

Running head: LPGA GOLF PRODUCT

Sports Spectatorship Theories and Spectator Views
of the LPGA Golf Product

Debbie Lagace

University of Ottawa

Ottawa, Ontario





National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-15730-X

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Abstract

The focus of this study was on determining which reasons for attending a golf event influenced spectators' decisions to attend the LPGA DuMaurier Classic 'major' golf event as well as to determine what, if any, sports spectatorship theories could be used to explain golf spectatorship. A questionnaire comprised of a demographic section and 27 attendance reasons was completed by 957 spectators using the spectator intercept method. It was predicted that Entertainment theories would best explain golf spectatorship. It was hypothesized that to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see live action and to see the best perform would be in the top ten reasons of the total sample, as it was in previous studies; and that male and female spectators, the four categories of golf playing frequency spectators, and weekday and weekend spectators would focus on different aspects of the golf spectating experience. Frequency statistics provided demographic data, descriptive statistics gave rankings of the 27 attendance reasons for each category of each sample while inferential statistics (t-tests, ANOVA) demonstrated between which groups significant differences occurred. A factor analysis performed on the attendance reasons produced six factor categories which were then matched to the sports spectatorship theories. All four hypotheses were supported by the results of the analyses. Female spectators differed from male spectators on six attendance reasons related to a learning and entertainment focus. Non-golfers differed from the other golfers by placing a greater emphasis on non-learning and non-golfing attendance reasons, occasional golfers distinguished themselves by being interested in promotional aspects of the event while avid golfers attended for reasons related to entertainment. Weekend spectators differed

from weekday spectators on 11 reasons related to an entertainment focus. This study provided insight into why people attended the LPGA DuMaurier Classic 'major' golf event and examined the sports spectatorship theories in an individual sport setting. It also discovered areas that require further study in order to better understand the phenomenon of sports spectatorship as well as the complexity and ambiguity of the sports spectatorship theories.

Table of Contents

Chapter I - Introduction	8
Statement of the Problem	11
Hypotheses	12
Significance of the Study	13
Delimitations	14
Limitations	15
Chapter II - Review of Literature	17
Phenomenon of Sports Spectatorship	18
Benefits of Sports Spectatorship	20
Types of Spectators	23
Factors Affecting Attendance	25
Theories of Sports Spectatorship	30
Model of Leisure-Choice Behavior	32
Salubrious Effects Theories	33
Stress and Stimulation Seeking Theories	36
Catharsis and Aggression Theories	41
Entertainment Theories	44
Disposition Theories	55
Achievement Seeking Theories	58
Sports Specific Literature	65

Golf Specific Literature	67
Summary	73
Chapter III - Methodology	79
Subjects	80
Sample Selection	80
Instrument	81
Data Collection	84
Treatment of the Data	85
Chapter IV - Results	88
Total Sample	90
Gender Differences	94
Golf Playing Differences	99
Day of Attendance Differences	107
Factor Analysis	112
Chapter V - Discussion	115
Total Sample	116
Gender Differences	122
Golf Playing Differences	128
Day of Attendance Differences	134
Factor Analysis	138

Chapter VI - Conclusion and Recommendations	141
Total Sample	143
Gender Differences	144
Golf Playing Differences	145
Day of Attendance Differences	148
Factor Analysis	148
 Appendix A - Stratified Random Sample	 150
Appendix B - Spectator-Intercept Location Protocol	152
Appendix C - LPGA DuMaurier Classic Golf Questionnaire	154
Appendix D - Interviewer Protocol	156
Appendix E - Demographic data	159
Appendix F - Chi-square results	168
Appendix G - Sample size, means and standard deviations for the golf playing frequency sample	175
Appendix H - Loadings and factors from the factor analysis	180
 References	 183

List of Tables

1 - Means and standard deviations of the 27 reasons for the total sample	92
2 - Significant differences for the 27 reasons by gender	97
3 - Significant differences for the 27 reasons by golf playing frequency	105
4 - Significant differences for the 27 reasons by day of attendance	110
5 - Top ten reasons of total samples of spectators at major LPGA, regular LPGA and regular PGA events	121

Chapter I

Introduction

The concept of sports spectatorship appears to have evolved along with active sports participation itself (Zillmann & Paulus, 1993). For any demonstration or contest of skill, there were always neighbours, villagers and other interested parties to watch and cheer. In Ancient Roman times, thousands of people filled the Colosseum to observe gladiatorial contests. Today, hundreds of thousands of spectators turn out for professional and collegiate sporting events and millions more tune in via radio and television. The magnitude of the spectatorship phenomenon in modern society is usually at its greatest during the Olympics, World Cup Soccer Playoffs and on SuperBowl Sunday when millions of people around the world join together to watch (in person or on television) or listen (radio) to the events (Sloan, 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993).

The introduction of the mass media into the sports world has increased the number of ways in which a person can consume sporting events. The term sports spectator now encompasses many types of spectators. There are those who go to the stadium, arena or course and watch the event in person. Others prefer to remain in the comfort of their own home or in the company of others at a sports bar and watch the event on television. Still others do not watch the event but follow the event on the radio or read about it in the newspaper or in one of the many specialty sports magazines. For the purposes of clarity, this study will concentrate on the type of spectator who engages in direct consumption of a sporting event by attending it in person.

Despite the fact that sports spectatorship co-evolved with sports participation and that sports spectatorship is a multi-billion dollar industry, most research to date has concentrated on the implications of active sports participation. Little attention has been given to the phenomenon of sports spectatorship (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993; Guttman, 1986; Lee & Zeiss, 1980; Wann & Branscombe, 1993; Zillmann, Bryant, & Sapolsky, 1989). The studies that have been undertaken on sports spectatorship have focused primarily on team sports and have dealt with the factors affecting attendance (Baade & Tiehen, 1990; Becker & Suls, 1983; Bergier, 1981; Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Hansen & Gauthier, 1989; Iso-Ahola, 1980; Kennedy, 1980; Schofield, 1983; Schurr, Wittig, Ruble, & Ellen, 1988; Sloan, 1989; Zillmann et al., 1989), the effect of team identification and affiliation on the individual's image and esteem (Cialdini et al., 1976; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Lee, 1985; Wann & Branscombe, 1990, 1993) and on the benefits of sports for the individual and society (Beisser, 1963; Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Guttman, 1986; Hall, Slack, Smith & Whitson, 1991; Loy, 1981; Melnick, 1993; Sloan, 1989; Snyder & Sprietzer, 1983; Wann & Branscombe, 1990, 1993; Zillmann et al., 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993).

To date, very little is known about spectator views, behaviours and motives towards individual sports or what, if any, theories and models can be applied to them. A number of theories from the sports participation literature have been advanced to explain, or at least accommodate, the findings from the team sports spectatorship studies (Sloan, 1989). Catharsis and Aggression theories attempt to account for the feelings of anger, aggression and hostility felt by spectators after viewing sporting events. Some of

the Aggression theories point to a decrease in hostility and anger (Catharsis, Instinct) while other theories suggest that observing aggressive acts leads to more aggression in the spectator (Social Learning, Disinhibition). Salubrious Effects theories suggest that spectators receive favourable health benefits from sport and that for them sport functions as a beneficial leisure activity and temporary escape. Stress and Stimulation theories assert that people do not experience enough stress and stimulation in their everyday lives and must seek it out elsewhere. Sport affords the spectator this added source of stress. Stress and Stimulation Seeking theories also view sport as having the opposite effect, that of releasing extra energy in a socially desirable context.

Entertainment theories hold that sport is enjoyable, exciting and pleasurable because of (a) aesthetics, which deals with the quality of the play or contest; (b) values, which encompasses the idea of sport as a transmitter or reflector of values and culture; and (c) learning, which deals with the acquisition of knowledge about the sport, contest or a player. Disposition theory of sportsfanship suggests that a person's identification, affiliation or disposition towards a team will determine the extent to which he/she enjoys or deplores certain plays and outcomes. Achievement Seeking theories view sport as a means by which people can enhance their image and self-esteem. The idea of disposition is also important to this theory.

While some of these theories have potential, others have already been called into question. Research has yet to determine whether the theories and models can be generalized to individual sports situations since most of the theories and models have been developed from and applied to mainly team sports situations.

Although little research has been conducted to increase the knowledge base in the individual sports setting, even less is known about specific individual sports such as golf. Numerous golf specific studies have been conducted on the biomechanics of the swing (see Cochran & Farrally, 1994) but there have been relatively few studies on the views that spectators hold of the various tours - Professional Golf Association (PGA), Senior PGA and the Ladies PGA (LPGA) or of the factors that affect their attendance at the tour events. This was very surprising, from a marketing and administrative perspective, considering the fact that golf is a multi-million dollar industry which is gaining in popularity (participation and spectatorship rates) and media attention. This lack of knowledge about the motivation, perceptions and behaviours of the golf spectator as well as the lack of practical applicability of the sports spectatorship theories to individual sports served as the thrust for this study.

Statement of the Problem

The focus of this study was on determining which reasons for attending a golf event influenced spectators' decisions to attend the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event. The study investigated which reasons were the most influential in the decision making process of the sample as a whole as well as for the various categories of the gender and golf playing frequency subsamples. Differences in the reasons to attend the weekday rounds of competition (Thursday and Friday) as compared to the weekend rounds of competition (Saturday and Sunday) were also determined. The factor categories obtained from the golf spectators' reasons for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event

were compared to the sports spectatorship theories in order to see if any of the theories provided viable explanations for golf spectatorship. It was anticipated that spectators' reasons for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event would be best explained by Entertainment theories.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study were formulated based on results from previous research on golf spectatorship (Gauthier & Hansen, 1994; Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994).

1. The reasons that influenced spectators' decisions to attend the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event will be very similar to the reasons given by spectators in the previous golf spectatorship studies such that to see the finesse of shot making, to see live action and to see the best perform will be among the top ten reasons for attending.
2. Male and female spectators will differ somewhat on the reasons for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event in that they focus on different aspects of the golf spectating experience.
3. Infrequent golfers (0-7 rounds of golf per year) will differ from frequent (8-24 rounds) and avid golfers (25 or more rounds) on the reasons that most influenced their decisions to attend the golf event
4. The reasons that attracted spectators to the weekday play will differ from reasons that attracted spectators to the weekend play in terms of the importance given to the reasons for attending the golf event.

Significance of the Study

Research in the area of sports spectatorship was scarce and virtually non-existent in golf. Research needs to be conducted in order to better understand the motives, beliefs and behaviours of spectators towards the sport of golf. As the sport of golf and its related industry (equipment, retail merchandise) continue to grow, a knowledge base must exist to help support decisions and trends where the spectator is concerned. The results from the analyses of the demographic and psychographic data were used to develop spectator profiles. These spectator profiles could be used in future marketing ventures and provide the event directors with information on the different segments that make up the golf spectator market. This will enable the event directors to develop appropriate marketing mixes for the different segments.

The theories of sports spectatorship, taken from the sports participant literature, have been applied mainly to popular team sports and have not been empirically tested beyond Sloan's studies (1989). If these theories are to be used to explain sports spectatorship, then support for them cannot come solely from studies on spectator moods and feelings. Support must come from the actual motives and behaviours of the spectators. The data collected on spectator reasons for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event therefore helped test the applicability of the existing sport spectatorship theories in explaining the motives and behaviours of golf spectators. It demonstrated if the theories can be applied to the individual sport of golf and its spectators.

From a scholarship perspective, this study added to the theoretical knowledge and understanding of who the golf spectator is and why he/she attended the golf event. The

previous studies on golf spectators' views of the golf product and their reasons for attending (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993; Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994) were conducted at regular tour events. The current study was the first to use data from a major event. So, in addition to being the first major event sampled, this study also provided support for or refuted the results of the previous golf spectatorship studies and increased or decreased confidence in the results. This study also added to the literature on sports spectatorship in general which is an area that was lacking in research literature.

Delimitations

The subjects for this study were obtained from those people in attendance at the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event held at the Ottawa Hunt and Golf Club in August of 1994. Spectators were approached with a three part questionnaire using a modified mall-intercept method - the spectator-intercept method. The questionnaire was composed of a demographic section, a three word free response section, and 27 items of potential reasons for attending the golf event (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993).

A sample protocol provided sampling of a stratified sample of spectators based on gender and age, while a location protocol provided for the random sampling of the spectators from areas in which they tended to aggregate. For the location protocol, six intercept station areas were established that contained a representative number of par 3, 4 and 5 holes as well as a representative distribution of stations at the previously identified areas of aggregation. The interview areas included the tee boxes, fairways, greens, concession stand areas, driving range, and practice putting green.

Once collected, the data was entered into a computer file. The SAS program was used to facilitate the data treatment and analysis. Frequency, descriptive and inferential analyses were undertaken to obtain the necessary information for the determination of the most and least important reasons for attending as well as to make comparisons between the various subsamples (gender, golf playing frequency and day of attendance). Factor analysis generated clusters which were then compared to the theories of sports spectatorship. The results were used to develop golf spectator profiles and to determine which theory(ies) was (were) the most appropriate in explaining golf spectatorship.

Limitations

The mall-intercept method on which the spectator-intercept method was based has been questioned relative to the representativeness of the sample that it produces (Gates & Solomon, 1982). The sample derived from a mall-intercept method of sampling may or may not be representative of the total population due to the fact that not everyone goes to shopping centres and that frequent shoppers will be overrepresented. This concern has been somewhat allayed with the spectator-intercept method since the population of interest in this study was not the general population but the golf spectator population. The spectator-intercept method was validated at the 1994 LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event and is considered reliable and the results generalizable to the golf spectator population.

Due to the chosen method of sample selection, the sample was limited to those people able to attend the event. It was for this reason that the term golf spectator referred to only those people in attendance of the event. As a result of the need to keep

the questionnaire brief and simple to answer, a fixed number (27) of potential reasons for attending the golf event were used. There was no allowance made for "other, please specify" response to accommodate other attendance motives. This potentially limited the full understanding of why people attended. It could also have prevented the identification of motives that would have supported some of the other theories.

The data that was used in this study was collected in August of 1994 and thus constituted secondary data. By the time that this data was analyzed, it was almost a year old. This should not pose any problems as it is not likely that golf spectator motives, views and behaviours have changed much, if at all, since the time of data collection. The results are still assumed to be representative of the golf spectator population and the information still useful to golf event directors and marketers.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

When compared to active sports participation, sports spectatorship has received relatively little scholarly attention (Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Gauthier & Hansen, 1993; Godbey & Robinson, 1979; Guttman, 1986; Hirt, Zillmann, Erickson & Kennedy, 1989; Lee & Zeiss, 1980; Wann & Branscombe, 1993; Zillmann et al., 1989).

In view of the massive nature of the social phenomenon of sport spectatorship, it is strikingly surprising that so few sport historians, sport psychologists, and sport sociologists have attempted to analyze the antecedents and consequences, causes and effects, functions and dysfunctions of this phenomenon in either past or present perspective. (Loy, 1981, p.262)

Gaps exist in the literature seeking to explain what factors motivate people to attend and follow sports events as well as what, if any, models or theories can be used to help explain sport spectatorship behaviour. The forthcoming review of literature sought to provide the reader with an overview of the existing research. A brief account of the past, present and future of the phenomenon of sports spectatorship will be presented in order to set the ground for a more detailed review of the sports spectator. In this more detailed investigation, the benefits of sports spectatorship and the factors influencing the decision to follow sports was undertaken in order to prepare the reader for and make a link to the theories related to sports spectatorship. The final section of this chapter will present sport

specific and golf specific studies of spectators.

Phenomenon of Sports Spectatorship

The phenomenon of sports spectatorship is by far a recent thing. The emergence of sports spectatorship appears to have coincided with the beginnings of sport itself, the very thing being observed. The relationship between active sports participation and sports spectatorship has been described as a symbiosis (Zillmann & Paulus, 1993) and involvement in sports has been predominantly characterized by spectatorship as opposed to active sports participation (Loy, 1981).

Greek culture is usually considered the "cradle of enlightened sports spectatorship" (Harris and Sansone as cited in Zillmann & Paulus, 1993, p. 600) since enthusiasm for sport has been a major part of developed societies since the "Golden Age of Greece" (Loy, 1981, p. 262). There were usually more spectators at the early Olympic Games in Greece than there were participants (Loy, 1981). Incidence of massive gatherings of spectators in pre-modern times have been recorded for gladiatorial contests in Rome's colosseum which "accommodated more than 40 000 spectators" (Zillmann & Paulus, 1993, p. 601) as well as for the Roman racetracks (Zillmann & Paulus, 1993) and the Circus Maximus (Guttmann, 1986; Loy, 1981) which held over a quarter of a million spectators. In the 1800's, it was noted that more people engaged in sport as spectators than as actual participants (Godbey & Robinson, 1979). Guttmann (1986), in his book entitled Sports Spectators, elaborates on the role and rise of sports spectatorship from its beginnings in pre-Greek culture to its current form in present day society.

The magnitude of the sports spectatorship phenomenon is increasing (Anderson, 1979; Hirt et al., 1992; Schwartz, 1971) as the world becomes a global village. No longer is sports spectating limited to actual attendance of the event. In fact, a discussion of sports spectatorship in the industrialized world is incomplete without the inclusion of the mass media. "Attending the games assumed a new meaning, however, with radio and, especially, television coverage of sports events. The new communication technologies raised sports spectatorship more than a thousandfold" (Zillmann & Paulus, 1993, p.601). The statistics on the magnitude of modern day sports spectatorship are astonishing. It is estimated that 60-70% of households watch professional or college sports regularly (Sloan, 1989) and 70% of Americans watch, read or discuss sports at least once a day (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Hirt et al., 1992). Sports accounted for over 1800 hours of network programming and close to 5000 hours of cable coverage in the late 1980's (Zillmann & Paulus, 1993) and specialty sports stations now exist (ESPN and TSN) to provide the sports spectator with 24 hours a day sports coverage. While it is estimated that 800 million people watched the 1988 World Cup soccer final (Sloan, 1989), the number jumped to an estimated 2 billion for the 1994 World Cup soccer final (C. Ayoub, personal communication, December 1, 1994). The "sports phenomenon is so strong (1500 hours of sports per year), that it has become a self-perpetuating, multi-billion dollar industry, frequently creating contests, competitions and even some new sports" (Sloan, 1989, p.175).

With the introduction of the electronic and mass media, the building of newer and larger stadia in most urban centres and the increase in leisure time, it is predicted that the

phenomenon will only increase (Schwartz, 1971; Sloan, 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993). The day will soon be here when "fans can look forward to, or dread, the day when soccer, football, baseball, basketball, hockey, golf and tennis compete simultaneously for their attention" (Guttman, 1986, p.127). While some predict a positive and ever-expanding future for sports spectatorship, at least one author feels that the outlook may not be so bright. Johnson (1993), looking at economic and demographic patterns, predicts that fans' demand for spectator sports will decrease as the economy worsens. He also explains that as the ethnic diversity of the United States increases, people's demands for traditional sports will decrease in favour of other forms of entertainment and other non-traditional forms of sports.

Whatever the future predictions for sports spectatorship, the fact remains that it is currently a huge phenomenon. With this dearth of evidence of the great interest in sports spectatorship, one must now ask what attracts people to sport as spectators.

Benefits of Sports Spectatorship

Although some people believe that sports spectatorship is devoid of any benefit and have outright condemned it (Stone, 1958; Howard as cited in Zillmann et al., 1989), others have seen some positive benefits for the spectator and society (Beisser, 1963; Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Guttman, 1986; Hall et al., 1991; Loy, 1981; Melnick, 1993; Sloan, 1989; Snyder & Sprietzer, 1983; Wann & Branscombe, 1990, 1993; Zillmann et al., 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993). While it is evident that sports spectators do not experience all of the active participation benefits of sport (Zillmann et al., 1989),

they do receive many other benefits. Although it seems odd to count physical benefits among the benefits of sports spectatorship, some studies have actually demonstrated that sports spectators do in fact experience increased heart rate (Corbin as cited in Roberts, 1976) and blood pressure (Branscombe & Wann, 1992). Corbin (as cited in Roberts, 1976) suggested that the sports spectator needs to maintain a fairly high level of physical fitness in order to prevent heart attacks brought on by the emotional and physical stress of the event.

Related to the physical nature of sports spectating, it has been demonstrated in a number of empirical studies that there is a link between sports spectatorship and active sports participation (Anderson, 1979; Godbey & Robinson, 1979; Guttman, 1986; Snyder & Sprietzer, 1983). It has been shown that active sports participants are more likely to be sports spectators and that sports spectators are more likely to be active sports participants (Guttman, 1986). This would seem to dispel the typical lethargic, beer-guzzling, couch potato image with which the sports spectator has often been associated.

"Sports do have a deep influence on our lives, and that influence extends from the individual to collective lives at the local, national and international levels as well" (Sloan, 1989, p.177). Sports spectatorship has been linked to the fostering of feelings of solidarity and the creation of social ties (Anderson, 1979; Beisser, 1963; Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Gantz, 1981; Guttman, 1986; Hall et al., 1991; Lee & Zeiss, 1980; Melnick, 1993; Ponomarev, 1980; Smith, 1988; Zillmann et al., 1989). These social feelings have an impact for society as a whole but also for the various institutions within society. Due to the industrialization and globalization of the world, traditional social ties

have declined and been eroded. Sports spectatorship can provide the antidote to the alienation experienced by many people (Beisser, 1963).

