statement is true.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree or Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable playing golf with members of the opposite sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would play more golf if my family thought it is alright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would play more golf if my friends thought it was alright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would play more golf if I did not feel self-conscious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not in good enough shape to play more golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would play more golf if it did not require a lot of skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have friends and/or acquaintances with whom to play more golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I know usually do not have time to play more golf with me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I know usually do not have enough money to play more golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I know usually have too many family obligations to play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people I know usually do not have enough skills to play more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would play more golf if the PSU Golf Courses were not crowded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would play more golf if the PSU Golf Courses were convenient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am too busy with other activities to play more golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would play more if other golfers were more highly skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would play more golf if other golfers were more aware of golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It costs too much to play more golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would play more golf if it did not take so much time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Participation in Golf

1. The following are some of the things people have told us they do to get around the obstacles they face in continuing or increasing their participation in golf. Please read each of the statements and choose how frequently you have done or are doing the following things to continue or increase your participation in golf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I set aside time to golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prioritize what I want to do and make golf a priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to work my golf in around my other commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get up earlier or stay up later to make time to play golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to play golf in off-peak times when facilities are less busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to improve my golfing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I play golf despite an injury or physical/health condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take golf lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I obtain treatment for an injury or health conditions so I can play golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to find people with whom to play golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I arrange rides with friends to play golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I play golf with people my own age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to meet people with similar interest in golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I borrow equipment to play golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to budget my money in order to play golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I save money to participate in golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I play more golf close to home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I improvise with the equipment and/or clothes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to play golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Motivation

1. I play golf or would like to play more golf because...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>1 Not at All</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is good for my health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the company of my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the competition with myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the competition with my playing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like meeting new people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the challenge of the game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It improves my skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy being outdoors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides me with enjoyment/pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intentions to Revisit the Penn State Golf Courses

1. How likely are you to do the following in the next 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither Unlikely or Likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play golf at the PSU Golf Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize the practice facilities at the PSU Golf Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a golf lesson at the PSU Golf Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase equipment and/or clothing at the PSU Golf Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How many rounds of golf do you expect to play at the PSU Golf Courses during the next 12 months?

Rounds: [ ]
A bit of information about you

1. What is your gender?
   - Female
   - Male

2. What is your age?
   Years

3. What is your current employment status?
   - Full-Time
   - Part-Time
   - Retired
   - Unemployed
     Other (please specify)

4. If you are employed full-time, on average how many hours a week do you work?
   Hours per week

5. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   - High School
   - Community College (Associates Degree)
   - University (Four-Year Degree)
   - Masters Degree
   - Doctorate
     Other (please specify)

6. Which of the following best describes your total gross household income in 2006?
   - Under $20,000
   - $20,000 to $39,999
   - $40,000 to $59,999
   - $60,000 to $79,999
   - $80,000 to $99,999
7. What is your present marital status?
- Single, never married
- Married
- Separated/Divorced
- Widowed

8. Are there any children living in your home?
- Yes
- No

1. If yes, how many of the children who live in your home are:
- Under 5 years of age
- 5 to 12 years of age
- 13 to 19 years of age
- 20 or more years of age

Thank you!

1. If you do NOT want your name to be entered into the drawing for rounds of golf, please check below.
- I do NOT want my name to be entered

Thank you for participating in this study!

Once completed, we will send you an e-mail with a link to the study results in October 2007.

G. Burch Wilkes, IV
Study Director
Appendix E – Rounds and Golfer Comparison

Chart 1: Rounds and Golfer Comparison

Year

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005

Rounds of Golf (Millions)

518.1 502.4 37.1 499.7 499.6

Number of Golfers (Millions)

41 40 39 39 38

Legend:
- Rounds of Golf
- Golfers
Appendix F – Course Openings and Closings

Chart 2: Course Openings vs. Closings
Appendix G – Golf Course Supply and Demand
Appendix H – Core vs. Occasional Golfers

**Golfer Involvement Levels (mm)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Golfers</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional Golfers</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I – Satisfaction with the Golf Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction item</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied 1</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied 2</th>
<th>Neither Dissatisfied or Satisfied 3</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied 4</th>
<th>Very Satisfied 5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Golf Carts</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club House</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Shop</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness/Service of Staff</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Companions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Design/Layout</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tee Time Availability</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Quality of Experience</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Course Drinking Water</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability/Value</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker Room</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Greens</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Course</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Hole Food &amp; Beverage Service</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Course Restrooms</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Performance</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Course Food &amp; Beverage Service</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace of Play</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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