In terms of the benefits to the individual, sports spectatorship can impact positively on a person's development in a number of ways. Sports spectatorship can function as a leisure activity and accrue the benefits of relief from boredom, relaxation of tensions and the possibility of personal development (Zillmann et al., 1989). It can function as fantasy and a temporary escape from reality (Brandmeyer & Alexander, 1986; Gantz, 1981). Sports spectatorship teaches people how to cope with their emotions (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Zillmann et al., 1989). "The repeated experience of disappointment resulting from witnessing the defeat of a supported team may well function as a training in coping with adverse reactions. In fact, sports spectatorship may serve this function better than sports participation" (Zillmann et al., 1989, p.252). Sports spectatorship can also increase self-esteem, reduce depression and alienation in this highly structured and ordered world (Branscombe & Wann, 1991).

Sport can also serve as an excellent conversation topic (Hirt et al., 1992; Zillmann et al., 1989) because it is universally employable and relatively noncontroversial. Beyond the mentioned benefits of sports spectatorship, there are certain satisfactions that were identified as being obtainable from leisure activities, of which sports spectatorship is one. These satisfactions include:

- (1) Welcome change from work, (2) sheer pleasure, (3) contact with friends, (4) new experience, (5) chance of achieving something, (6) makes time pass, (7) benefit to society, (8) self respect for doing it, (9) feeling of

being creative, (10) helps financially, (11) gives more standing with others and (12) makes oneself popular. (Donald & Havighurst as cited in Bergier, 1981, p. 149)

Perhaps the best aspect of sports spectatorship, in contrast to active participation, is that it is accessible to almost everyone regardless of age, gender, skill level and socio-economic situation. There are no minimum levels of knowledge or ability which limit people's access to the world of sports spectatorship (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Zillmann et al., 1989).

Types of Spectators

Spectators have been classified a variety of ways based on a number of characteristics such as mode of consumption (Bergier, 1981; Guttman, 1986; Lee & Zeiss, 1980), level of identification (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Lee, 1985; Wann & Branscombe, 1990, 1993), and degree of commitment (Lee & Zeiss, 1980; Schurr et al., 1988). Unfortunately, degree of dedication or commitment is difficult to assess as "an individual may be a dedicated sports fan, but not support one team in particular. Likewise, persons may support their college team, yet care little about a particular sport, or sports in general" (Branscombe & Wann, 1991, p.116). To date, the most common method of segmenting the spectator population has been based on the level of identification with a player or team. Identification is typically assessed by determining the number of games the person attends, the amount of money invested in the player/team,

the length of time the person has been a fan as well as the person's feelings and behaviours related to the outcome of the game (Wann & Branscombe, 1993).

The sports spectator population can also be divided according to the mode of consumption with which they consume sporting events. Sports events can be consumed in person, on television, radio, in print or by secondhand information. Guttman (1986) defines a sports spectator as

...who views a sports event, either in situ or through visual media such as television. In their social roles, the fans who follow sports in the newspapers and magazines or on the radio are certainly similar to those who sit in the ballpark or flip on the television, but a conceptual line has to be drawn somewhere between those who experience a sports event fully and those whose experience is partial. I draw my admittedly arbitrary line between those who can see an action taking place and those who cannot. (p.5-6)

Guttman's classification of sports spectatorship into those who can and cannot see an action was also proposed in Bergier's (1981) model of consumer and leisure choice behaviour. In his model, Bergier classified the attendance of a sporting event in person or the watching of the event on television as viewing sports and classified listening to sporting events on the radio or reading about them in the print media as following sports.

Lee and Zeiss (1980) developed a "Typology of sport consumers" (p. 411) whereby spectators were categorized according to their frequency of indirect consumption (exposure to mass media) and their frequency-selectivity of direct consumption (attending

the event in person). Frequency was determined by the absolute number of times spectatorship was engaged in while selectivity was operationalized as "the number of times it is engaged in relative to analogous kinds of behaviour" (Lee & Zeiss, 1980, p. 408). The authors came up with the following different types of spectators: specialized fan, general fan, specialized spectator, general spectator, specialized follower, general follower, specialized onlooker and general onlooker. Although this typology does provide a more detailed division of spectators, it consists of too many groups, and hence treatment conditions, to be useful in an experiment.

What is useful about the work done by Lee & Zeiss (1980) is the way in which they divided sports spectatorship into direct and indirect consumption. Although very similar to the previously mentioned categories of sports spectatorship based on mode of consumption (Bergier, 1981; Guttman, 1986), Lee & Zeiss used different definitions to describe direct and indirect consumption. Direct consumption involves actually attending the contest in person and indirect consumption refers to exposure via the mass media. The definitions of the types of sport spectatorship to be used in this study were based on Lee & Zeiss' interpretations of direct and indirect sports spectatorship consumption.

Factors Affecting Attendance at Sports Events

There are many different types of people each possessing their own individual personalities, dispositions and unique sets of factors influencing their decision as to the type of sports spectatorship to engage in. Although it would be impossible to list all of the motivations and factors affecting the decision to become a sports spectator, there are

some factors which appear to be quite common amongst the various types of people who engage in sports spectatorship. While most of the literature related to the factors affecting the decision to be a sports spectator have come from studies on direct consumption of sports events, the results may also somewhat apply to indirect sports consumption.

One of the factors that has been linked most often with attendance at sporting events is team performance (Baade & Tiehen, 1990; Becker & Suls, 1983; Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Iso-Ahola, 1980; Kennedy, 1980; Schurr et al., 1988). The general rule of thumb is that the better a team does, the more people attend. Of course, there are always exceptions to every rule, but the support of a winning team as evidenced by spectator attendance is a common thing. There is one person who disputes the claim that people attend primarily because the team is winning. Levine (as cited in Kennedy, 1980) claims that only 25% of sports spectators attend games solely because their team is winning. He goes on to say that "while the correlation between winning teams and attendance is clear, there are so many exceptions that only the most apathetic observer would be unaware that there is more to filling the stands than leading the standings" (Kennedy, 1980, p.36).

So if winning is not the only thing, what else is? Some people attend games because of a star player (Baade & Tiehen, 1990; Schurr et al., 1988). Other people consider the social (league standings, games ahead/behind leader), objective (team quality, percentages of games won/lost) and temporal (compare past and present success) performance information in making decisions (Becker & Suls, 1983) while still others attend for the pure enjoyment and excitement of the sporting event (Hall et al., 1991;

Sloan, 1989; Zillmann et al., 1989). Intentions of people to spectate a sporting event are also affected by personal factors (Bergier, 1981; Godbey & Robinson, 1979; Lee & Zeiss, 1980; Schofield, 1983; Schurr et al., 1988; Shamir & Ruskin, 1984), product (Bergier, 1981; Brooks, 1994) and environmental factors (Bergier, 1981; Schofield, 1983). Personal factors are related to the scarcity of time and money to spend on spectating as well as interpersonal influences (family and peers). Product related factors deal with the availability and quality of the sporting event while environmental factors relate to the accessibility and location of the event and a concern for the weather conditions.

The social environment and atmosphere at a sporting event has also been shown to have an impact on the decision to attend and on the enjoyment of the event once there (Guttmann, 1986; Hall et al., 1991; Hocking, 1982; Melnick, 1993; Rothenbuhler, 1988; Smith, 1988), presumably providing positive feedback for future attendance. "The desire for casual sociability may well be one of the major psychosocial attractions of attending a sports event" (Melnick, 1993, p.52). The author goes on to point out that certain actions on the part of team and facility management (ie., restrictions on party noise, party decorations, player-fan interactions and smoking) are decreasing the social atmosphere of the sporting events.

Enjoyment of an event is another good predictor of future attendance at similar events. Spectator enjoyment is influenced by a number of factors. Studies by Zillmann et al. (1989) have shown that the following situations tend to increase enjoyment of an event and hence increase the probability of attendance: good plays and success of the

home team, poor plays and failure of the opponent, identification with a player or team, intense rivalry between players or teams, difficult and risky plays that are successfully executed and large incentives for winning (championship, money, medal). Other factors that affect enjoyment are drama and tension (Bryant et al., 1982; Gantz, 1981; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Hall et al., 1991; Loy, 1981; Sapolsky, 1980; Wenner & Gantz, 1989; Wulk, 1979; Zillmann et al., 1989) and the aesthetics of the sport (Schwartz, 1971; Shamir & Ruskin, 1984; Sloan, 1989; Smith, 1988; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993).

Another factor that has an influence on attendance is the degree of identification that the spectator has with the player/team. It has been demonstrated that a positive relationship exists between degree of identification and attendance at sports events (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Lee, 1985; Murrell & Dietz, 1992; Wann & Branscombe, 1990, 1993). Identification was most often measured with a seven item questionnaire related to the team and another questionnaire related to the person's behaviour and reactions towards the team. People who were classified as being highly identified with the player or team tended to be more involved with the player or team, made fewer external attributions for the team's success, accepted more internal attributions for success, paid more for tickets, waited in line longer for tickets, viewed other spectators as being special, felt it to be more important for their friends to be fans and disassociated themselves from the team during unsuccessful periods less often than did people of moderate and low identification levels (Wann & Branscombe, 1993). Thus, a factor related to attendance is the level of identification that a person has with a player or team.

Considering the theory of demand, Schofield (1983) identified the following

factors as having some influence on attendance: entrance price, price and availability of substitute forms of entertainment or complementary commodities, average income, population size and consumer tastes and preferences for the particular sport. He grouped the factors into four convenient categories of economic, demographic, attractiveness of the game and residual preferences. Economic variables included such things as price, substitute or complements and income. It has been argued that ticket price is indeed a factor influencing the decision to attend sporting events (Baade & Tiehen, 1990; Melnick, 1993). Demographic variables consisted of population size, ethnic mix and other variables which might have an impact on attendance such as gender and age. Closeness of competition in a particular game, home and visiting team records, characteristics of players and special occasions were grouped under variables that affect the attractiveness of the game. The final category included residual preference variables not accounted for in the other categories such as weather, stadium quality, time of day, week and season at which the game is played. Each of these factors have been shown in previous studies to have a bearing on attendance (Schofield, 1983).

A continuation of Schofield's (1983) work on factors affecting attendance was undertaken by Hansen and Gauthier (1989). From their review of literature they summarized the factors into the same categories except that Schofield's demographic category was expanded to socio-demographic. This allowed for the inclusion of geographical variables (distance between franchises, access to facility) to be entered into the analysis of attendance. In their study, Hansen and Gauthier (1989) sent a questionnaire to the marketing/promotion heads of all the teams in the Canadian Football

League, National Football League, National Hockey League, National Basketball Association and the Major Indoor Soccer League. The questionnaire consisted of 40 factors that were derived from the literature. Factor analysis generated ten factor categories for the list of items affecting attendance. The results revealed that items falling in the categories of attractiveness and residual preferences were deemed more important and positively affected attendance to a larger extent than did economic and socio-demographic variables. The team's involvement in competition along with the quality of the team in relation to opponents were most influential in increasing attendance on a per game and per season basis.

As can be seen, there are many reasons for attending sporting events. The type of spectator and the motivations of the individual will determine, in part, which factors are relevant to him/her. The grouping of factors into convenient categories by Schofield (1983) but more specific categories by Hansen and Gauthier (1989) provided a concise and easily manageable list of factors that affect attendance and provided a fact based foundation for developing marketing plans.

Theories of Sports Spectatorship

A number of theories exist that attempt to explain the causes of sports spectatorship although no one theory has evolved that encompasses the many facets of sports spectatorship. Most of the theories advanced by Sloan (1989) were derived from the literature on active sports participation. He assumed that since sports participants and spectators share many of the same motives, feelings and responses to sport, that the

theories used to explain sport participation could help account for sports spectatorship. "[The] theories aren't mutually exclusive and competitive. Any number of noncontradictory overlapping theories could be valid and may have additive or multiplicative influences on fan responses" (Sloan, 1989, p. 202). The theories discussed by Sloan include: Salubrious Effect theories, Stress and Stimulation theories, Catharsis and Aggression theories, Entertainment theories and Achievement Seeking theories. Although many different authors developed and researched the various concepts captured within the theories, it was Sloan who put a name to them. In addition to the aforementioned theories, the Disposition theory of sportsfanship (Zillmann et al., 1989) and the consumer and leisure-choice behavior models (Bergier, 1981) will also be discussed.

Each theory will be described and the relevant literature cited in support or rejection of the theory as a possible explanation for the attraction of people to sports spectatorship. As the reader proceeds through the theories, he/she will discover that most of the benefits of sports spectatorship and the factors affecting attendance are contained within the theories. As the focus of this study was on direct sports consumption by the sports spectator, the relevant literature will attempt to emphasize results and findings dealing with direct consumption. However, studies of indirect consumption were also presented to provide further support for the theories because "the fans who follow sports in the newspaper and magazines or on the radio are certainly similar to those who sit in the ballpark or flip on the television" (Guttmann, 1986, p.6). Particularly close attention should be paid to the discussion of entertainment theories as they are predicted to best explain spectator motives.

Model of Leisure-Choice Behaviour

Bergier (1981) discusses a number of paradigms available that attempt "to provide a better understanding of how and why people behave the way they do" (p. 142). The paradigms were classified as economic, integrative, attitudinal, perceptual, stochastic and simulation models of consumer behaviour. The economic model states that consumer choice and behaviour are a function of problems with the allocation of limited resources (money and time). The stochastic models view behaviour as random while simulation models categorize behaviour as complex and only predictable through simulation of events.

Bergier developed his own "Conceptual model of leisure-time choice behaviour" using sport as the stimulus. The model provides a step-by-step approach to understanding how people arrive at their decisions to spectate by examining the antecedents to the independent variables, the independent variables themselves, the intervening variables and the dependent variables. Antecedent to the independent variables include such things as demographic and socio-economic characteristics as well as personal factors and reference group influences. Independent variables pertain to such things as perceptions, preferences and predispositions while intervening variables are constraints on time and money, behavioral intentions and interpersonal influences. Dependent variables relate to the ultimate behaviour - attend, watch, listen or read about a sporting event or do something completely different. No studies were found that further examined or tested the model. Although the model does outline the variables that come into play in consumers decisions

to engage in sports spectatorship, the model contains too many variables to look at at once.

Salubrious Effects Theories

Salubrious Effects theories are a collection of theories that suggest that "activity or sports involvement is attractive because it provides a kind of pleasure and increased physical and mental well being" (Sloan, 1989, p.183). Salubrious means that which is "favourable to health" (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 1974). According to the theories encompassed by Salubrious Effects, sports spectatorship accrues favourable benefits to the spectators' physical and mental health.

Two of the theories which fall under the heading of Salubrious Effects are the Recreation Theory and Diversion Theory. The Recreation Theory asserts that energy is restored and rejuvenated through playing. This restoration and rejuvenation allows the person to be better able to deal with work and life in general (Sloan, 1989). Unfortunately, there are no studies to support the reported effects.

The second Salubrious Effects theory is the Diversion Theory. Diversion Theory "specifically labels play as an escape from work and the other tediums of life" (Sloan, 1989, p.183). Fulfilment and liberation can be sought through the escape mechanism of sport (Smith, 1988). This change of pace and escape contribute new dimensions to the individual's life and enhance the individual's well-being (Sloan, 1989).

Both Recreation and Diversion Theories deal with the concept of sport as a diversionary activity and as a way of relieving the boredom and tensions of everyday life.

Dumazedier (as cited in Zillmann et al., 1989) defined three criteria of a beneficial leisure activity. The three criteria include relaxation (relief from fatigue), recreation (relief from boredom), and free development (relief from specialization). Although initially reserved for active sports participation, sports spectatorship does satisfy all three criteria of a beneficial leisure activity (Zillmann et al., 1989). From this perspective, Salubrious Effects theories could account for some of the reasons for the attraction to sports spectating relating to its benefits as a leisure activity.

The concept of Kinesthetic Satisfaction also falls under the umbrella of Salubrious Effects theories. This complex concept involves the perception of how an activity feels to the individual. It involves the sensory and kinesthetic feedback from movement and involvement (Harris, 1973; Sloan, 1989). The spectator's own physical involvement in the game often produces pleasurable kinesthetic stimulation (Sloan, 1989). Harris (1973) hypothesized that perhaps spectators have an empathetic understanding of the skills being performed in front of them and the feedback from these skills produces pleasurable experiences.

The understanding and appreciation of the complexity of skill and strategy and the overall aesthetic satisfaction enhance the spectators' enjoyment and satisfaction. Perhaps much of the spectators' involvement can be explained by empathetic, kinesthetic understanding they have for the performer and their ability to relate to the performer because of this understanding. (Harris, 1973, p.179)

Kinesthetic satisfaction often leads to the "feel-better response" (Harris, 1973,

p.182). The feel-better response manifests itself in terms of a healthy tiredness, increased vigour and vitality, perceptions of being more amiable, graceful and good tempered after having participated or been involved in physical movement. Snyder and Spreitzer (1983) explained the response in terms of a flow concept whereby enjoyment, pleasure and fun were experienced intrinsically from physical movement.

Salubrious Effects theories predict that after viewing a sporting event, feelings of a positive nature should rise and prevail, regardless of the event's outcome (win/loss). Spectators should experience an increase in happiness, energy and benevolence and a decrease in anger. Differential effects from winning or losing are absent from these theories (Sloan, 1989). Results from a number of studies (Sloan, 1989) provide evidence for partial opposition to the Salubrious Effects theories. Benevolence was unaffected while tension was affected by the type of sport observed (increased for basketball and decreased for football). Where happiness decreased after a loss and increased after a victory, anger increased after a loss and was non-existent after a victory (Sloan, 1989; Gantz & Wenner, 1991). While it appears that there is some support for the use of Salubrious Effects theories in explaining spectator behaviour and participation in sports spectatorship, the support is not conclusive. The leisure activity aspect of the theories may be most useful in explaining some aspects of television viewing (indirect spectatorship).

In three studies on televised sports viewing (Gantz, 1981; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Wenner & Gantz, 1989), subjects were asked to rate the importance of 17 viewing motives on their decision to watch sports on television. A motivation factor "to pass

time" emerged from a varimax factor analysis to account for the viewing motives of "because there is nothing else on and I enjoy watching TV" and "because there is nothing else to do" (Gantz, 1982, p.270). The results also demonstrated that female subjects tended to be more motivated to watch sports as a last resort, as indicated by their high loading on the previously mentioned viewing motives. These results seem to lend support to the utility of sport to satisfy the second criterion of the beneficial leisure activity - namely relief from boredom. Television sports viewing did not produce a relaxation benefit for the female subjects as they tended to work while watching the sports event but it did have a relaxation effect for male subjects who watched to "unwind and become wrapped up in the unfolding excitement and drama" (Gantz & Wenner, 1991, p.241).

The research may indicate that relaxation and relief of boredom are more applicable to television viewing of sports events (indirect spectatorship) than actual attendance at the events (direct spectatorship). Nevertheless, support for these hypotheses are weak at best.

Stress and Stimulation Seeking Theories

The basic premise of Stress and Stimulation Seeking theories is that individuals do not experience enough tension, risk and stress in their daily lives (Elias & Dunning, 1970; Harris, 1973; Sloan, 1989; Tutko, 1989; Zuckerman, 1979). The seeking of stress and stimulation is seen as a basic human need that is essential for well-being - physical, social and mental (Elias & Dunning, 1970; Zuckerman, 1979).

Unless the organism is intermittently flushed and stirred by some exciting

experience with the help of strong feelings, overall routinisation and restraint as conditions of orderliness and security are apt to engender as dryness of the emotions, a feeling of monotony. (Elias & Dunning, 1970, p.35)

When the level of stress that an individual is experiencing is below some desired level, the individual engages in stress and stimulation seeking activities to restore the desired level of stress, stimulation, tension and arousal (Elias & Dunning, 1970; Harris, 1973; Zuckerman, 1979)

Stress and Stimulation Seeking can also be seen as a way of releasing extra energy that would otherwise be used for undesirable ventures (Harris, 1973) or as a way of generating energy for desirable ventures (Elias & Dunning, 1970; Harris, 1973). Elias and Dunning (1970) believe that it is "not a release from tension but, on the contrary, a specific type of tension, a form of excitement" (p. 42) that we seek. Stress and Stimulation Seeking can also serve the function of relief from boredom (Harris, 1973; Tutko, 1989) and the "refreshment of the soul" (Elias & Dunning, 1970, p.35).

Harris (1973) cites a number of theories by multiple references that refer to such Stress and Stimulation Seeking theories as risk exercise, need for tension, arousal seeking, reduction/augmentation and so forth. The need for tension theory (Frankl as cited in Harris, 1973) concerns itself with the impact that a lack of tension can have on one's life. Lack of tension creates a sense of meaninglessness in the person's life and drives the person to create tension in socially desirable or undesirable ways. Arousal seeking (Ellis as cited in Harris, 1973) describes play as behaviour motivated by a need to increase the

level of arousal towards some optimal level. These two supporting theories themselves appear to describe the Stress and Stimulation Seeking tendencies described by Sloan (1989).

Sport and leisure activities are seen as stressors which can raise the level of stimulation, arousal, and tension within an individual towards his or her desired level (Elias & Dunning, 1970; Harris, 1973; Tutko, 1989). Sport and sports spectatorship allow the individual to experience desired levels of risk, stress, stimulation and arousal in socially acceptable ways (Elias & Dunning, 1970; Harris, 1973) and without the social and personal dangers of reality (Elias & Dunning, 1970).

Sports spectators may experience the desired levels of stress and stimulation through the process of vicarious stress seeking (Harris, 1973). Vicarious stress seeking can be achieved by words, pictures, symbols and by simply observing the bodily movements of the athletes. Eustress, or pleasant stress, may be experienced when the athlete or team simulates the individual's feelings by acting them out on the field of play. When the spectator identifies himself or herself with the athlete or team, the spectator is vicariously experiencing a desired level of arousal simply by having viewed and identified with the athlete or team (Harris, 1973; Sloan, 1989).

Tension mounts to produce a state of eustressfulness that is experienced as readily as if one were actually involved in the situation. The thrill and exhilaration that accompany this experience are exciting and enjoyable and generally produce a desire for repeating the feelings. (Harris, 1973, p.112)

According to Stress and Stimulation Seeking theories, spectating an athletic contest should produce a change in the levels of tension and energy experienced. The changes should not be affected by the outcome of the event in terms of win or loss. This is explained by the hypothesis that it is the "process of taking risk that provides the satisfaction sought, not the outcome of the risk" (Sloan, 1989, p.186) however, the stressful or stimulating effects of spectating may be affected by the perceived difficulty of the sport or the particular event (Sloan, 1989).

Support for the theories of Stress and Stimulation Seeking is mixed. As previously stated, results from studies by Sloan (1989) demonstrated that tension and energy were differentially affected by a win/loss condition. Tension and energy did not increase simply because of exposure to stress and stimulation occurred. This does not support the prediction of these theories that change would not be affected by competitive outcome. Subjects in one study (Sloan, 1989) did report being tired after viewing a boxing tournament. The author explained this finding as fatigue from excited behaviour and vocal involvement in the tournament. This small finding would seem to support the notion of stress and stimulation at sporting events.

Results from studies on television viewing motives (Gantz, 1981; Gantz & Wenner, 1991) appear to lend some support for the Stress and Stimulation Seeking theories. It was found that television sports fans were strongly motivated by "consumative emotions (eg. rooting, getting psyched and excited, feeling good in victory and when the fans go wild)" (Gantz, 1981, p.267) and listed "interest in the drama and tension" (Gantz & Wenner, 1991, p.238) as one of the most important motivations for watching sports on

television. Of the total sample of respondents, 58.5% felt sad or depressed, 87.9% felt excited, 64.9% yelled in displeasure and 72.5% yelled in pleasure at least somewhat frequently while watching sports on television (Gantz, 1981).

Support for the use of Stress and Stimulation Seeking theories to explain sports spectator behaviour is thus varied. While results from some studies (Sloan, 1989) demonstrate "null effects for the stimulation-seeking theories" (p.208), others (Gantz, 1981; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Wenner & Gantz, 1989) provide some support for their use in at least explaining television sports viewing motives. Another possible explanation for Stress and Stimulation Seeking activities of sports spectatorship may be the lure of being part of a crowd.

[It] is possible that the spectator seeks the arousal experienced by being involved with the crowd, in picking a team and risking failure in bad judgement, by cheering vigorously, and doubtless, by simply being a member of the crowd itself (Sloan, 1989, p. 186).

Sloan (1989) argues that while the effects of being a member of the crowd may influence actual attendance of events, it could not account for the massive interest in and number of television sports viewers. This may or may not be true depending on the perception of the individual viewer who may feel himself or herself a part of the crowd anyway.

While viewers may not root quite as vociferously, the player/team identification and vicarious participation elements associated with actual attendance seem to be

important underlying ingredients in TV sports exposure decision (Gantz, 1981, p.273).

Hocking (1982) suggests that producers of television sports programs should place greater emphasis on crowd reaction to increase viewer enjoyment, excitement and arousal from watching sports on television. This would create a feeling in the television sports viewer of being at the event and part of the crowd and would enhance enjoyment.

Although Stress and Stimulation Seeking theories may be able to explain some of the spectator behaviours associated with sports spectating, it has some real weaknesses. The theory would not be appropriate in explaining attendance or viewing of games or sports where there is not much tension. This would occur in situations whereby one team is far superior than the other and the outcome is not really in doubt. In this case, there would be no lure because of the anticipation of stress and stimulation seeking.

Catharsis' and Aggression Theories

Catharsis and Aggression theories consist of a number of diverse theories which attempt to explain the relationship between sport, sports spectatorship and aggression. These theories will be briefly explained but will not be considered outside of the context of this review of literature as the theories do not add to our further understanding of why people engage in sports spectatorship and they do not apply to the sport of golf. The theories that are enveloped by Catharsis and Aggression theories include Catharsis, Instinct, Frustration-Aggression, Social Learning and Disinhibition.

Of all the theories relating to aggression, the notion of catharsis is the oldest and most untenable of all the theories to be discussed (Goldstein, 1989; Sloan, 1989). The notion of catharsis related to sport dates back to Aristotle (Sloan, 1989). Catharsis theories suggest that "catharsis or reduction of aggression levels will occur either by participating in an aggressive act or vicariously through watching acts of aggression by others" (Sloan, 1989, p.187). These theories do not differentiate between win or loss outcomes in terms of their effects on aggression. The theories maintain that it is the act of viewing violence and aggression that relieves aggressive tensions and tendencies in the viewer (Sloan, 1989). Regardless of the age and tenacity of these theories, studies have shown them to be without conclusive support. In fact, most studies have demonstrated that viewing aggressive acts serves to increase, not decrease, feelings of aggression and hostility in the observer (Arms, Russell, & Sandilands, 1979, 1980; Cox, 1994; Cratty, 1989; Goldstein, 1989; Goldstein & Arms, 1971; Mann, 1974; Russell, 1981; Sloan, 1989; Zillmann et al., 1989).

Instinct theory (Cox, 1994; Sloan, 1989) explains human aggression as an innate, biological drive. It is related to catharsis in that acts of aggression are supposed to allow the individual to purge pent up emotions. Sport is seen as a socially acceptable forum for expressions of aggression. Due to its similarities to the catharsis theories, instinct theory is subject to the same fact - that of not being supported by the research literature.

Frustration-Aggression theories view aggression as an outcome of frustration. When a person's drive or desired outcome is blocked (eg., preferred team loses), the individual becomes frustrated. This frustration leads to feelings of aggression and

hostility (Cox, 1994; Cratty, 1989; Sloan, 1989). Frustration-aggression schemes predict that frustration would be produced by viewing the defeat of one's preferred team because the goal of winning would be blocked. Although losing would enhance aggressiveness, winning should not produce frustration because the goal of victory would be achieved. However, victory may lead to hostility as the losers are labelled as "deserving targets of violence" (Sloan, 1989, p.188). The research on frustration-aggression theories appears mixed and the utility of the theories in explaining aggression seems to be flawed as "(1) frustration does not always lead to aggression; in some cases frustration triggers other emotions, including helplessness, despair, depression, or withdrawal; and (2) aggression may occur at times without the presence of frustrating circumstances or provocations" (Cratty, 1989,p.248).

Social learning theory asserts that people learn aggressive and hostile acts simply by viewing them. The extent to which the viewers of aggressive acts will themselves exhibit future violent acts depends on the their perceptions of how these acts are punished (inhibitory) or rewarded (disinhibitory) (Arms et al., 1980; Cox, 1994; Cratty, 1989; Goldstein, 1989; Goldstein & Arms, 1971; Mann, 1974; Russell, 1981; Sloan, 1989).

The strength of inhibitions against aggressive behaviours might be reduced in all viewers simply by observing violence, thereby increasing the likelihood of subsequent aggression...seeing violence bring a rewarding victory to one's preferred team should increase the likelihood of violence, while suffering (vicariously) the team's loss should inhibit hostile behaviours in the observers. (Sloan, 1989, p.188)

Aggression has a circular effect (Bandura as cited in Cox, 1994) and thus the simple act of viewing aggression and violence will increase the desire for subsequent aggression.

Disinhibition theory is very similar to the social learning theory. Disinhibition theory states that viewing aggressive acts leads to a general lessening of the strength of the inhibitions that operate to suppress overt acts of aggression (Arm et al., 1979, 1980; Goldstein & Arms, 1971; Mann, 1974). In general, social learning theory and disinhibition theory are opposites to catharsis and instinct theories and are thus supported by the research literature (Arms et al., 1979, 1980; Cox, 1994; Cratty, 1989; Goldstein, 1989; Goldstein & Arms, 1971; Mann, 1974; Russell, 1981; Sloan, 1989).

Although the above mentioned aggression theories attempt to explain the relationship between sports spectatorship and aggression, with varying degrees of success, they fail to provide any real insight into why people engage in sports spectatorship. It may be that spectators attend and watch sports events for the stimulation experienced by the arousal of viewing aggressive acts, but this would fall under stress and stimulation seeking not catharsis and aggression. As previously stated, in light of the obvious lack of physical contact and aggressive acts in golf and the focus of this study on reasons for attendance at golf events, these theories were excluded from any further analyses.

Entertainment Theories

Entertainment theories relate to the actual content or meaning of the event in terms of the game, action, plays and athletes (Sloan, 1989). They suggest that people are attracted to sport because of its entertainment value and its ability to capture people's

attention and occupy it pleasurably. People come to see sport as entertaining by means of the process of socialization (Sloan, 1989) which begins at birth and continues until death. Socialization is a developmental learning process through which people acquire the knowledge, values, norms and beliefs necessary for participation in society (McPherson, Curtis & Loy, 1989). It is through the process of socialization that we learn about the different social roles - sex roles, work roles, leisure roles (McPherson et al., 1989). Therefore, just as we are socialized into the role of sport participant (Hall et al., 1991; McPherson et al., 1989), so too are we socialized into the role of sport spectator.

Central to the themes of the entertainment theories are the concepts of enjoyment, fun and pleasure. It can be assumed with some confidence that people do not seek out boredom and unenjoyable situations. Under this assumption, it can be said that the large audiences that are drawn to sports contests week after week and year after year is evidence of sports' boredom-relieving and enjoyment producing functions (Zillmann et al., 1989). "If spectatorship produced no effects other than enjoyment, and even if such enjoyment were branded as superficial, it would still be an experience of some value and preferable to many others" (Zillmann et al., 1989, p.254). For some people, life is made more enjoyable by the variety and stimulation afforded by sport (Hall et al., 1991; Smith, 1988). In general, people attend, watch or read about sport contests (games, plays, contests and athletes) because it is fun, enjoyable and pleasurable.

Enjoyment, pleasure and fun are subjective terms and can mean different things to different people, however there are certain aspects of sport that seem to influence the level of enjoyment and pleasure experienced by most people. Although enjoyment and

pleasure are central to many of the theories to be discussed and some of the aspects could be included in a number of different theories. The factors that enhance enjoyment, fun and pleasure that will be considered under the guise of Entertainment theories are: drama (Gantz, 1981; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Wenner & Gantz, 1989; Zillmann et al., 1989), tension (Bryant et al., 1982), suspense (Bryant et al., 1982; Hall et al., 1991; Loy, 1981; Sapolsky, 1980; Zillmann et al., 1989), aggressive play or play between foes (Bryant et al., 1982; Zillmann et al., 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993), values or reflection of culture (Hall et al., 1991; Loy, 1981; McPherson et al., 1989; Ponomarev, 1980; Rothenbuhler, 1988; Schwartz, 1971; Sloan, 1989), aesthetics, beauty and excellence (Schwartz, 1971; Shamir & Ruskin, 1984; Sloan, 1989; Smith, 1988; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993), novel plays (Wulk, 1979; Zillmann et al., 1989), equal skill (Iso-Ahola, 1980; Zillmann et al., 1989) and learning about the game and/or players (Gantz, 1981; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Hall et al., 1991; Wenner & Gantz, 1989).

The above mentioned factors that have been shown to increase spectators' enjoyment and pleasure of sporting events can be broken down into three different Entertainment theories: (a) Aesthetics, which deals with the beauty, excellence and quality of the play or contest; (b) values, which encompasses the ideal of sport as a transmitter, teacher and reflector of culture, values and norms; and (c) learning, which deals with the acquisition of knowledge about the sport, contest, particular play, skill and/or athletes.

Aesthetics. Aesthetics in reference to sport has typically been limited to the discussion of the beauty and excellence of plays. This definition is too limiting and only

captures part of the meaning to be used in this study. The aesthetic nature of sport will be seen as entertaining because enjoyment and pleasure are enhanced by witnessing beautiful plays or moves (Sloan, 1989; Smith, 1988; Wulk, 1979), excellence (Schwartz, 1971; Smith, 1988), novel plays (Wulk, 1979; Zillmann et al., 1989), teams of equal ability (Iso-Ahola, 1980; Zillmann et al., 1989), aggressive play or play between rivals (Bryant et al., 1982; Zillmann et al., 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993) and tension and suspense from outcome uncertainty (Bryant et al., 1982; Gantz, 1981; Gantz & Wenner, 1991; Hall et al., 1991; Loy, 1981; Sapolsky, 1980; Wenner & Gantz, 1989; Wulk, 1979; Zillmann et al., 1989).

Although it would seem more appropriate to put aggressive play under Aggression Theories, in this context it refers to aggressive or hostile acts within the confines of the rules as well as acts that demonstrate to the spectators that the player/teams are 100% committed to winning (Hall et al., 1991; Zillmann et al., 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993). An example of this is the use of the slam dunk in basketball instead of the layup. Both plays have the same benefit, that of scoring two points, but the slam dunk is preferred by spectators presumably because it demonstrates competitiveness and hunger for victory (Zillmann & Paulus, 1993). The idea that the relationship between the players might have an impact on spectator enjoyment was tested by Bryant and colleagues (1982). In this study, the colour commentary of a tennis match was manipulated to see if the relationship between opponents influenced the level of enjoyment experienced by the spectators. The tennis match was deemed more enjoyable and exciting when the players were perceived as rivals as compared to when they were perceived as friends or when no

information was given about their relationship. "Perceived animosity between opponents... not only facilitates the overall enjoyment of a contest, but makes play appear more exciting, interesting and involving, and it makes the players seem more hostile, tense and competitive" (Bryant et al., 1982, p.118).

The traditional aesthetics factors of sport (beauty and excellence) have received little attention and thus little data is available and it remains a poorly understood phenomenon (Sloan, 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993). As will be demonstrated in future sections, these factors do figure prominently in the golf literature. According to Sloan (1989), the outcome of the contest should not influence enjoyment of these components of aesthetics. People will experience enjoyment because they are witnessing beauty, grace and excellence and the outcome should be irrelevant.

In a study of the impact of different football plays on enjoyment, Zillmann and colleagues (1989, p.273) discovered that "enjoyment of a play can be predicted with considerable accuracy on the basis of the risk of failure it entails." A novel, innovative and surprising play lends excitement and suspense to the game (Zillmann et al., 1989). This study also demonstrated that enjoyment, as measured by spectator applause, was enhanced with successful and effective plays regardless of any other factors (Zillmann et al., 1989). Another way that has been found to increase suspense, tension and enjoyment of a sporting contest is to have competition between equally skilled teams whose past performance has been based on ability and effort. In a study of causal attributions of football games by college fans, it was discovered that these fans preferred an "equal (even), exciting, and entertaining game, with the potential for excellent football and the

possibility of the home team winning" (Iso-Ahola, 1980, p.39). This situation ensured an exciting, highly skilled game with the outcome in doubt (Iso-Ahola, 1980). It appears that uncertainty of outcome creates suspense and tension which in turn creates enjoyment and entertainment (Bryant et al., 1982; Hall et al., 1991; Loy, 1981; Sapolsky, 1980; Wulk, 1979; Zillmann et al., 1989). For the Aesthetic theory, the mere suspense and tension created by the uncertainty of the outcome is sufficient for enjoyment and entertainment.

Values. Sport is thought to be a form of entertainment that provides enjoyment and pleasure because it is a vehicle of social morals and values (Felshin, 1972; Hall et al., 1991; Loy, 1981; Rothenbuhler, 1988; Sloan, 1989; Zillmann et al., 1989), a transmitter of culture (Hall et al., 1991; Ponomarev, 1980; Schwartz, 1971) and a demonstrator of ritual (Beisser, 1967; Duncan, 1983; Loy, 1981; Sage, 1989). "Our attraction to games and their rule structures may be precisely because they teach us of life by letting us witness life's values or our culture's numerous values being portrayed" (Miller as cited in Sloan, 1989, p.191). From its rule structure, strict observance of the rules and punishments for rule violations, spectators are taught about the principles of fairness and justice (Zillmann et al., 1989).

It has been proposed that sport builds character and prepares us for life's pitfalls (Loy, 1981; Sloan, 1989). With today's mass media and popularity of sport, many athletes have been elevated to the status of hero and moral leader (Loy, 1981). The athlete hero is expected to represent the society's values and beliefs and to transmit them

to the public through his/her behaviour on and off the playing field. The athletes represent the city, province/state, school or nation and are perceived as embodying the beliefs and values of that collectivity (Guttmann, 1986; Smith, 1987). These athlete heroes are supposed to exhibit and transmit such moral characteristics as courage, integrity, gallantry and composure (physical, mental and emotional) (Loy, 1981). "Athletic hero worship has been accepted and even encouraged because sport represents major cultural values" (Smith, 1987, p.62). Athlete heroes of good moral character can be beneficial to the development of good values and beliefs in spectators as they are looked up to by hundreds of loyal fans and these fans take great pride and pleasure in emulating these athlete heroes (Guttmann, 1986).

Although the need to worship and emulate the athlete heroes still exists, the athletes that are out there often do not merit our worship. The so-called "demise of the sports hero" (Smith, 1987, p.65) has come about due to any number of the following reasons: less exemplary models; too many sports and hence athletes to follow; too many teams and good players to be able to distinguish the great from the good; loss of credibility by the athletes as a result of holdouts, strikes, large salaries, bad endorsements, frequent trades; and finally because some of the new superstar athletes represent counter culture values (Smith, 1987). All this said, the role of the athlete hero as a transmitter of the dominant culture and social values is no longer as significant or important as it was a couple of decades ago. The role of the sports hero is undergoing a change and it remains to be seen if it has past its usefulness (Smith, 1987).

While some authors feel that sport's contribution to character development is

harmful (Ogilvie & Tutko as cited in Sloan, 1989; Stone, 1958), to date, the scholarly research has not been conclusive (Sloan, 1989). Sloan (1989) counteracts the inconclusiveness of the results by stating that perhaps the attractiveness of sport may come from the fact that sport purports to represent and teach us about life, even if it does not actually do so.

There are some who view sport as a reflection of society and culture (Hall et al., 1991; McPherson et al., 1989; Ponomarev, 1980; Schwartz, 1971). The racial and socio-economic facets of society at large are said to be reflected in sport (McPherson et al., 1989). While sport may reflect culture, in industrialized nations (particularly North America) sport is itself becoming part of our culture (Hall et al., 1991; Loy, 1981). Baseball is considered the great American past-time while hockey is identified as Canada's game (McPherson et al., 1989). Sport has become so important to society that it now forms part of our culture and national identity (Hall et al., 1991; McPherson, 1989). Sport has become...

an important part of Canadian popular culture and ...the cultural meanings and values that are re-enacted every time Canadians participate in sports or watch sporting events help to make us who we are, both as individuals and as a society (Hall et al., 1991, p.45)

The relationship between sport, society and culture was demonstrated in a study by Rothenbuhler (1988) on the viewing habits and behaviours of Americans before and after the 1984 Summer Olympic Games. The author found that the social activities that were

engaged in and around the games enhanced enjoyment and provided evidence for a "culture affirming its identity and values" (Rothenbuhler, 1988, p.78). Thus, enjoyment under the Values theory comes from being able to identify with the culture and exhibit its characteristics.

Sport may also be enjoyable and pleasurable because it is shrouded in ritual and routine (Beisser, 1967; Duncan, 1983; Sage, 1989; Schwartz, 1971). From the recurring pageantry of the Olympics with their own set of values, beliefs and symbols (Rothenbuhler, 1988) to the singing of the national anthem before every game to the tradition of CBC's Hockey Night in Canada, the rituals create routine that creates continuity in an ever changing world (Duncan, 1983; Guttman, 1986). The rituals help to create bonds between members of society and foster feelings of belonging to that society (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Duncan, 1983; Guttman, 1986; Lee & Zeiss, 1980; Sage, 1989). Sport subcultures, be it athlete or fan groups, create the sense of belonging and bonding that produces joy in sport and reinforce identification with the community (Duncan, 1983; Hall et al., 1991).

Sport has in recent years been likened to religion as it contains many of the characteristics of religion as it contains many of the characteristics traditionally associated with religion (Guttman, 1986; Sage, 1989). Both religion and sport have idols (saints versus past sports legends), basic commandments (thou shalt not kill versus winning is the only thing), proverbs (a wise son brings joy to his father, but a foolish son grief to his mother versus nice guys finish last), shrines or halls of fame, pilgrims/followers who travel long distances to attend the ceremonies (Sage, 1989). The new religion of sport

serves to give people something to follow and believe in, people to look up to for cultural and moral indications, and unites people with a common interest/focus.

From the Values theory perspective, pleasure and enjoyment are derived from sports spectating through sports' representation of society's values, the adulation of athlete heroes and the sense of belonging to and identification with one's community.

Learning. The learning theory of entertainment deals with the pleasure and enjoyment that spectators derive from obtaining and/or seeking out information about the game, event or player. Although learning about the players and game rated only slightly above "not very important" in one study on television viewing (Gantz, 1981), it ranked among the top reasons in another similar study (Gantz & Wenner, 1991) and varied across sports in a comparative study (Wenner & Gantz, 1989). These studies did concur on the fact that male sport followers (indirect consumption), more often than female sport followers, "read about what might take place and tune in early" (Gantz & Wenner, 1991, p.238) and "followed up on the game by watching highlights on television newscasts...by reading about the action in the paper" (Gantz & Wenner, 1991, p.240). The craving for the information about the game is acknowledged by broadcasters in the lengthy and elaborate pre-game shows before major contests such as the Superbowl or Grey Cup and even before Sunday afternoon football games. The information hungry spectator can also get information on players via the numerous player profiles, team statistics and standings (Hall et al., 1991) in newspapers, magazines and during television broadcasts themselves.

Besides wanting to acquire information about the players or the contest, spectators

may also want to learn hints or tips about plays, moves or strategies (Hall et al., 1991). A common feature of any figure skating competition broadcast is a segment on the technique of a certain skill or series of movements while golf spectators are provided with tips and hints during similar segments of golf round coverage. Although there is not much research in this area and most is observation, the learning theory was presented here because it will be significant in the discussion of the golf literature and is expected to be relevant in this study.

Thus, entertainment theories focus on the content or meaning of the event in and of itself. Spectators may come to find a sporting event as entertaining due to socialization processes. An event is entertaining if it provides the spectator with an enjoyable and pleasurable experience. Enjoyment can be experienced and enhanced by a multitude of combinations of factors that were placed under the theories of aesthetics, values and learning. Aesthetic enjoyment and pleasure will be increased when the spectator views beautiful and excellent plays, novel plays and contests between equally skilled teams or between rivals. Values enjoyment will be enhanced by seeing the values of society displayed in the behaviour and actions of the players and teams and by following one's athlete role model. Learning enjoyment and pleasure will be enhanced by increasing one's knowledge of the game, sport or player and by improving one's playing ability through tips and hints. In all of these theories, the game outcome should be irrelevant since according to these theories, pleasure and enjoyment are not functions of disposition.

Disposition Theory

The disposition theory of sportsfanship asserts that "the spectator's disposition towards a player or a team appears to determine the degree to which he or she will enjoy or deplore great and poor play" (Zillmann et al., 1989, p. 256). The theory is based on Zillmann and Cantor's disposition theory of mirth (as cited in Zillmann et al., 1989). The disposition theory of mirth contends that a loss of value of our enemies and a gain of value by our friends will be appreciated while the reverse situation will be deplored. The disposition theory, as defined by Zillmann and associates (1989), has two propositions:

1. Enjoyment derived from witnessing the success and victory of a competing party increases with positive sentiments and decreases with negative sentiments towards that party.
2. Enjoyment derived from witnessing failure and defeat of a competing party increases with negative sentiments and decreases with positive sentiments towards that party. (p. 257)

Predictions for the Disposition theory are based on the person's disposition or affect towards the player/team. Disposition towards the player/team will determine how plays and the contest outcome will affect enjoyment. According to the predictions of the theory, enjoyment will be at its greatest when an intensely liked player/team defeats an intensely disliked player/team. Enjoyment will be minimized when the reverse situation occurs. Disposition theory also predicts that enjoyment will be low when two equally liked or disliked players/teams meet because the "forces that enhance enjoyment are

counteracted by those impairing it" (Zillmann et al., 1989, p.257). Minimal enjoyment is also predicted to occur when the spectator has no dispositional involvement with any of the players/teams competing. Disposition or alliance with a player/team can be formed on the basis of geography, race, gender or any other personal reasons. Geographical affiliation occurs when the sport spectator cheers for a player/team representing his/her country in international competition, or his/her community or local institution in national competition. The basis for geographical affiliation is dependent on identification with the country, city or institution. Personal reasons for affiliation can be based on one's alma mater, because one's favourite player plays for the team or because family or friends play/work for the team.

In a series of studies on dispositional effects in football and basketball, Zillmann and colleagues (1989) discovered that the results were all in the predicted direction of the disposition model. In one of the football studies, a positive disposition towards the winning team (Minnesota Vikings) enhanced the enjoyment of offensive plays successfully performed by the team as well as enjoyment of the entire game and the outcome in particular. Spectators who liked the winning team (Minnesota Vikings) and disliked the losing team (St. Louis Cardinals) experienced the greatest enjoyment.

An investigation of the crowd's vocal reactions at a college football game were analyzed and the results demonstrated "symmetry of enjoyment and disappointment that the disposition model predicts" (Zillmann et al., 1989, p.260). The model was also supported in a study of the enjoyment of plays in a US versus Yugoslavia Olympic men's basketball gold medal game using subjects affiliated with Indiana University. Plays that

resulted in American baskets were enjoyed and applauded while plays leading to Yugoslavian baskets were deplored. The plays of two local players were applauded and enjoyed even more than any other player's plays - American or Yugoslavian (Zillmann et al., 1989).

Further support for the disposition theory was provided by the results of a study using the movie *Rocky* as the source of affiliation (Branscombe & Wann, 1992), another college football study (Schweitzer, Zillmann, Weaver & Luttrell, 1992) and a study using the race of the basketball players as the source of disposition (Sapolsky, 1980). All three studies demonstrated greater enjoyment for those who's player/team of affiliation won the contest. Schweitzer and colleagues (1992) discovered the profound effects that the loss of an affiliated team has on the spectator's enjoyment, or in this case displeasure. "In their dejection about the game, Auburn students deemed a war in the Persian Gulf more likely than did UA students [who's team won]" (Schweitzer et al., 1992, p.79). They also provided higher estimates of the number of Americans and Iraqis who would be killed in the war.

The findings from the research on the Disposition theory of sportsfanship suggest that:

1. Affective disposition toward players and teams, both positive and negative, do indeed exist in the audience at large.
2. These dispositions determine the appreciation of events in sports contests, and ultimately, the appreciation of contests altogether to a very high degree. (Zillmann et al., 1989, p.264)

Thus disposition theory has definite predictions for outcome such that enjoyment will be greatest when the liked player/team defeats a disliked player/team.

Achievement Seeking Theories

The need for achievement, as expressed by a desire for prestige, accomplishment, esteem and the overcoming of obstacles, may be considered a basic human need (Sloan, 1989). In relation to sports spectating, people can experience achievement vicariously by sharing in the glory of successful others with whom they have some sort of affiliation (Cialdini et al., 1976). The Achievement Seeking theories rely on the assumptions of the balance theory. From the balance theory, researchers have identified two tactics that people employ to enhance their image. These tactics rely on the ability of the person to manipulate his/her affiliation with a person or object. The first tactic involves Basking-In-Reflected-Glory (BIRGing) and the second involves Cutting-Off-Reflected-Failure (CORFing). Both of these tactics can be better understood with a brief explanation of the Balance Theory on which they are based.

Balance Theory. The Balance theory, as advanced by Heider in 1958 (as cited in Cialdini & Richardson, 1980), asserts that people strive to maintain cognitive consistency and harmony in their perceptions of other people and things. The Balance Theory principles:

Because of the tendency of observers to try to attain cognitive harmony by evaluating positively associated objects similarly and negatively connected objects differently, we may achieve the goal of enhanced public prestige by either

convincing others that things with which we are positively connected should be positively evaluated or that things with which we are negatively connected should be negatively evaluated. (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980, p. 413)

This theory may help to explain, at least in part, why people try to associate themselves with positive others in order to be evaluated in a positive light, even if they themselves were not instrumental in generating the positivity or success. This now leads to the two image enhancement tactics of BIRGing and CORFing which rely on the balance theory for their benefits.

Basking-In-Reflected-Glory.

The tendency to express or deny an affiliation with a sports team can vary according to the subject's need for self-enhancement and the capability of the team to provide that enhancement through the association. Thus, the BIRG phenomenon refers to the tendency of subjects to claim an association with successful others. (Lee, 1985, p. 213)

People want other people to know of their achievements. According to the Balance Theory, BIRGing appears to be one explanation for people's tendency to publicly associate themselves with a particular player/team. BIRGing relates to an individual's desire to increase affiliation with a player/team in order to enhance his or her image (Cialdini et al., 1976; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Hitt et al., 1992; Wann &

Branscombe, 1993; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993), and esteem and prestige (Sloan, 1989). BIRGing can enhance one's image or esteem by means of two distinct strategies. In the first strategy, BIRGing is accomplished by decreasing the psychological distance between the individual and the successful player or team (Wann & Branscombe, 1993). Thus by declaring themselves as supporters of the player/team and by publicly displaying their connection to the player/ team, spectators can increase their public image (Cialdini et al., 1976; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993).

The second strategy is to increase the perceived positivity of those things with which the person is associated. Since an association has already been made, the person's image can be made to appear to be more positive by making the associated player/team appear to be more positive (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). While one strategy seeks to make an association with a positive player/team known to as many other people as possible to enhance his/her esteem or image, the other strategy seeks to make more positive that with which one is already associated.

Related to the second BIRG strategy is the concept of Blasting (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). Blasting refers to the denigration of players or teams with which the spectator is negatively associated. So while one can enhance one's image or prestige by increasing the positivity of something with which one is positively associated, image enhancement can also occur by decreasing the positivity of something with which one is negatively associated (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980). This causes the person to be perceived more favourably in comparison to the player/team that has been blasted and suffered damage to its image.

Cutting-Off-Reflected-Failure. "Whereas BIRGing is an enhancement tactic, CORFing is an image protection tactic that allows the individual to avoid negative evaluations by others (resulting from association with unsuccessful people or things)" (Hirt et al., 1992, p. 724). CORFing is an ego and image protection mechanism used to increase the psychological distance between the spectator and the unsuccessful player/team (Wann & Branscombe, 1990, 1993; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993). It is a coping strategy employed to ward off any threat to the spectator's esteem or image caused by the possible negative evaluation of being associated with an unsuccessful player/team (Wann & Branscombe, 1990). People denounce their association with unsuccessful players/teams so that the image of failure and negativity is not reflected on them. According to the balance theory, by creating a negative association, the two things will be evaluated differently.

Related to CORFing is the concept of Protective-Anticipatory-Distancing (PADing) (Sloan, 1989). PADing is said to occur when there is an "absence of a need for achievement relationship support prior to games that would be lost" (Sloan, 1989, p.223). PADing is therefore a form of CORFing that occurs before a contest in which the outcome is particularly uncertain and has a good chance of resulting in a loss and self-esteem threatening situation.

Overall, the results of the studies on BIRGing and CORFing, and image maintenance in general, have demonstrated a clear tendency for people to increase or decrease the perceived association between themselves and a positive or negative other in order to strategically manage their image or esteem (Cialdini et al., 1989; Cialdini &

DeNicholas, 1989; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Hirt et al., 1992; Lee, 1985; Sloan, 1989; Snyder, Lassegard & Ford, 1986). The concepts of Achievement Seeking theories were tested in a number of university settings. A couple of the studies will be outlined here to provide the reader with an idea of the extent to which this theory has been investigated.

Cialdini and associates (1976) were the first researchers to study the tendencies of people to associate themselves with positive others to enhance their public image in a sports context. It was demonstrated that there was an increase in the tendency of students to wear football team or university related apparel the Monday after a weekend victory than after a weekend defeat. The researchers hypothesized that this increase in wearing of team and university related apparel was a result of the students' need to be publicly associated with a positive thing - the victorious football team.

Cialdini et al. (1976) also examined the use of the "we" term when referring to the football team and university. The "we" term was used as an indication of association and "non-we" or third person terms were indications of disassociation. Subjects were asked questions related to the university and their results were manipulated into success or failure condition, after which subjects were asked questions about the university's football team. The researchers discovered that the frequency of the use of the "we" term when referring to the football team increased in general after a team victory. This trend was especially true if the subject had just suffered a personal failure and was in need of image enhancement. The use of the "we" term decreased after a team defeat and, as predicted, decreased significantly more when subjects had experienced a personal failure

and needed image protection.

Lee (1985) expanded on Cialdini and associates' (1976) experiment. He too manipulated the experience of the subjects and the outcome of the event such that the subjects experienced one of four experimental conditions: successful experience-favourable event, successful experience-unfavourable event, unsuccessful experience-favourable event, unsuccessful experience-unfavourable event. Results demonstrated that subjects in the success-unfavourable condition exhibited the greatest association with the team, measured by the use of the "we" response when referring to the team. Lee introduced the concept of group salience into the experiment to determine if the importance of the group to the individual had any impact on the subject's association with the group. He found that recall of the team and game related information was affected by the personal success or failure of the subject, with failure being negatively related to recall. BIRGing, CORFing and selective recall all serve to insulate the person against negative image and decreased esteem.

Wann and Branscombe (1990) studied the effects of the level of team identification on the tendency to BIRG and CORF. Their results demonstrated that people with a high identification level with a player or team had a greater tendency to BIRG than those with moderate and low identification levels. The opposite relationship occurs with the CORFing strategy. Individuals who had low and moderate identification levels with a player or team were more likely to CORF than were individuals with high identification levels. In fact, it was noticed that highly identified individuals had a tendency to maintain allegiance to a player/team regardless of success or failure. It may be that highly

identified spectators are unable to disassociate themselves from the player/team and are thus forced into selecting a different coping mechanism other than CORFing. Wann and Branscombe (1990) hypothesized that these fans see themselves as part of the team-group and share in victory and defeat as a member of that team.

Sloan (1989) coined the term Achievement Seeking theories to account for spectators' need for prestige, accomplishment and an enhanced image. The author presented the results from football, basketball and boxing studies which demonstrated that subjects' moods were differentially affected by the outcome of the contest. Happiness and pleasure decreased after losses but increased following victories while anger and hostility showed the opposite pattern.

Sloan (1989) summarized the literature on Achievement Seeking with the following points: (a) People BIRG to associate themselves with victorious players or teams in order to increase their esteem and prestige, this is especially true after having suffered a personal failure; (b) people also employ PADing to reduce the reflected failure after a game that they had predicted would result in a loss; (c) fans seek achievement and esteem in sports victories; and (d) people BIRG more in conversations with people outside of the team-group than they do with people within the team-group. Achievement seeking will thus refer to the behaviours and motives of sports spectators included in the image enhancement strategies of BIRGing and the image protection strategy of CORFing.

Sports Specific Literature

Many spectator related studies have been undertaken on sports such as baseball (Becker & Suls, 1983; Brandmeyer & Alexander, 1986), basketball (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Schurr et al., 1988; Sloan, 1989; Wann & Branscombe, 1990; Zillmann et al., 1989), football (Sloan, 1989; Zillmann et al., 1989), boxing (Sloan, 1989), and tennis (Zillmann et al., 1989). Although related to sports spectatorship, these and other studies have investigated areas such as factors affecting attendance (Baade & Tiehen, 1990; Becker & Suls, 1983; Bergier, 1981; Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Iso-Ahola, 1980; Kennedy, 1980; Schofield, 1983; Schurr et al., 1988; Sloan, 1989; Zillmann et al., 1989) and the benefits of sports spectatorship for the individual and society (Beisser, 1963; Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Guttman, 1986; Hall et al., 1991; Loy, 1981; Melnick, 1993; Sloan, 1989; Snyder & Sprietzer, 1983; Wann & Branscombe, 1990, 1993; Zillmann et al., 1989; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993) among others. These studies have helped to provide an insight into the motives and behaviours of sports spectators. Unfortunately, they tell us very little about who the sports spectator is and how he/she views the sport and/or sporting event. Because they are looking at motives and behaviours in general, most of these researchers have kept the study general in nature in order to be able to generalize their findings to sports spectators at large. Thus they provide relatively little insight into the sport specific spectator.

One sports spectatorship study examined the general spectator markets and could be beneficial to marketing departments in that the study identified what aspects of the sport event were important to spectators as well as what aspects of the event are under the

control of the marketing directors. The preliminary study of consummative patterns of spectator markets conducted by Brooks (1994) used University of Michigan undergraduates as its sample. From the results, Brooks came up with "three clusters of consumption items that are important to spectators" (p.91). Cluster one related to the tangible core product whereby spectators wanted to watch the best athletes with the highest skill levels compete in an exciting competition. This is very much the type of response that would be categorized under Entertainment theories. Cluster two dealt with spectators needs to feel team ownership and university pride and to contribute to school/team spirit. "This ownership cluster may explain why there is a sudden surge of support of American athletes during a major world event...[and]why people start watching 'their' team during playoffs after ignoring it all season" (Brooks, 1994, p.91). This analysis appears to fit in with Achievement Seeking theories. The third cluster concerns itself with the environment of the event and such things a fun and exciting atmosphere, a good time and other social reasons. Brooks summarized her results by stating that an "exciting competition is one of the most important consumption elements for both men and women" (p.92). Although this gives an idea about what people generally want from a competition, it does not provide further insight into the sport specific spectator and what he/she wants from specific sports events. It can probably be said that Brooks' results can be generalized partially to most events as a general desire of spectators.

The trend in recent literature appears to be on market research to determine who is attending or following the various sports in order to make marketing plans and administrative decisions on accurate information and not on speculation. Randl and

Cuneen (1994) examined the who of thoroughbred racing spectators at smaller, local tracks while Graham (1994) sought to determine if the economic and demographic characteristics of spectators at two different professional tennis tournaments were similar or different. The latter author discovered that the "demographic and economic characteristics of spectators attending outdoor professional tennis tournaments held at resort areas during the summer months are universal rather than a function of the geographic locale in which the event is staged" (Graham, 1994, p.38). This trend towards better understanding the sport specific spectator market will help event organizers target the appropriate sponsors and develop effective marketing mixes.

Golf Specific Literature

From the sales of equipment and course memberships to the large corporate sponsorships to the enormous tour purses, golf has become a multimillion dollar industry. In fact, a look at the total prize money available on the tours showed an increase of over a thousand percent from 1972 to 1992 (Wagner, 1994). The participation rates of golf have also increased "with almost 10 million more [American] adults playing the game in 1989 than in 1980" (Howard, 1992, p.200). In fact, of the sports studied by Howard (golf, tennis, racquetball, aerobics, jog/run, weight lifting), only golf showed an increase in participation rates over the decade. There is even a World Scientific Congress of Golf that brings together enthusiasts of golf who have done research on various aspects of golf.

To date, most of the research conducted on golf has been based on the game, equipment and the course. A quick look through the recently published proceedings of

the 1994 World Scientific Congress of Golf (Cochran & Farrally, 1994) demonstrates this point. There are 36 studies on the golfer and the biomechanics of his/her play, 23 studies on the golfer's equipment (balls, clubs), 22 studies on the golf course, its design and care, a handful on the golf market and the social aspects of golf and one study on spectators' views of the PGA event.

Studies on the golf spectator are scarce and thus, they remain somewhat of a mystery. One of the studies looked at LPGA spectators' abilities to recall and recognize sponsorship advertising (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993). Although they did collect some demographic data while doing the study, this was not their primary focus. Taylor and colleagues (1985) described golf as the "finest spectator sport of the future" (p.18). They listed among the benefits of spectating a golf event the freedom to roam the acres and acres of the course, selecting which spot to watch from and which players to watch. The authors divided golf spectators into the five following groups:

1. Scouts - spectators who play the course backwards by starting at the 18 hole and moving backwards to the first hole. In this regard, they see all of the holes and all of golfers play.
2. Disciples - these spectators follow their favourite golfer in search of hints, tips and insight. They move from hole to hole as the golfer does and do not see any of the other golfers.
3. Campers - as the name implies, these spectators select one spot or hole and camp out there all day. They see all the players in the tournament play that one hole without having to move or find a good spot at every hole.

4. Star Gazers - these spectators are not as interested in the actual golf as they are in the excitement of the event. They tend to attend in order to experience the excitement of the super star golfers as well as for the atmosphere of the tournament. They hang around the club house, scoreboard and refreshment areas in hopes of meeting a star golfer.
5. Super-star Spectators - these are true spectators. They seek out new spectating experiences and opportunities. "They physically play the entire course and the total setting to its fullest extent" (Taylor et al., 1985, p.20).

Although the above mentioned studies did discuss the golf spectator, there are really only three articles that have addressed as their purpose the characteristics, motives and views of spectators of the golf tours - PGA, LPGA and Sr.PGA (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993; Hansen & Gauthier, 1991, 1993, 1994). As there are only three articles, each will be discussed in some detail.

The results of the study on spectators' characteristics, motives and views of the PGA tour were derived from the 3019 spectators attending six different PGA events (Hansen & Gauthier, 1994). Among the demographic characteristics of the spectators, it was discovered that 72% were male and 28% were female and the majority (86%) fell under the age of 65. Forty-six percent of the spectators made the decision to attend the event at least a month or more in advance. The highest rated reasons for attending the PGA golf events were to see the best perform, to see live action, to see the finesse of shot making, to feel the excitement and because of the entertainment value of the event.

Subgroup comparisons were made in order to see if differences existed in their reasons to attend. It was discovered that spectators who play on public courses were

more influenced by reasons of drama and fitness benefits whereas private club spectators were more motivated to attend because of reasons related to the game of golf and the professionals playing it. Gender differences also appeared such that female spectators emphasized the course setting (healthy air and exercise) whereas males emphasized shot making and golf playing attributes. The under 35 age group placed less emphasis on the ability to make one's own decisions concerning who and where to watch. It appeared that the 35-50 year old group focused on entertainment and media related reasons while the 51-65 group emphasized the golf playing and scenery of the course aspects. Avid golfers (11-26+rounds) attended for reasons related to golf itself such as shot making and seeing the best whereas non-golfers differed on non-golf related reasons such as fitness benefits of walking the course.

Hansen & Gauthier (1994) drew the following conclusions from the PGA data:

(a) Non-golfers/infrequent golfers attended golf events because of course scenery, fitness benefits, event image and personality of golfers; (b) being close to the field of competition highlights the learning aspects of spectating; (c) an entertainment focus attracts males; (d) market segmentation using various reasons attributed to age groups would enhance market plans; (e) course scenery differentiated the PGA spectators from the other tours' spectators; (f) five clusters of attributes/images of the golf event product were derived: Atmosphere, Event, Golf, Course Setting, and Entertainment. (p.15)

One thousand three hundred sixty eight female spectators from two LPGA, six PGA, and two Sr.PGA events served as the sample for the article on female spectators' views of golf (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993). The demographic data revealed that 57% of the sample was 50 years of age or younger and that 37% of the female spectators played more than 25 rounds of golf per year. The three reasons for attending the events that were among the top five reasons for each tour included seeing the best, seeing live action, and the finesse of shot making, while the following four reasons were among the five least important reasons for the three tours: promotions associated with the event, size of purse, advertising and media coverage of the events.

"Golf playing frequency contributes to or accounts for significant differences between groups that appear to relate to a learning and entertainment function" (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993, p.25). Non-golfers focused on the scenery of the course and the fitness benefits of the course while frequent golfers emphasized golf playing reasons (shot making) as well as the ability to make one's own decisions as to who and where to watch. Age differences were also noted such that the over 35 spectators attended for entertainment reasons (great golf, seeing the best, learning about golf). The 66-plus group distinguished themselves from the other age groups by being interested in the promotional aspects of the events. The authors suggested that in order to increase the number of females attending golf events, organizers should emphasize media related factors to the older female spectators and scenery and health factors to the younger female spectators.

Two minor LPGA golf events in Florida served as the sampling grounds for the 677 spectators used in the third article (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993). Males represented

54% of the spectator sample and females the remaining 46%. It is interesting to note that this is the most even split of any of the tours. The largest number of subjects fell between the ages of 35 and 50. Forty-one percent of spectators decided to attend the event one month or more in advance of the event.

As usual, comparisons were made between sample groups in order to determine if there were any differences between their motives for attending and their views of the event. Female spectators emphasized excitement/drama and the fact that the event was noted for great golf as reasons for attending while male spectators focused on such reasons as television coverage, charity(ies) and promotions. Age differences were also noted such that the under 35 group focused on the scenery, the 35-50 age group favoured learning and excitement motives, the 51-65 group emphasized the personalities of the golfers and picking up tips and, finally, the 66 plus group liked the drama of the play, seeing the best and the ability to make one's own decisions. Non-golfers favoured the scenery, infrequent golfers were drawn by the personality of the golfers, fitness benefits and playing tips while frequent and avid golfers were most interested in the action, learning tips and deciding where and who to watch.

From these results, the authors came up with some suggestions for improving the marketing of LPGA events. They suggested that directors should promote the learning aspect of golf and the presence of the golfers to attract golfers while promoting fitness benefits, event image and big names to attract non-golfers. Female attendance could also be increased by promoting reasons for attendance related to the excitement of the event.

The golf spectator articles found differences between spectators' views of the tours and reasons for attending. PGA spectators appear to attend more for reasons related to enjoying the scenery and promotions which may be explained by the tendency for PGA spectators to be non-golfers or infrequent golfers. LPGA spectators attend for entertainment reasons related to excitement/drama as well as fitness benefits. The Sr. PGA tour spectators place more emphasis on big names and the personality of the golfers. With the differences in spectators' reasons for attending, it is apparent that the tours are indeed perceived differently by the different spectators. In order to better market the LPGA tour, additional spectators' views of the LPGA are needed as well as a better understanding of the reasons for which they attend.

As can be seen there has not been much research done on the whys and hows of the golf spectator and the studies that have been done have focused on spectators that actually attend the event. These results show that people attend for reasons related to entertainment and to see the best golfers live.

Summary

Sports spectatorship is as old as sports participation itself and yet the scholarly literature does not reflect this (Guttmann, 1986; Zillmann & Paulus, 1993). Only recently have academics become interested in the phenomenon of sports spectatorship. Researchers are finally investigating what it is that attracts the masses to sport as spectators as well as why they are attracted to it. Factors affecting attendance at sporting events include such reasons as team performance (Baade & Tiehen, 1990; Becker & Suls, 1983;

Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Iso-Ahola, 1980; Kennedy, 1980; Schurr et al., 1988), star players (Baade & Tiehen, 1990; Schurr et al., 1988), excitement (Gauthier & Hansen, 1994; Hall et al., 1991; Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994; Sloan, 1989; Zillmann et al., 1989), social belonging (Guttmann, 1986; Hall et al., 1991; Melnick, 1993; Rothenbuhler, 1988; Smith, 1988) and degree of identification with the team (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Lee, 1985; Murrell & Dietz, 1992; Wann & Branscombe, 1990, 1993). Schofield (1983) reviewed much of the literature on sports spectatorship and grouped the factors affecting attendance into four categories: economic, demographic, attractiveness of the game, and residual preferences. Hansen & Gauthier (1989) identified ten factor categories from a study of directors of professional sports teams. The combination of factors that influence the decision to attend, or follow, a sporting event will no doubt be specific to the individual and the situation.

In an attempt to explain sport spectators' behaviours and motivations, Sloan (1989) applied some theories of sport participation to sports spectatorship. This attempt met with varying degrees of success. Although the theory of Catharsis was not supported, the social learning and disinhibition theories did receive support when anger, hostility and frustration increased after having witnessed aggressive and violent acts. This was even more evident after a team has suffered a loss. Because Salubrious Effects theories and Stress and Stimulation theories made no outcome predictions, they were only partially supported when results were differentially affected by outcome. Disposition theory was supported by results of studies that showed increased enjoyment in situation of player/team victory and decreased enjoyment in player/team defeat. Whereas disposition

theory has different predictions for enjoyment based on outcome of the contest, entertainment theories simply provide for increased enjoyment when witnessing beauty, grace, excellence, when experiencing tension and drama or when learning about values of the game. Although there is not much research in the area of learning as a motive for sports spectatorship, the results from golf studies do show it to be a viable explanation. With the inclusion of the boredom relieving function of sport under Entertainment and Salubrious Effects theories, these two theories could probably be merged. Salubrious Effects could be a category of Entertainment. Regardless, Entertainment theories may be one of the best theories to explain people's continued attraction to sport.

Achievement Seeking theories with its BIRGing and CORFing tactics have received a lot of attention in sports spectatorship literature. Both tactics have been studied under a number of conditions and seem able to at least partially explain the patterns of affiliation, association and identification with players/teams.

Sloan (1989), in his studies on anger, happiness, hostility and pleasure, found that the moods were differentially affected by the event outcome. Since the author had stated that only achievement seeking theories made different predictions based on outcome, he made the concluding remarks that "vicarious achievement seeking theory has emerged repeatedly as the only position uniformly supported by the findings here. Achievement seeking now appears to be a major motive for the average sports fan" (Sloan, 1989, p.218). The only problem with these conclusions is that the supposed support for them came, predominantly, from mood studies. The author had defined achievement seeking in terms of the concepts of BIRGing, identification and affiliation. The seemingly sudden

jump from evidence about emotions being differentially affected by outcome to unanimous support for achievement was not made clear. His reference to mood in relation to game outcome seems more appropriate to a discussion of Disposition theory.

Zillmann and Paulus (1993) have also criticized Sloan's (1989) claim that achievement seeking theories are a major sport spectating motive. They argue this based on three very relevant points:

First, spectators of athletic contest are not assured of glorious performances on the part of their chosen performers or teams. They have to take chances. If the possibility of a win attracts them to the contest, the possibility of a loss should deter them...Second, if bragging rights are everything, attendance of games is unnecessary. Learning secondhand about the glory of a winning home team entitles everyone around to share in the "We showed 'em!" experience. Third, the focus on benefits that accrue to favourable outcomes of games detracts from what should be considered crucial in the consideration of spectatorship: the spectators' reactions to the athletic event proper. (Zillmann & Paulus, 1993, p.603)

At this point in the search for answers as to why people attend sporting events, it is difficult to determine if the theories and models of sports spectatorship which have been developed predominantly from team sports can be applied to individual sports. The previous studies on golf spectatorship appear to indicate that spectators attend for entertainment related reasons and that differences occur between subgroups of spectators at the various events in terms of the importance that they assigned to the various reasons

for attending (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993, Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994). It is expected that entertainment theories will also be the best theories for explaining why people attended the LPGA du Maurier Classic golf event and that subgroup differences (gender, rounds, and day of attendance) will also occur.

Are these the only reasons and do they apply to all golf spectators? Sloan (1989, p. 228) put forth two very interesting questions: "Are there different theories for different sports?" and "[Are there] different fans for different sports?" Brooks (1994) suggest that "the level of fandom is the key, and not the actual type of sport" (p.92). Graham (1994) found that summer resort professional tennis tournament spectators have universal demographic and economic characteristics regardless of the geographic locale of the event, while Wenner and Gantz (1989) discovered that indirect sports spectators (television) viewing behaviours and motivations differed depending on the sport that they were watching. The golf spectatorship studies (Gauthier & Hansen 1994; Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994) indicated that spectators attended the various tours for different reasons. The knowledge of why certain golf spectators are attracted to certain golf events will help directors and marketers tailor their marketing plans. Hence, one of the purposes of this study.

That answers one of Sloan's questions. There is no literature that has presented the results of a study that has tested the usefulness of the sports spectatorship theories in explaining sports spectators behaviour for the different sports. Although the theories overlap and are broadly defined, Sloan (1989) suggests that each of the theories may have some benefit in predicting and explaining the behaviour of different spectators in the

different sports but that no one is sufficient to fully explain the complex behaviour of the multitude of sports spectators across all the different sports.

Chapter III

Methodology

The focus of this study was on determining which reasons for attending a golf event influenced spectators' decisions to attend the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event. The study investigated which reasons were the most influential in the decision making process of the sample as a whole as well as for the various categories of gender and golf playing frequency subsamples. Differences in the reasons to attend the weekday rounds of competition (Thursday and Friday) as compared to the weekend rounds of competition (Saturday and Sunday) were also determined. The factor categories obtained from the golf spectators' reasons for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event were compared to the sports spectatorship theories in order to see if any of the theories provided viable explanations for golf spectatorship.

The data used for this study was collected in August of 1994. As the idea for this particular study was generated after the collection of the data, the data was considered secondary data. However, it must be noted that the data would have been collected in the same manner had the idea for this study arose before August of 1994.

This chapter will outline what population the sample was drawn from as well as the method used for sample selection. The instrument used to collect the data and the data collection procedures will be discussed in some detail. The treatment and analysis of the data will be presented under the final heading of Treatment of the Data.

Subjects

The sample of subjects was obtained from those people in attendance at the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf tournament held at the Ottawa Hunt and Golf Club the week of August 22-28, 1994. A total of 960 people participated in the study by completing a questionnaire. Of the 960, only three subjects' questionnaires were discarded because they were not completed properly. The remaining 957 subjects' questionnaires were used in this study.

Sample Selection

A stratified random selection was used to obtain the 960 subjects for the sample. Based on previous research on golf spectators and on private studies, an age and gender stratified random sample was developed. From previous research, it was determined what the proportions of males and females in the age groups of 18-35, 36-55, and 56-plus should be at a typical golf event. Interviewers were instructed to obtain a specific number of subjects in each of the categories. The suggested breakdown of the stratified random sample is provided in Appendix A. The researchers were trying to obtain a 60-40 percent split between males and females and a 25-50-25 percent split for the age categories of the total sample and across gender.

Potential subjects were approached as they passed an interview area. The spectators were approached in accordance with the modified version of the mall-intercept method developed by Hansen and Gauthier (1993). Their spectator-intercept method has been shown to be a valid and reliable method for sample selection. In their attempt to

validate the instrument, the researchers compared the samples derived from two previously determined groups of interviewers. The results of the two samples demonstrated that there were no significant differences between the two samples from any of the interview stations. The researchers thus concluded that the spectator-intercept method was valid and reliable.

In order to obtain the stratified random sample, a location protocol was developed to reduce the potential sampling biases associated with the mall-intercept method (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993). The various locations at which spectators gather were identified and included such areas as the tee boxes, fairways, greens, concession areas, driving range, and practice putting green.

The golf course was divided into six areas for each of the six interviewers. Each area consisted of a par 3, 4, and 5 hole except one area which did not have a par 3 hole. The locations of the interviewing stations were arranged so that people along the various locations of the holes were sampled. Appendix B contains the interview station locations for the interviewers as well as a map indicating which areas were sampled. Sampling occurred between 11am and 3pm on each of the four days of the tournament.

Instruments

A questionnaire was employed to obtain the required information from the subjects. The questionnaire was developed by Hansen and Gauthier (1993) and consisted of three separate sections all contained on one page. Appendix C contains a copy of the questionnaire used to collect the data being used in this study. The first section was

"designed to collect demographic information from the spectators so that analysis of subgroups could occur" (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, p.18). The questions pertaining to the general demographic information of the spectators included: Gender, age, residence, household income, golf playing frequency, where golf is played (type of course), when the decision to attend the event was made and where tickets were purchased. The questions pertaining to household income and where tickets were purchased were added to the questionnaire for the first time for the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event. The number of age categories was increased from four to six for the questionnaire for the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event in order to obtain more specific age clusters. The age categories of 18-25, 26-35, 36-45, 46-55, 56-65, and 66-plus were developed from the literature and used instead of under 35, 36-50, 51-65, and 66-plus age categories used in the original questionnaire. The operational definitions of golf playing frequency were also modified from those on the original questionnaire. The categories for the number of rounds of golf played per year were changed from 0, 1-10, 11-25, and 26-plus to 0, 1-7, 8-24, and 25-plus rounds for the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event.

The second part of the questionnaire provided the spectator with the opportunity to give three of his/her own words to describe the event. The question asked "What words come to mind when you think of the LPGA tour?" The free response allowed for the collection of qualitative data on the views of spectators towards the LPGA golf event and the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event in particular. The data obtained from this section of the questionnaire was not used in this study.

The final section of the questionnaire consisted of 27 reasons for attending the golf

event. The 27 reasons were developed from Hansen and Gauthier's previous research (1989, 1992) as well as from interviews with golf related sources such as "event organizers, professional golfers, media personnel covering golf and event sponsors" (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, p.18) as well as a sample of LPGA and PGA spectators. The 27 reasons for attending the event included: To enjoy the personality of the golfers, to take in the scenery of the course, to see the finesse of shot making, to feel the excitement/drama, to see golfers overcome adversity, to see golfers make a charge, to pick up tips on how to play shots, to see live action, to see the best perform, to make my own decisions about who to watch and where to watch, to feel the presence of golfers-to be close to golfers in the field of competition, to enjoy the excitement of weekend play, due to the number big names in the event, because of promotions associated with the event, because of charity(ies) supported by the event, to enjoy the excitement of final round play, since the event is noted for great golf, because of business reasons, due to the convenience of getting to the event, because of the value of ticket package price, due to the image of the event, because of social reasons, because of the entertainment value of this event, due to the advertising of the event, to enjoy the excitement of the first two rounds, because of the media coverage of the event, and to enjoy the fitness benefits of walking the course. Subjects were asked to "Please circle importance of these reasons for you to attend the event" on a five point likert scale (1-no, 2/3-slight and 4/5-strong) for each of the 27 reasons.

The overall internal consistency of the questionnaire, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, was found to be 0.914. This suggests that there was a fairly high level of internal

consistency and it provides confidence that the items are measuring the same thing - reasons for attending the golf event.

Data Collection

Data was collected at the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event at the Ottawa Hunt and Golf Club August 25-28, 1994 between 11am and 3pm. The data collection was undertaken by six first and second year Master of Human Kinetics students from the University of Ottawa. Each interviewer was given a written protocol (included in Appendix D) of what was expected of them. The protocol included such things as the spectator's right to say no, how to assist the spectator in filling out the questionnaire, proper golf etiquette as well as specific information on how to administer the questionnaire and to whom. Each interviewer was assigned a specific part of the course from which they were to obtain their 40 subjects per day. Appendix B provides the reader with an understanding of the areas for which the interviewers were responsible.

The interviewers were instructed to try, as best possible, to estimate which age group the potential subjects fell into in order to achieve the proper stratified random sample. The spectator was approached and asked to participate in the study by filling out a simple one page questionnaire. Once participation was established, the spectator was provided with a questionnaire to complete. When completed, the questionnaire was quickly looked over by the interviewer to ensure that it had been completely and properly filled out. In the event that a question had not been properly filled out or left blank, the interviewer asked the spectator if he/she would like to complete it. The spectator was

thanked for his/her cooperation once the questionnaire had been handed back to the interviewer and any questions were directed to the researchers. Since the questionnaire was on one page and required, for the most part, simply checking off or circling the appropriate answer, the interviews lasted approximately 3-5 minutes.

Treatment of the Data

Once all of the data was collected from the four days of the event, the quantitative data was coded and entered into a computer for future statistical analyses. The words from the free responses were also entered into a computer file for future qualitative analysis. The sample was considered as a whole but was also broken down by gender, playing frequency and day of attendance.

A frequency analysis was done to determine the number of subjects that responded to each question. The frequency analysis was most useful for the eight categorical demographic questions. Chi-square analyses for the different categories of the demographic data helped to determine if any statistically significant differences existed, at the 0.05 alpha level, between any of the variables' distributions.

Descriptive analyses were undertaken on the demographic and reasons for attending data. Statistics such as the mean and standard deviation were generated to provide an idea of the distribution of the data and the average scores. The descriptive statistics allowed for the identification of the most and least important reasons for attending the event by total, gender, golf playing frequency, and day of attendance samples. This information assisted in creating spectator profiles. It was assumed that the

data conformed to the General Linear Model and that parametric statistics were appropriate.

The inferential analysis employed the student t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test whether any statistically significant differences at the 0.05 alpha level existed between any of the sample subgroups on the reasons given for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event. If statistically significant results were found, the Tukey HSD post hoc test was administered to determine where the difference(s) existed. The Tukey HSD was selected because it was considered to be more stringent than some of the other post hoc tests and because it was one of the simplest to use.

The inferential tests were conducted on the two categories of the gender subsample and the four categories of the golf playing frequency subsample. The day of attendance subsample was grouped into two categories with data collected on Thursday and Friday representing one category and data collected on Saturday and Sunday representing the second category. Statistically significant results were anticipated for each of the inferential analyses of the reasons to attend the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event.

A principal components factor analysis was also undertaken on the total sample's responses to the reasons for attending questions in order to derive factor clusters. Key words or phrases were deduced from the items within each factor cluster. These descriptors captured the essence of the reasons contained within each cluster. Key words or phrases were also developed for the sports spectatorship theories such that they captured the essence of the theories. Comparisons were made between the attendance reasons and the key words of the theories in order to determine if there were any matches.

Each reason was assigned a theory by the panel of six people, composed of graduate students and faculty from the School of Human Kinetics at the University of Ottawa, who undertook the task of matching theories to attendance reasons. A panel was used to increase reliability and to decrease bias. Each factor was also assigned a theory according to the dominant theory given to the reasons contained within it. A match would indicate that the theory could be used to explain the particular category of reasons, for this sample.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The focus of this study was to determine which reasons for attending a golf event most influenced spectators' decisions to attend the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event. The reasons for attending the golf event were analyzed in terms of the total sample as well as by gender, golf playing frequency and day of attendance sample breakdowns. Frequency statistics provided demographic data on the total, gender, golf playing frequency, and day of attendance samples. The results of the frequency analysis (the demographic data), are contained in Appendix E. Descriptive statistics provided a ranking of the most and least important reasons for attending the golf event for each of the samples and their categories. Inferential statistics (student t-test and ANOVA's) determined if significant differences occurred between the various categories of gender, golf playing frequency and day of attendance. Results were considered significant at the 0.05 alpha level.

Upon examination of the distribution of the data, it was noticed that the data was not normally distributed. As non-normality is a violation of a general assumption underlying parametric statistical use, the results were viewed with caution. In order to increase the confidence in the results derived from the t-tests and ANOVA's, chi-square tests were administered, post hoc. Significant chi-square values helped to increase the confidence in the significant t-test and ANOVA results by providing further support that the categories of a variable were indeed different. While t-tests and ANOVA's rely on

the means and variances of the categories to determine significant differences, the chi-square test looks at the distribution of the scores across one category and compares it to the distribution of scores across the other categories of the variable to see if differences occurred between their distributions. The usefulness of the chi-square tests in this study were to relieve some of the questions associated with parametric statistics by providing additional statistical support. After the presentation of the significant t-test and ANOVA results, the results of the chi-square tests will be mentioned in terms of which reasons were or were not significant. A significant chi-square result and non-significant t-test/ANOVA result indicated that the distribution was significantly different but that the means were not. A significant t-test/ANOVA result and non-significant chi-square result indicated that the means were significantly different but that the distributions were not. In these cases, the variances were examined to see if they could be useful in helping to explain the results. The chi-square value, probability and sample size for the chi square tests are contained in Appendix F.

The factor analysis of the total sample's 27 reasons produced factor categories that were named and associated with the sports spectatorship theory that best accounted for the reasons within the factor. The results of the demographic, descriptive and inferential analyses for the total sample, gender, golf frequency and day of attendance breakdowns will be presented first, followed by the results of the factor analysis and theory matching.

Total Sample

The 60-40 percent male-female gender split and 25-50-25 percent age split outlined in the stratified random sample protocol (Appendix A) was essentially achieved. Table E1 contains the demographic data for the total sample. Most of the spectators who attended the golf event lived locally (80%), played 25 or more rounds of golf per year (44.4%) and played most often at public golf courses (46.0%). When household income was grouped into three categories (50 000-less, 51-75 000, and 76 000-plus), a greater percentage of spectators (39.0%) fell under the 76 000-plus household income level. However, with five household income categories, a yearly income of \$51-75 000 was the most frequent household income (29.6%).

Tickets appeared to have been purchased continuously from more than three months before the event up until the day of the event, although purchases more than three months before the event (28.3%) and the week before the event (23.4%) were the most frequent. Daily ticket purchases were the least frequent of the six time frame categories at 12.0%; however, this does represent 105 people. Grouped differently, purchases of tickets more than a month before the event (1-3 months and 3+months), indicating long term planning, were more frequent than purchases of tickets 1-3 weeks before the event (46.4% versus 41.6% respectively). Tickets were most often obtained as a gift (30.0%) or bought from the event office (25.9%). The golf club was the least likely place from which to have bought tickets (6.2%).

The results from the descriptive analysis of the reasons for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event are contained in Table 1. The means for the reasons for

attending the event ranged from 1.67 to 4.55. The ten most important reasons for attending the golf event included: to see the best perform, to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see live action, since the event is noted for great golf, to feel the excitement/drama, because of the entertainment value of this event, to feel the presence of golfers-to be close to golfers in the field of competition, to pick up tips on how to play shots, due to the number of big names in the event, and to enjoy the excitement of final round play. The ten least important reasons for attending the event consisted of because of business reasons, because of social reasons, because of media coverage of the event, because of promotions associated with the event, due to the advertising of the event, because of the value of ticket package prices, due to the convenience of getting to the event, because of charity(ies) supported by the event, to enjoy the excitement of the first two rounds , and to enjoy the fitness benefits of walking the course. Seventeen of the 27 reasons were rated above the midpoint (3) of the five point likert scale. This would seem to indicate that many of the reasons were strong motivators in the spectators' decisions to attend the golf event.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of the 27 reasons for the total sample

Reason		<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1.	to see best perform	952	4.55	0.83
2.	finesse of shotmaking	953	4.54	0.76
3.	to see live action	651	4.41	0.86
4.	event noted for great golf	934	3.98	1.03
5.	feel excitement/drama	950	3.86	0.98
6.	entertainment value	937	3.79	1.14
7.	to be close to golfers	945	3.69	1.23
8.	to pick up tips	948	3.68	1.21
9.	number of big names	943	3.64	1.15
10.	excitement final round	924	3.62	1.35
11.	golfers overcome adversity	949	3.62	1.06
12.	golfers make a charge	940	3.61	1.11
13.	make own decisions	944	3.58	1.19

Table 1 continued

Reason		<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
14.	excitement weekend play	936	3.49	1.19
15.	scenery of the course	948	3.46	1.12
16.	personality of golfers	943	3.23	1.14
17.	image of event	935	3.20	1.29
18.	fitness benefits of walking	946	2.77	1.35
19.	enjoy first two rounds	924	2.77	2.77
20.	charity supported	936	2.71	1.23
21.	convenience getting to event	937	2.69	1.39
22.	value of ticket package	931	2.57	1.37
23.	advertising of event	926	2.25	1.19
24.	promotions of event	936	2.22	1.14
25.	media coverage	937	2.18	1.12
26.	social reasons	932	2.17	1.21
27.	business reasons	926	1.67	1.09

Gender Differences

The LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event data was sorted by gender to obtain demographic data on male and female spectators as well as to determine if any differences existed in the importance of the reasons given for attending the event between the two genders. The demographic data of the male and female spectators are contained in Table E2. A larger percentage of female spectators (19.1%) indicated a household income of \$35 000 or less as compared to male spectators (13.2%). The opposite pattern occurred for the \$51 000 - 75 000 household income level whereby more male spectators (31.7%) than female spectators (27.5%) placed themselves in this category. When grouped into three income categories, a household income of over \$76 thousand received the greatest percentage of responses for both genders than did the categories of \$51-75 thousand and \$50 000 or less, although the differences between the three categories were less marked for female spectators.

The percentage of female spectators who recorded that they played 0 or 1-7 rounds of golf per year (7.2% and 24.9% respectively) was higher than the percentage of male spectators (3.8% and 17.4% respectively) who indicated that they played the same number of rounds of golf per year. However, a larger percentage of male spectators reported that they played 8-24 or 25+ rounds of golf per year (31.2% and 47.6% respectively) than did the female spectators (26.5% and 41.4% respectively). Regardless of the golf playing frequency differences noted, both male and female spectators played most frequently at public courses, 46.4% and 44.8% respectively.

An approximately equal percentage of male and female spectators purchased tickets

in most of the five time categories. A slightly larger percentage of female spectators (20.2%) purchased tickets 1-3 months before the event as compared to male spectators (16.4%). There was not much difference between male and female spectators in their point of purchase. For both genders, tickets were most frequently received as a gift or were purchased at the event office. Purchases at the golf club were the least frequent for both male and female spectators.

Table 2 contains the sample sizes, means, and standard deviations for each of the attendance reasons as rated by the male and female subjects. The top four reasons for attending the DuMaurier Classic golf event were the same for both male and female subjects and consisted of the reasons to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see live action, to see the best perform, and because the event is noted for great golf. The five least important reasons (because of the advertising of the event, because of the promotions associated with the event, because of social reasons, due to the media coverage of the event and because of business reasons) were also the same for both male and female subjects.

T-tests were run on each of the 27 reasons for attending the golf event to determine if male and female subjects rated the attendance reasons differently. Significant results, at an alpha level of 0.05, are indicated in Table 2 by an s beside the standard deviation of the gender that rated the reasons higher. Significant differences were found for eight of 27 reasons for attending the golf event. The six reasons significantly more important to female subjects were to feel the excitement/drama, to pick up tips on how to play shots, to see live action, to enjoy the excitement of weekend play, to enjoy the

excitement of final round play and because the event is noted for great golf. Male subjects considered the convenience of getting to the event and the value of ticket package prices as significantly more important than did the female subjects.

Significant chi-square results (Appendix F1), at an alpha level of 0.05, are indicated by asterisks in front of the name of the reasons in Table 2. The chi-square tests performed on the distributions of the male and female responses to the reasons for attending produced two problems. The significant t-test results of the reasons to pick up tips on how to play shots and the convenience of getting to the event did not produce significant chi-square results. Thus, their results must be interpreted with caution. Both reasons to pick up tips on how to play shots and convenience of getting to the event, did not have significant F values when the variances were tested (1.06 and 1.08 respectively). This suggested that there was no significant difference between the variances of male and female responses on these reasons and that the t-test results may be accurate. The reason because of the entertainment value of the event did produce a significant F value and thus there was a significant difference between the variances of the male and female spectators responses. As equality of variance is an assumption underlying the use of parametric statistics, it is understandable that this reason did not produce a significant t-test result.

Table 2

Significant Differences for the 27 reasons by gender

Reasons	Male			Female		
	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
personality of golfers	536	3.15	1.14	368	3.29	1.13
scenery of the course	535	3.45	1.12	374	3.47	1.12
finesse of shotmaking	538	4.57	0.70	376	4.52	0.78
feel excitement/drama	535	3.78	0.96	377	3.96	0.99
golfers overcome adversity	536	3.55	1.05	374	3.67	1.07
golfers make a charge	535	3.60	1.09	366	3.59	1.12
to pick up tips	536	3.59	1.22	373	3.81	1.19*
to see live action	537	4.36	0.86	375	4.48	0.83
to see best perform	537	4.54	0.81	376	4.58	0.81
make own decisions	534	3.60	1.19	371	3.55	1.18
to be close to golfers	532	3.66	1.11	374	3.72	1.14
excitement weekend play	529	3.39	1.16	369	3.62	1.23
number of big names	534	3.59	1.17	371	3.71	1.13

Note. * p <0.05 on t-test

Note. * p <0.05 on chi-square test

Table 2 continued

Reasons	Male			Female		
	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
promotions of event	531	2.18	1.12	367	2.22	1.43
charity supported	530	2.68	1.22	368	2.71	1.26
excitement of final round	522	3.42	1.42	363	3.91	1.19
event format for great golf	530	3.91	1.03	366	4.08	1.02
business reasons	526	1.69	1.09	364	1.58	1.04
convenience getting to event	532	2.77	1.37*	367	2.57	1.42
value of ticket package	531	2.64	1.34	363	2.41	1.39
image of event	530	3.25	1.27	367	3.14	1.34
social reasons	531	2.18	1.20	364	2.12	1.23
*entertainment value	529	3.81	1.07	370	3.76	1.24
advertising of event	526	2.25	1.14	363	2.22	1.24
enjoy first two rounds	523	2.75	1.31	362	2.81	1.32
media coverage	533	2.13	1.08	366	2.22	1.18
fitness benefits of walking	536	2.71	1.32	371	2.87	1.41

Note.* p <0.05 on t-test

Note.* p <0.05 on chi-square test

Golf Playing Differences

The LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event total sample was broken down by the categories of rounds of golf that the subjects indicated that they played per year. Spectators were asked to indicate which of the following categories of golf playing frequency they fell into: 0, 1-7, 8-24, or 25+ rounds of golf per year. The golf playing frequency data were looked at in terms of the demographic characteristics of each group (Table E3) and in terms of the ranking of each reason for attending. The data was also analyzed for similarities and differences between the four groups of golfers.

Although a 60-40% male-female gender split was achieved for the total sample, the male-female ratio did not carry over to all of the golf playing frequency categories. The last two golf frequency categories achieved the 60-40% split. A higher percentage of female spectators (7.2%) than male spectators (3.8%) reported not playing any rounds of golf in the last year. A similar pattern occurred for the 1-7 rounds per year category such that 24.9% of the female spectators and only 17.4% of the male spectators reported playing 1-7 rounds of golf in the last year. The opposite situation occurred in the other two golf playing frequency categories in that more male spectators reported playing 8-24 and 25+ rounds of golf per year (31.2% and 47.6% respectively) compared to female spectators (26.5% and 41.4% respectively). The data demonstrated that more female spectators were non-golfers and more male spectators were frequent and avid golfers.

It was also observed from the demographic data that a larger percentage of avid golfers (28.0%) fell between the ages of 46-55 years whereas the age group with the largest frequency for frequent golfers was 26-35 years (30.0%), 36-45 years for occasional

goifers (28.6%) and 26-35 years for non-golfers (23.9%). Thus, it would seem that more of the avid golfers were older.

A greater percentage of non-golfers had a household income of \$35 000 or less as compared to the other three groups of golfers, with avid golfers having the lowest frequency at 13.2%. Household incomes of \$36-50 thousand and \$51-75 thousand were similar across the four categories of golfers. Once in the upper household income categories of \$76 000-100 000 and \$100 000 plus, non-golfers had the lowest frequency. Avid golfers had the largest frequency at 40.2%, followed by occasional golfers (39.9%), frequent golfers (37.2%) and non-golfers (31.8%). Regardless of these income differences, the largest percentage of spectators in all four golf playing frequency categories had a household income of between \$51 000 and \$75 000.

Avid golfers, who played 25+ rounds of golf per year, tended to play at private (40.3%) and semi-private (33.5%) clubs as compared to the frequent and occasional golfers who tended to play predominantly at public courses, 58.9% and 70.3% respectively. It is interesting to note that seven spectators who claimed that they golfed 0 rounds per year indicated where they played golf (3 at private, 2 at public and 2 at semi-private clubs). This appears to be contradictory information.

Whereas larger percentage of avid golfers (39.1%) bought their tickets more than three months before the event, a larger percentage of frequent, occasional and non-golfers purchased their tickets the week before the event, 29.4%, 29.7%, and 34.1% respectively. From this data, it appeared that avid golfers prepared for the event by purchasing tickets in advance whereas the other three groups waited and bought them just before the event.

Regardless of golf playing frequency, the majority of spectators received their tickets as a gift or bought them at the event office. The least likely point of purchase was the golf club with responses ranging from 4.2 to 7.0%.

The top three reasons given for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event for all four golf playing frequency categories were to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see the best perform and to see live action. These three reasons were also the top three for the total and gender samples. The four golf playing frequency categories all had one reason in common as the least important reason for attending. Attending because of business reasons was rated below 2.00 for all four golfing categories. Although they had some reasons in common, significant differences did emerge between the four golfing frequencies on the relative importance given to 13 of 27 attendance reasons. For simplicity and ease of reading, only the means of the 27 reasons and between which reasons significant differences occurred are contained in Table 3. The complete information (sample sizes, means and standard deviations) for the four categories of golfers is contained in Appendix G. The letter (a, b, c, or d) placed beside a reason in Table 3 indicates that this category of golfer rated the reason significantly higher than did the group represented by the letter.

In all cases of significant results, non-golfers rated the reasons for attending lower than did the other categories of golfers. They rated the following reasons significantly lower than did the other three groups of golfers: to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see the golfers make a charge, to pick up tips on how to play shots and because the event is noted for great golf. Non-golfers differed significantly from avid golfers on the reasons

to enjoy the excitement of weekend play, because of the entertainment value of the event and to enjoy the excitement of the first two rounds. An interesting point to note is that non-golfers rated the reason to pick up tips on how to play shots over one full point lower than did any of the other groups. This is quite a large margin of difference.

Although not significant, non-golfers did rate some reasons higher than the other three categories of golfers. In fact, they rated the following five reasons as more important: to enjoy the scenery of the course, because of the charity supported by the event, due to the convenience of getting to the event, because of social reasons and due to the fitness benefits of walking the course. These reasons seem to be non-learning reasons which are extraneous to golf itself but are important for non-golfing spectators versus golfing spectators who seem to go for learning reasons.

Occasional golfers rated the reasons to pick up tips on how to play shots and to see the finesse of shotmaking significantly lower than did the avid golfers. Occasional golfers also rated to feel the excitement/drama, because of promotions associated with the event, to enjoy the excitement of final round play, because of business reasons, due to the advertising of the event and because of the media coverage of the event higher than all three of the other groups, although not significantly higher. These reasons could be used to attract more occasional golfers to the golf event.

Frequent golfers did not really rate any reasons higher than all three groups. Frequent golfers did rate to enjoy the personality of golfers and because of the value of ticket package prices slightly higher. Avid golfers distinguished themselves from the other three categories of golfers by their significantly higher interest in being able to make

their own decisions about who to watch and from where to watch the action. This is a unique case as it is the only result whereby one category of golfer was significantly higher than all three other groups. Aside from this, avid golfers were also significantly less interested in business reasons than frequent and occasional golfers and less interested in attending for social reasons than frequent golfers.

The significant ANOVA results were further supported by the significant chi-square values (indicated by asterisks beside the reasons in Table 3) as the chi-square results (Table F2) indicated that differences did indeed exist between the distribution of the responses of the four golf playing frequency groups. The significant ANOVA differences of to enjoy the personality of golfers did not obtain a significant chi-square result. When the variances for this reason were examined, the F value was not found to be significant and hence the variances were not significantly different. This might suggest that the ANOVA results were accurate. The reasons to see the golfers overcome adversity, to be close to golfers in the field of competition, because of charity(ies) supported by the event, and to enjoy the excitement of the final round play achieved significant chi-square values but did not obtain significant ANOVA results. When their F values were examined, it was determined that they were all significant, indicating that significant differences occurred between their variances. As equality of variance is an assumption underlying parametric statistics, it is understandable why these reasons did not achieve significant ANOVA's but does not clarify if a difference did or did not occur between the groups of golfers. The reason because of media coverage of the event also produced a significant chi-square and non-significant ANOVA but its F value was not

significant. In this case, it is safer to state that the ANOVA was accurate in detecting no differences between the means.

Table 3

Significant differences for the 27 reasons by golf playing frequency

Reason	Rounds of golf			
	0	1-7	8-24	25 +
	a	b	c	d
	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>
personality of golfers	2.78	3.18	3.29 ^a	3.28 ^a
scenery of the course	3.71	3.53	3.53	3.34
*finesse of shotmaking	3.93	4.46 ^a	4.53 ^a	4.64 ^{ab}
feel excitement/drama	3.57	3.91	3.87	3.87
*golfers overcome adversity	3.28	3.58	3.59	3.70
*golfers make a charge	2.89	3.55 ^a	3.61 ^a	3.70 ^a
*to pick up tips	2.41	3.55 ^a	3.78 ^a	3.83 ^{ab}
*to see live action	4.02	4.36	4.41 ^a	4.48 ^a
*to see best perform	4.24	4.59 ^a	4.52	4.59 ^a
*make own decisions	3.18	3.45	3.49	3.74 ^{abc}
*to be close to golfers	3.33	3.64	3.68	3.76
*excitement weekend play	2.98	3.49	3.46	3.59 ^a
number of big names	3.47	3.62	3.62	3.69

Note. ^{abcd} p <0.05 on ANOVANote. * p <0.05 on chi-square

Table 3 continued

Reason	Rounds of golf			
	0	1-7	8-24	25+
	a	b	c	d
	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>
promotions of event	2.24	2.31	2.20	2.20
*charity supported	2.80	2.69	2.59	2.79
*excitement final round	3.29	3.69	3.59	3.66
*event noted for great golf	3.44	4.01 ^a	3.94 ^a	4.03 ^a
*business reasons	1.36	1.88 ^d	1.82 ^d	1.46
convenience getting to event	2.78	2.68	2.71	2.68
value of ticket package	2.55	2.56	2.59	2.58
image of event	2.98	3.16	3.11	3.29
*social reasons	2.36	2.31	2.29 ^d	2.04
*entertainment value	3.41	3.83	3.71	3.88 ^a
advertising of event	2.29	2.33	2.17	2.28
*enjoy first two rounds	2.26	2.67	2.79	2.87 ^a
*media coverage	2.15	2.32	2.16	2.13
fitness benefits of walking	3.13	2.84	2.72	2.73

Note. ^{abcd} p < 0.05 on ANOVA

Note. * p < 0.05 on chi-square

Day of Attendance Differences

The total sample from the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event was also sorted according to the day that each spectator attended the event. The demographic data for the four days of the tournament, contained in Table E4, demonstrated similar patterns to those observed in the previous analyses. The gender and age of the spectators followed closely the 60-40% male-female and 25-50-25% age split outlined in the stratified random sample protocol (Appendix A). Regardless of household income, people bought tickets evenly across the four days of the tournament even though tickets for weekend rounds were more expensive, although there was a slight deviation in the percentages across the days for spectators who had a household income of \$100 000 plus. In this household income category, a larger percentage of spectators attended on Sunday as opposed to the other three days. Other than this minor difference, household income did not appear to affect the day upon which spectators attended the event.

The highest percentage of spectators played 25+ rounds of golf per year across all four days of the tournament. The public golf course was also the most frequent place to play golf for spectators attending every day of the event. The most frequent category of golfers (avid golfers playing 25+ rounds) and the most frequent type of course (public) are consistent with the demographic data for the total sample. As with every analysis to this point, the most frequent time to have bought the tickets, regardless of the day of attendance, was more than three months before the event and the week before the event and spectators either received their tickets as gifts or purchased them at the event office.

The top three reasons for attending the event were the same irrespective of the day

upon which the event was attended. The order of the top four reasons, to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see live action, to see the best perform, and event noted for great golf, varied across the four days but they all had an average rating over 4.00, except event noted for great golf where weekday spectators rated it at 3.89. Because of business reasons was the least important attendance reason for spectators on all four days as it was consistently rated below 2.00.

For the inferential analysis, it was decided that the total sample would be divided into two groups. People who attended Thursday and Friday would represent weekday spectators while Saturday and Sunday would represent weekend spectators. T-tests were conducted to determine if significant differences existed in the reasons given for attending weekday (Thursday/Friday) versus weekend (Saturday/Sunday) rounds. Table 4 contains the reasons, sample sizes, means, and standard deviations by weekday and weekend attendance as well as which reasons produced significant t-test results. An s beside the standard deviation of a reason indicates that this reason produced a significant t-test result. The s was placed beside the standard deviation of the group that rated the reason significantly higher than the other group.

Weekday spectators rated 11 of the 12 reasons that were found to be significant on the t-test lower than did weekend spectators. Weekend spectators rated the reasons to see the finesse of shotmaking, to feel the excitement/drama, to see golfers overcome adversity, to see golfers make a charge, to see the best perform, to be close to golfers in the field of competition, to enjoy the excitement of weekend play, due to the number of big names, to enjoy the excitement of final round play, because the event is noted for

great golf, and because of the entertainment value of the event significantly higher than weekday spectators.

Weekday spectators rated only one reason, to enjoy the excitement of first two rounds, significantly higher than weekend spectators. Of the non-significant reasons, weekday spectators rated because of social reasons, because of the media coverage of the event and to enjoy the fitness benefits of walking the course more than 0.10 points higher than weekend spectators. These reasons could be used to appeal to weekday spectators in a marketing plan.

Eight of the 12 reasons with significant t-test results also produced significant chi-square results (Table F3), indicated by an asterisk in Table 4. This helped to increase the confidence in the results, that there are differences between the weekday and weekend spectators on these reasons. The significant t-test reasons to see golfers make a charge, to see the best perform, to be close to golfers in the field of competition and because of the entertainment value of the event did not produce significant chi-square results and hence must be undertaken with caution. Of these four reasons, only to see the best perform had a significant F value. Since the variances were not equal and hence violate an assumption underlying parametric statistical usage, the significant t-test should not be given too much consideration as it is likely invalid. The other three reasons may be interpreted with a little more assurance as their variances were not shown to be significantly different.

Table 4

Significant differences for the 27 reasons by day of attendance

Reasons	Weekday			Weekend		
	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
personality of golfers	476	3.25	1.10	467	3.22	1.17
scenery of the course	478	3.45	1.14	470	3.47	1.10
finesse of shotmaking	480	4.48	0.84	473	4.60	0.67
feel excitement/drama	476	3.74	0.99	474	3.99	0.96
golfers overcome adversity	478	3.53	1.08	471	3.70	1.04
golfers make a charge	471	3.51	1.12	469	3.69	1.08*
to pick up tips	476	3.64	1.24	472	3.72	1.19
to see live action	480	4.36	0.93	471	4.45	0.78
to see best perform	479	4.48	0.91	473	4.62	0.72*
make own decisions	476	3.53	1.20	468	3.63	1.17
to be close to golfers	475	3.59	1.13	470	3.78	1.12*
excitement weekend play	467	3.28	1.23	469	3.72	1.12
number of big names	473	3.53	1.18	470	3.76	1.11

Note.* p <0.05 on t-testNote.* p < 0.05 on chi-square

Table 4 continued

Reasons	Weekday			Weekend		
	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
promotions of event	470	2.19	1.10	466	2.25	1.17
charity supported	472	2.66	1.21	464	2.75	1.25
excitement final round	461	3.28	1.44	463	3.97	1.16 []
event noted for great golf	470	3.89	1.09	464	4.06	0.96 []
business reasons	466	1.69	1.11	460	1.64	1.06
convenience getting to event	475	2.68	1.36	462	2.71	1.43
value of ticket package	467	2.49	1.33	464	2.65	1.42
image of event	467	3.14	1.28	468	3.26	1.32
social reasons	468	2.23	1.22	464	2.11	1.19
entertainment value	474	3.69	1.18	463	3.91	1.09 [*]
advertising of event	463	2.21	1.15	463	2.29	1.23
enjoy first two rounds	473	3.07	1.23 []	451	2.46	1.33
media coverage	472	2.22	1.10	465	2.13	1.14
fitness benefits of walking	478	2.85	1.33	468	2.69	1.37

Note. ^{*} p < 0.05 on t-test

Note. ^{*} p < 0.05 on chi-square



Factor Analysis

Using a minimum criterion loading of 0.50, six factor clusters emerged from the total sample's principal components varimax rotation factor analysis of the 27 reasons for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event. Appendix H contains the factors, reasons and their loadings from the factor analysis. Reasons that loaded close to 0.50 but not above it are enclosed in parentheses. They were included as they were used to help define the factor. The name for each factor was obtained by examining the reasons contained within the factor for similarities and commonalities. The following factors emerged:

Factor 1 - The Event - contains reasons which focus on the golf event itself. Factor 1 is made up of reasons related to the enjoyment of the excitement of weekend and final round play, the number of big names at the event and the reputation of the event in terms of it being noted for great golf.

Factor 2 - Marketing/Promotions - contains a diverse set of reasons which add up to the marketing of the event. Reasons such as promotions, advertising, media coverage and charity associated with the event help to market the event while business and social reasons are broad, generic reasons for attending the event that are not related to golf. Although both reasons loaded above 0.50, business and social reasons were consistently given low ratings by the spectators (below 2.5).

Factor 3 - Players/Golfers - involves the golfers themselves and the entertainment that they provide. Reasons such as enjoying the personality of the golfers and the excitement of the first two rounds, feeling the excitement/drama, and seeing golfers make

a charge and overcome adversity lend themselves to drama, excitement and entertainment.

Factor 4 - Attractiveness of the event - contains reasons related to the golf event but not the golf being played. The convenience of getting to the event and the value of the ticket package prices are related to the event's attractiveness but not to its quality or content as in factor 1. Image of the event was also included in this factor.

Factor 5 - Golf - concerned with the quality of the golf product itself. Reasons related to the golf being played included seeing the finesse of shotmaking, seeing live action, seeing the best performers as well as picking up tips on how to play shots.

Factor 6 - Locale/The Course - contains reasons related to the golf course such as the scenery of the course and fitness benefits of walking the course. Reasons extraneous to the event, golf and players.

The reasons for attending the event were looked at independently and an attempt was made to match each reason to one of the sports spectatorship theories. This was undertaken by a panel of six people and the results were compared in order to create a common listing. The panel was composed of graduate students and faculty of the School of Human Kinetics at the University of Ottawa. Each judge on the panel matched the attendance reasons to descriptors of the theories provided by the researcher. It was soon discovered that the attendance reasons could not all be easily assigned to only one of the sports spectatorship theories. In fact, some of them did not really fit anywhere. Tabulation of the results from the matchings indicated that approximately 16 of the 27 attendance reasons had agreement of at least 4 of the 6 judges. However difficult, eventually most of the reasons were assigned one, at the most two, theories which seemed

to best represent the reason. These matchings are contained in the right hand column of Appendix H. Once the individual reasons were matched, the reasons and their theory(ies) were grouped in their factor clusters and the dominant (most frequent) theory was assigned to the factor. The following matches were made:

Factor 1 - The event	Entertainment theories
Factor 2 - Marketing/Promotions	Entertainment/Salubrious/Achievement/ Disposition
Factor 3 - Players/Golfers	Entertainment theories
Factor 4 - Attractiveness of event	Entertainment/Residual Preferences
Factor 5 - Golf	Entertainment theories
Factor 6 - Locale/Course	Salubrious Effects

Factor 1, 3, and 5 appeared to be best explained/accounted for by Entertainment theories. Salubrious Effects theories definitely explained the two reasons contained in Factor 6. Although Entertainment theories came out for Factor 4, it is unclear how entertainment theories could explain the reasons within the factor. It is for this reason that Schofield's (1983) residual preferences category of factors affecting attendance has been included with this factor. Factor 2 reasons did not demonstrate any real consensus and no one theory came through as dominating the reasons within the factor, therefore all four theories appear beside the factor.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

A discussion of the results from the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event will be undertaken in a number of ways. Trends and observations that were noted in the analysis of the results will be explored and potential explanations will be put forth in an attempt to explain the trends and observations. A summary of the reasons that were found to be significantly different in the t-test and ANOVA analyses will be presented. The differences between the categories of the demographic variables will be explored and potential explanations for the differences ventured. The differences between the categories of the demographic variables will also be examined to determine if a common factor and/or sports spectatorship theory can be used to account for the differences. For example, can the differences between male and female spectators be explained by the entertainment theories. Using this information, suggestions will be made as to how these differences can be used in developing marketing strategies. Once all of this is done, the hypotheses will be reviewed and a statement will be made as to whether the hypothesis should be rejected or not. The order of presentation of the discussion will follow that of the presentation of the results, namely the total sample will be discussed first, followed by gender, golf frequency and day of attendance samples. A discussion of the factor analysis will be presented last whereby a discussion of the reason-theory matching and factor-theory matching will be undertaken.

Total Sample

The results of the frequency analysis (the demographic data) of the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event's total sample demonstrated some interesting points. From the reports of the number of rounds of golf played per year, it appeared that the golf event attracted predominantly spectators who golf. This was evidenced by the fact that almost 74% of the total sample played eight or more rounds of golf per year, indicating that the majority of spectators played golf at least somewhat frequently. Support for the idea that golfing spectators were attracted to the golf event is increased when occasional golfers are figured into the analysis. In this case, 95% of all spectators attending this event played at least one round of golf per year. The extremely high percentage does indeed suggest that people with at least some golfing experience were more attracted to the idea of attending the golf event. The spectators' golfing experiences may have contributed to their decisions and/or motivations to attend the event.

The fact that 80% of LPGA spectators lived locally indicated that tourism did not play a large role in this event as most people lived within the so-called "trade area." The percentage of spectators who lived locally was higher in this study than in the other three golf spectatorship studies. Over a quarter of the spectators sampled purchased their tickets more than three months before the event. Purchases of tickets that far in advance of an event suggests long-term planning for the event and a keen interest in obtaining tickets. These spectators really wanted to attend the event and most probably wanted to make sure that they got tickets to the rounds that they wanted to see. Thought and advance preparation was put into the decision to attend the event. This may represent die-hard or

hard-core golf fans. Almost another quarter of the spectators sampled purchased their tickets the week before the event. Purchases of tickets the week before the event suggest more of a last minute decision to attend the event. Factors other than the desire to see the golf being played may have factored into the decision as promotions and advertising were probably increased in the weeks before the event. The high percentage of trade-area spectators and the high percentage of spectators who bought their tickets in advance of the event reinforces the statement "ticket packages and advertising can be designed to accommodate the majority of spectators well in advance of the actual event" (Hansen & Gauthier, 1994, p12).

It was very interesting to see that 30% of the spectators sampled received their tickets as a gift. This seems to be quite high. It also provides a unique insight for event organizers and marketers. If so many people already think of the idea of giving golf event tickets as gifts, why not run a few advertisements using this idea. Golf event tickets could be billed as "the perfect gift for the golf enthusiast in your life" or "the perfect gift for the golfer who has everything." Promotions could be done around holidays such as Christmas, Valentine's Day, Mother's and Father's days as well as suggesting tickets as great anniversary or birthday gifts. Making these suggestions could increase advance ticket sales and reassure sponsors and organizers of the success of the event.

The low number of tickets sold at golf clubs was very surprising. From the results, it was shown that 74% of spectators sampled played eight or more rounds of golf per year while 95% played at least once a year. Given these statistics, it is odd that more tickets were not purchased at the golf club. If most spectators golfed at least occasionally,

then surely the golf club would have been a convenient point of purchase. However, it was not known if advertising was done to promote the clubs as points of purchase nor was it known how many and what clubs participated in the selling of tickets. Since most of the golf spectating population seemed to play golf, tickets should be distributed to clubs in all areas of the city. Ticket distribution should not be limited to only prestigious private clubs but should be distributed to public courses where 46% of the golfers play and where every level of golfer would have the opportunity to purchase them.

The top three reasons for attending the golf event, as obtained from the descriptive analysis, were to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see live action and to see the best perform. These results provide support for the first hypothesis which predicted that the reasons influencing spectators to attend this event would be similar to the reasons cited in previous golf spectatorship studies such that the above mentioned three reasons would be amongst the top ten. In fact, the three reasons were the top three in all of the golf spectatorship studies. Thus, it appears that this study has replicated the top three results obtained in the previous golf spectatorship studies (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993; Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994).

It is interesting to note that the top three reasons were contained in factor 5 - Golf. This implies that the primary reasons for attending the golf event were for the product of golf itself. Whereas the three most important reasons were related to the quality of the golf being played, the five least important reasons all fell under factor 2 - Marketing/Promotions. Perhaps contradictory to what many event promoters may think, the spectators were not all that interested in the advertising, promotions and media

coverage of the event. The spectators were even less interested in attending for social and business reasons. The fact that the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event was attended primarily for the golf being played is a great selling feature. In constructing a marketing plan, it would be best to focus on factor 5 reasons for the general campaign as the reasons contained within it were appreciated by almost all of the spectators. Although not seen as important by the spectators, factor 2 should be used to highlight the golf product with the use of marketing and promotional strategies.

Table 5 contains the top ten attendance reasons from the major LPGA DuMaurier Classic event, regular LPGA tour events (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993) as well as regular PGA tour events (Hansen & Gauthier, 1991). As can be seen, the top three attendance reasons are the same for the three types of tours. The major LPGA event differed from the regular LPGA tour events on two reasons while it differed from the regular PGA tour events on four reasons.

The major LPGA tour event contained the reasons event noted for great golf and due to the number of big names among the top ten while these reasons were 11 and 14 respectively in the regular LPGA tour events (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993). Similarly, the two reasons to make own decisions about who/where to watch and seeing golfers make a charge were among the regular tour event's top ten but were 13 and 12 respectively in the major tour event (Table 1).

A potential explanation for the fact that the reasons event noted for great golf and due to the number of big names was in the major tour event's top ten and not in the regular tour events' top ten is that major events tend to attract more of the higher profile

golfers and are considered to be more important or prestigious. Golfers tend to play in as many major events as possible perhaps as a result of greater media exposure and typically larger purses. Major events are thus better known for the number of big names that they attract. Since the best golfers are playing in the event, the event would be noted for great golf performed by the best players. It would seem that, according to this descriptive analysis, there was not really a large difference between the major and regular LPGA tour events in terms of why spectators attended.

While the regular PGA tour events had the reasons to make own decisions about who/where to watch, to see golfers make a charge, to see golfers overcome adversity and to enjoy the scenery of the course in its top ten, the major LPGA tour event had event noted for great golf, to be close to golfers in the field of competition, to pick up tips on how to play shots, and to enjoy the excitement of final round play in its top ten reasons. It should be noted that the differing regular PGA tour events' reasons occurred at positions 13, 12, 11, and 15 respectively in the major LPGA event rankings (Table 1).

Although differing by almost half of the top ten reasons, the major LPGA and regular PGA tour events did have the same top three reasons. The differing reasons were contained in four factor categories. Three of the major LPGA tour event reasons were contained in factor 1 - the event while two of the four regular PGA tour event reasons were contained in factor 3 - players/golfers. This suggests that the major LPGA tour event spectators put more emphasis on the golf event itself as compared to the regular PGA tour event spectators who were more enthralled with the golfers. The reason to enjoy the scenery of the course was also a unique feature that distinguished the regular

PGA tour events from the major LPGA tour event. These observations could be used to help distinguish the LPGA from the PGA for spectators as well as to differentially market the two tours.

Table 5

Top ten reasons of total samples of spectators at major LPGA, regular LPGA and regular PGA events

	major LPGA	regular LPGA	regular PGA
1.	to see best perform	to see best perform	to see best perform
2.	finesse of shotmaking	to see live action	to see live action
3.	to see live action	finesse of shotmaking	finesse of shotmaking
4.	event noted for great golf	to be close to golfers	feel excitement/drama
5.	feel excitement/drama	feel excitement/drama	entertainment value
6.	entertainment value	make own decisions	make own decisions
7.	to be close to golfers	excitement final round	golfers make charge
8.	to pick up tips	entertainment value	overcome adversity
9.	number of big names	golfers make a charge	number of big names
10.	excitement final round	to pick up tips	scenery of the course

Gender Differences

The LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event's total sample was sorted into male and female spectator samples to determine if differences existed in their demographic variable make-up as well as in their consumption motives. As mentioned previously, demographic information was obtained by doing a frequency analysis while differences were determined by running t-tests on the 27 attendance reasons. Male and female spectators did not differ much in their buying patterns. In fact, their time and point of purchases were the same. Both genders obtained tickets most frequently more three months before the event or the week before the event and purchased them from the event office or were given the tickets as a gift. These demographic variables cannot be used to distinguish one gender from the other.

Differences did occur in the reports of the number of rounds of golf played per year. Male spectators had a higher percentage of frequent and avid golfers whereas female spectators had a higher percentage of non-golfers and occasional golfers, when compared to one another. This means that men still play more rounds of golf per year than do female spectators. Although differing by only 3 to 7 percent, these results indicated that more male spectators played a greater number of rounds of golf per year than the female spectators who were sampled. Even though the number of new female golfers has been increasing at a faster rate than that for new male golfers (Howard, 1992), golf is still very much a male game. As more females take up the game, the gap between the percentages of male and female golfers will no doubt close. However, the fact remains that in this study, female spectators played golf less often than did the male

spectators.

Male and female spectators did agree on the top four reasons for attending the golf event - to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see live action, to see the best perform and because the event is noted for great golf. Despite the similarities in demographic data and the top four reasons for attending, significant gender differences did occur for eight of the attendance reasons. Female spectators rated six reasons significantly higher than did male spectators who rated two reasons significantly higher than the females spectators. Female spectators responded, with significantly higher ratings on the five point likert scale, that they attended to feel the excitement/drama, to pick up tips on how to play shots, to see live action, to enjoy the excitement of weekend play, to enjoy the excitement of final round play and because the event is noted for great golf.

That female spectators rated the reason to pick up tips on how to play shots significantly higher than male spectators may relate to female spectators' golfing experience. As the female spectators played fewer rounds of golf per year than the male spectators, they may have felt that they could learn something from watching the professional golfers and then apply it to their game. It may also be that the female spectators may have felt that their fellow female golfers may be able to provide them with unique tips on how to play from a woman's perspective. It may also be the case that the male spectators did not feel that they had as much to learn from the female golfers. It is not entirely clear from this data alone what reason(s) lies behind the female spectators' higher rating for the reason to pick up tips on how to play shots. Whatever the actual explanation, the fact remains that female spectators placed more emphasis on attending

the event to pick up tips on how to play shots. It should be noted that this reason did not achieve significant results in the chi-square analysis but the t-test may well be valid as the F value of this reasons was not significant and therefore the variances are considered not to be significantly different. The reason to pick up tips on how to play shots is the first reason that could be used to promote the LPGA to female spectators.

Although female spectators rated the reason to see live action significantly higher than male spectators, this reason was among the top three attendance reasons for both genders. So although statistically there was a difference, the reason was very important to both genders (rated above 4.3 on the 5 point scale) and there may not have actually been a difference in terms of their motivation to attend. Two other reasons with an entertainment focus that were rated significantly higher by female spectators for seemingly inexplicable reasons included to enjoy the excitement of weekend play and to enjoy the excitement of final round play. It appears that female spectators were highly interested in excitement and entertainment.

The greater interest in excitement and entertainment was borne out in female spectators' significantly higher ratings of the reasons to feel the excitement/drama and event noted for great golf. Female spectators may have been more excited than their male counterparts to observe their fellow female golfers excel at the game of golf and be the centre of attention. Female spectators may have identified more with the female golfers, been excited with and for them, and have appreciated the play to a greater degree. This would have led the female spectators to view the event as showcasing exciting, great golf to a greater extent than the male spectators. Gender and level of identification may have

contributed to the differences.

Sapolsky (1980) demonstrated that a factor such as race can be the point of identification and that this identification leads to greater enjoyment if the person is successful. If race can be used as a point of identification, then surely gender can as well. Wann and Branscombe (1990) demonstrated that different levels of identification result in different levels of BIRGing and CORFing. Since BIRGing and CORFing do not necessarily apply to golf, they could perhaps be substituted with level of enjoyment from the disposition theory. In fact, Zillmann et al. (1989, p.264) stated that "dispositions determine the appreciation of events in sport contests, and ultimately, the appreciation of contests altogether to a very high degree." Applied to this study, this suggests that because female spectators are probably better able to identify with female golfers, their level of identification is higher. The higher level of identification of the female spectators will lead them to appreciate the golf, golfers and event to a greater degree than the male spectators who identify less with the female golfers. This would have caused the female spectators to rate the reasons higher. The female spectators may also have viewed the plays as novel, great and exciting which, under the Entertainment theories, would lead to greater enjoyment. Greater enjoyment would thus lead to a higher rating as was the case with the significantly higher reasons rated by the female spectators in this study.

Some of these results were supportive of results found in previous golf spectatorship studies. To feel the excitement/drama was rated higher by females in the LPGA and professional golf product studies (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994) while the reason event noted for great golf was rated higher by females in the LPGA study (Hansen

& Gauthier, 1993).

Male spectators were differentiated significantly from female spectators on the reasons due to the convenience of getting to the event and because of the value of the ticket package price. Neither of these reasons came up in previous studies. It is interesting to note that in this sample, female spectators tended to put more emphasis on some of the performance oriented reasons whereas male spectators rated non-performance oriented reasons significantly higher. This seems contrary to the results discovered in the PGA study (Hansen & Gauthier, 1994) but partially supportive of the LPGA study (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993). One explanation for the results obtained in this study is that female spectators were watching female golfers. As already mentioned, the female spectator may have felt a stronger connection to the female golfer - a sense of identification, something the male spectators may not have had. Alternate explanations could be that the male spectators were more cognizant of the economics of attending the event in terms of monetary and time costs. It should also be noted that the reason convenience of getting to the event did not obtain a significant result in the chi-square analysis. However, the t-test result may still be valid as the F value was not significant and the variances considered not to be significantly different.

In terms of differentially marketing an LPGA event to male and female spectators, a number of points did emerge. Female spectators could be attracted to the event by emphasizing the excitement/drama, the ability to pick up tips from successful female golfers and the excitement of the final two rounds. Although not significant, they also rated to enjoy the personality of golfers and to see golfers overcome adversity higher.

Female golfers were attracted to the event by reasons contained in factors 1 - The event, 3 - Golfers/Players and 5 - Golf. By promoting reasons in these three factors, a unique marketing plan could be constructed to attract more female spectators to the golf event. Male spectators could be attracted to the event by the convenience of getting to it and the value of the ticket package prices. The male spectators also rated the reasons because of the image of the event and business reasons higher. Most of the reasons which male spectators rated higher are contained in factor 4 - Attractiveness of the event. Male spectators could be differentiated from the female spectators by focusing on reasons contained in the attractiveness of the event factor. Marketing tools should be used to highlight economic aspects to the male spectators and entertainment aspects of the event to female spectators.

The support received from the chi-square test for the significant t-tests reasons to feel the excitement/drama, to pick up tips on how to play shots, to see live action, to enjoy the excitement of weekend play, to enjoy the excitement of final round, because event is noted for great golf, and due to the value of ticket package prices provided more confidence that the two genders did indeed differ in their responses. It also provided more support for the second hypothesis - that male and female spectators would differ somewhat in their reasons for attending the golf event. They did indeed focus on different aspects of the golf spectating experience as female spectators had a more pronounced entertainment focus as compared to the male spectators who were more concerned about economics.

Golf Playing Differences

In order to determine if golfing experience affected spectators' decisions to attend the golf event, the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event's total sample was sorted by the demographic variable golf playing frequency. As a reminder, the groupings were done as follows: 0 rounds = non-golfers, 1-7 rounds = occasional golfers, 8-24 rounds = frequent golfers and 25+ rounds = avid golfers. Some interesting differences emerged from the analysis of spectators responses according to their golf playing frequency. Avid golfers were found to have a higher percentage of people in the 46-55 year age group but the lowest percentage of people in the 35 and under age group as compared to the other three golf frequency groups. Non-golfers had a slightly higher percentage of people in the 36-55 year age group as compared to the other golf frequency categories.

As would perhaps be expected, avid golfers played more frequently at private golf courses where they no doubt held memberships while occasional and frequent golfers played predominantly at pay-per-round public courses. These results are not altogether surprising for if a person plans on playing a lot of golf, then it would be worth his/her while to purchase a membership.

What is interesting to note is that avid golfers were no more likely to buy event tickets from their private and semi-private clubs than were the other golfers likely to buy them at public courses. In fact, all four categories of golfers purchased their tickets predominantly at the event office or received them as gifts. These results were the same as for the two previous analyses. Another trend noted in the total and gender samples that was present in the golf playing frequency sample was that avid golfers were more likely

to prepare in advance for the tournament by purchasing their tickets three or more months in advance of the event while those spectators who played fewer rounds of golf per year often left the purchase of their tickets until a week or couple of weeks before the event.

Although the top three reasons for attending the event (to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see live action and to see the best perform) were the same irrespective of golf playing frequency, differences did emerge between the groups on some of the attendance reasons. The importance of seeing the finesse of shotmaking as a reason to attend was significantly less important for non-golfers than for the other three golf playing frequency categories. This may have been due to non-golfers' inability to appreciate what a fine shot is and/or what is required in executing a shot. However, non-golfers still felt that to see the finesse of shotmaking was a good reason to attend because it was ranked third in their overall list of reasons. Non-golfers also rated to see the golfers make a charge as a less important reason for attending than did the other categories of golfers. Again, this could be due, in part, to their lack of complete understanding of the and what is going on.

The concept of Kinesthetic Satisfaction under the Salubrious Effects theories may be able to explain non-golfers' lower interest in the reasons to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see golfers make a charge, to enjoy the personality of golfers, to see golfers overcome adversity, to pick up tips on how to play shots, to see live action, to see the best perform, and because the event noted is for great golf. In relation to sports spectatorship, the concept of Kinesthetic Satisfaction states that a pleasurable experience comes from having an empathetic understanding of the skill being performed.

The understanding and appreciation of the complexity of skill and strategy and the overall aesthetic satisfaction enhance the spectators' enjoyment and satisfaction. Perhaps much of the spectators' involvement can be explained by empathetic, kinesthetic understanding they have for the performer and their ability to relate to the performer because of this understanding (Harris, 1973, p.179).

As non-golfers may lack the kinesthetic understanding of the golf skills being performed, they may not be able to fully relate to the golfers and their skills. This would cause the non-golfing spectators to rate the above mentioned reasons lower (less important) than golfing spectators who are better able to empathetically understand the female golfers and the golf event itself. In the case of the reason to pick up tips on how to play shots, non-golfers rated the reason over one full likert point below the other categories of golfers. Non-golfers may have not only lacked the empathetic understanding of golfers but they may have had no genuine interest in picking up tips on how to improve a game that they do not play.

Although non-golfers did not rate any reason significantly higher, they did enjoy the scenery of the course, the charity supported by the event, the convenience of getting to the event, the social reasons and the fitness benefits of walking the course. These reasons shed light on why the non-golfer attended the event. The non-golfers' reasons fell mostly under factor 6 - The course and factor 2 - Marketing/Promotions. In order to attract more non-golfers to the event, it would be wise to emphasize reasons contained in factor 2 and 6, particularly the scenery of the course and the fitness benefits of walking

the course. Some of the non-golfer results were seen in previous golf spectatorship studies such that the greater enjoyment of the scenery of the course by non-golfers was supported by significant results in the LPGA and female spectator studies (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993; Hansen & Gauthier, 1993). The non-golfers' greater enjoyment of the fitness benefits of walking the course was also supported by significant results in the female spectator and professional golf studies (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994).

Occasional golfers rated one reason significantly different than avid golfers and five reasons higher than all three of the other golf frequency groups, although not significantly. These reasons included because of business reasons, to feel the excitement/drama, because of promotions associated with the event, to enjoy the excitement of final round play, due to the advertising of the event, and because of the media coverage of the event. They occur predominantly in factor 2 - Marketing/Promotions (4 of the 6 reasons). Occasional golfers were still primarily motivated to attend for reasons related to golf as seen by the top three reasons; however, they distinguished themselves from the other categories of golfers by placing a greater emphasis on marketing and promotional aspects of the event. Although they do have some golf experience, it appeared that the occasional golfer was still more interested in non-golf related reasons. A potential explanation for this could be that they do not have enough experience to enjoy the event for the golf and therefore look to other aspects of the event with which to identify.

Frequent golfers were an interesting group. Though they did not rate any of the attendance reasons significantly higher than all three of the other golf frequency groups,

they did distinguish themselves from non-golfers on six reasons and avid golfers on a two reasons. Unfortunately, where they differed, so too did at least one other group. This made it difficult to state a reason which was unique in importance to frequent golfers. This problem may be due to the rather large range of frequencies over which this category was supposed to cover. One to seven rounds is a small range and really does typify the occasional golfer (once or twice a month during the golf season) but 8 to 24 is a large range that seems to cross over into both the occasional golfers at one end and the avid golfers at the other end of the range. A restructuring of the categories may lead to a better understanding of just who the frequent golfer is.

Avid golfers distinguished themselves from all other groups of golfers by placing more emphasis on making their own decisions about who and from where to watch. This was a unique point as it was the only case whereby one category was significantly higher than all three other groups. It is a statistically unique factor that can be promoted to avid golfers. This finding was supported by all three previous golf spectatorship studies (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993; Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994).

It is interesting that this reason was the one reason consistently significant for avid golfers. The avid golfer was probably aware of the players and the best parts of their game. He/she was probably also more familiar with the course or else became informed before the event in order to scope out the best vantage points. With this information, the avid golfer was ready to decide who to follow/watch and from where he/she would get the best view. This great need, to make their own decisions, may also be a result of television watching of golf whereby the television spectator is at the mercy of the

cameraperson and producer for coverage of the event. Whatever their motivation, this is a unique reason that has been shown, in previous golf studies, to be a distinguishing factor for avid golfers. This reason is also a distinguishing facet of the game of golf versus other sports where a ticket is purchased and the spectator is confined to one seat, watches the entire field of competition in a crowded arena (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993). Golf allows the spectator to select what part of the competition he/she is going to watch and from which vantage point along the scenic golf course he/she is going to watch from.

Avid golfers were significantly less interested in attending the event for business reasons than frequent and occasional golfers. Perhaps it was more the latter two categories of golfers who used the event for business and hospitality purposes. It may also be that, although there for business reasons as well, avid golfers' strongest motivations lie in other areas. Although high for all groups of golfers, avid golfers did have the highest means for the top three reasons. This would suggest that more than any other group, avid golfers attended for reasons related to the golf being played, contained under factor 5.

As has been shown, each frequency of golfer more or less emphasized a different aspect of the event. Non-golfers were distinguished by reasons contained in factors 6 as well as factor 2. Occasional golfers were also interested in factor 2 reasons. While frequent golfers did not differentiate themselves in this study, it can still be stated that they came for entertainment reasons due to their means on the top three reasons. Avid golfers were particularly interested in reasons contained in factors 1 and 5. By emphasizing the various reasons contained in each factor, all levels of golfers would

attend the golf event. If event organizers want to attract certain groups of golfers or want to increase attendance numbers in another group, they should try promoting the reasons contained within the factor(s) that distinguished the particular groups of golfers from the other groups.

Only one of the significant ANOVA results did not achieve a significant chi-square result. Therefore, other than to enjoy the personality of golfers, it can be said that differences did indeed exist between the categories of rounds of golf played. This also provided support for the third hypothesis - such that differences did occur between the four golf playing frequency categories on the importance that they attributed to some of the attendance reasons.

Day of Attendance Differences

The LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event's total sample was sorted by the day that people attended the event in order to determine if there were any differences between weekday spectators (Thursday and Friday rounds) and weekend spectators (Saturday and Sunday rounds) in terms of demographic variables and attendance reasons. The demographic results of the day of attendance breakdown demonstrated similar patterns to the other analyses. No surprising or unique trends emerged from the frequency analysis. This in itself is somewhat interesting as it could have happened that people with higher incomes could have attended the weekend rounds where ticket prices were higher. In fact, income did not have a noticeable effect on day of attendance as lower household income spectators still attended the weekend rounds where ticket prices were higher. Spectators

had similar demographic characteristics on all four days of the event and even attended for the same top three reasons.

The rationale for dividing the four day event into weekday (Thursday and Friday) and weekend (Saturday and Sunday) rounds was that there may have been a difference in the type of person able to attend rounds played during a workday versus those able to attend rounds played on a weekend. More importantly though, the division was done to represent or take into account a change in the tournament that occurred between the Friday and Saturday rounds. A cut occurs in the field of competition after Friday's round whereby only those players with the top scores advanced to Saturday and Sunday's rounds. The size of the field was reduced from 150 (plus or minus) players to about 70. Thus the competition was intensified. It was hypothesized that spectators would be attracted to different aspects of the event given the change in the tournament structure and field of competition.

Twelve of the 27 attendance reasons resulted in significant t-test values. This in itself would suggest that there was a difference in importance of reasons for weekend versus weekday spectators. That weekend spectators rated 11 of these 12 reasons higher than weekday spectators suggests that there was something special or unique about the weekend rounds. The 12 significant t-test results indicated support for the fifth hypothesis that spectators attending the weekday versus weekend rounds of the event would differ in the importance they placed on some of the reasons for attending. As no studies have investigated day of attendance differences, there was no previous research to substantiate predictions about which groups of spectators would rate which reasons higher than the

other group of spectators. The rationale for dividing the total sample into weekday and weekend samples could probably have provided support for any such predictions but was not thought of at the time.

In retrospect, it would have been expected that weekday spectators would rate reasons related to weekday rounds higher than weekend spectators who would have rated reasons concerning weekend rounds higher. Having attended on the weekend would have led to a greater importance being placed on the reasons to enjoy the excitement of weekend play and to enjoy the excitement of final round play while having attended on Thursday or Friday would have led spectators to emphasize the enjoyment of the excitement of the first two rounds. This was in fact what happened. These results follow common sense.

Weekend spectators rated the reasons to feel the excitement/drama, to see golfers overcome adversity, to see golfers make a charge, to see the best perform, due to the number of big names, because the event is noted for great golf and because of the entertainment value of the event significantly higher than weekday spectators. These reasons may have been rated higher by the weekend spectators as a result of the narrowing of the field of competition that occurred for Saturday's round. As the field was reduced to those golfers with the lowest scores, the competition was intensified. The final two days of competition are typically fierce and a lot of shuffling occurs in the ranking. Golfer's nerves come into play as do exceptional plays and last ditch efforts to move up in the standings. All this increases the drama, excitement and entertainment value of the event. Since the field is narrowed according to cumulative scores over the

first two rounds, the weekend rounds showcase the best golfers performing at their best and usually includes the top players on the tour. As such, the weekend rounds offer spectators more opportunity to see golf at its best and is a factor in why weekend spectators rated the previously mentioned reasons higher than weekday spectators who watched the entire field of competition in what could be considered the preliminary rounds leading up to the grand finale.

The reasons to see the finesse of shotmaking and to be close to golfers may also be explained by the former argument. As the weekend rounds contain the best golfers, one would expect to see the best shots and enjoy the finesse involved in making the shots. With many of the big names involved in the final two rounds, it is an opportunity to get close to the golfers. The reasons rated significantly higher by weekend spectators fell under factor 1 - the Event (5 reasons), 3 - Players/Golfers (3 reasons) and 5 - Golf (2 reasons). These three factors contain reasons with a predominantly entertainment focus. In fact, weekend spectators rated all of the reasons in factor 1 higher than the weekday spectators. This was a unique feature as it was the first analysis wherein all of the reasons within a factor were significant. This suggests that the event itself is a good area to focus on when marketing for weekend attendance as it is an excellent source of entertainment.

Weekday spectators focused on two reasons in factor 2 - Marketing/promotions and one reason in factor 3 - Players/Golfers and factor 6 - Locale/course. Since the reason in factor 3 is to enjoy the excitement of the first two rounds, the fact that the entire field of competition is playing would be a great drawing feature. The reasons rated higher by

the weekday spectators were not rated much higher and it was difficult to determine what exactly drew people to the less exciting first two rounds, other than the common three reasons of to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see live action and to see the best perform. Possible explanations could be the lower ticket prices, smaller crowds, the chance to get closer to the golfers, better views, the opportunity to see the entire field of competition, and the excitement/drama of seeing who would make Friday's cut. Perhaps some of these reasons should be added to the questionnaire in order to get a better understanding of what exactly drew people to the first two rounds.

Four of the reasons with significant t-test results did not produce significant chi-square values while the remaining eight significant t-test results were supported by significant chi-square values. Only the results of the reason to see the best perform must be interpreted with caution as its F value was significant and hence so was the difference between its variances. This suggests that the significant t-test may not be valid as one of the assumptions underlying the use of parametric statistics was violated. However, the seven reasons with double significant tests do provide support for a difference in the focus of weekend and weekday spectators and hence support for the fourth hypothesis

Factor Analysis

The task of assigning a theory to each of the 27 attendance reasons was by no means a simple one. In fact, it was difficult to obtain consensus between the panel members on many of the reasons. The reasons contained in factor 2 were especially difficult to match with a theory, perhaps because many of them were not really attendance

motivations. They deal with marketing tools that although of interest to the spectators may not really be factors that would greatly influence the spectators' decisions to attend. As such, they do not match with any of the theories. The panel was divided between two or three theories on many of the reasons due in part to limited understanding of the reasons for attending and sports spectatorship theories as well as the overlapping nature of the theories themselves. As mentioned in the review of literature, the theories are not altogether clearly defined nor have they really been applied to individual sports. Salubrious Effects theories could very well be combined with entertainment theories as a sort of subset of the theory as the two sets of theories do contain the same sort of spectator behaviour and predictions. The vagueness of the theories played a large role in the lack of consensus among the panel. Some of the reasons with conflicting theories were sorted out by the researcher who had a greater understanding of the intricacies and meanings of the theories than did the panel who had only a few, short descriptors for each theory.

Of the six factor categories derived from the factor analysis, three appeared to be best explained by Entertainment theories. When reviewing the reasons that were significantly different between the categories of the demographic variables, many are contained in the factors best explained by Entertainment theories. The three reasons that were consistently on the top of the ratings for all samples (total, gender, golf playing frequency, and day of attendance) were also associated with aspects of the Entertainment theories. From this, it appears that spectators' main reasons for attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event had an entertainment focus and probably best explains

attendance at the golf event, in part and/or in full.

This was the first golf spectatorship study to perform a factor analysis on the 27 actual attendance reasons. Previous studies performed a dendrogram method of clustering on the spectators' free responses to develop word clusters (Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994). The LPGA and PGA dendrogram clusters did contain some similarities to the factors derived in this study. One cluster was labelled "course setting" and contained such free responses as beauty, nice area, exercise. These words are very similar to factor 6 - Course/Locale. While factor 1- Event in this study represented related to reasons which focused on golf event itself in terms of the number of big names, excitement of weekend and final round play while the event cluster from previous studies captured such free responses as purse size, charity, professional, and sponsor name. The term golf was used in pretty much the same way in all three studies as it described skill, competition, to learn and pick up tips. It appears that although the labels of the factors are different, they contain similar attendance reasons as the clusters contain free responses.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to investigate which reasons for attending a golf event influenced spectators' decisions to attend the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event as well as what, if any, sports spectatorship theories could be used to explain the attendance reasons. The results from this study demonstrated some interesting trends that were similar to some of the findings in the previous golf spectatorship studies. This study also provided one of the first testing of the sports spectatorship theories in an individual setting.

The three attendance reasons that most influenced people's decisions to attend the golf event were to see the finesse of shotmaking, to see live action, and to see the best perform. These three reasons were consistently the top three rated reasons across all of the categories of the four samples studied. These results support the findings of the previous golf spectatorship studies (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993; Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994). Consistently last in this study was the reason because of business reasons.

A very high percentage of golf spectators at this event also played the game of golf. In fact 74% played 8 or more rounds of golf per year while 95% played at least once in the last year. Thus, it appeared that those people who play golf went to see the golf event. It would be interesting to determine what percentages of spectators at other sporting events (such as hockey, basketball, baseball, football) actually play the sport that they are watching. The sport with the highest percentage would have a very unique feature to promote.

There was a lack of use of the golf club as a point of purchase for event tickets. If 74% of spectators sampled played 8 or more rounds of golf per year and 95% played at least once per year, then surely the golf club would have been a convenient place from which to purchase tickets. It was not known how many and what types of clubs participated in the distribution of tickets for the event. It was suggested that event marketers promote the golf clubs as excellent places from which to buy tickets as they are convenient locales for the golfing spectators, the majority of spectators in this study. It was also recommended that ticket distribution not be limited to only prestigious private clubs but to public courses as well where 46% of golfers played. The fact that such a high percentage of golfing spectators played golf at public courses suggests that people are no longer willing to pay big fees for private memberships.

The purchase of event tickets for gifts appeared to be a common occurrence as 30% of the spectators received their tickets as gifts. As so many people have already thought about giving golf tickets as gifts, advertisements should be run to further promote this idea. Golf tickets could be promoted as "the perfect gift for the golf enthusiast in your life." A few advertisements could be run around the holidays (Christmas, Valentine's Day, Mother's and Father's Day) to suggest tickets as gift ideas.

When household income level was examined, it became evident that day of attendance was not noticeably influenced by income. People of all categories of household income attended on all four days of the event. Even though ticket prices were more expensive for the weekend rounds, spectators with lower incomes still attended. This was interesting as access to the event did not appear to be influenced by household

income.

In some incidence it was difficult to analyze the demographic variables as they were categorical in nature. Although categorical data may be easier to manipulate, it is difficult to calculate meaningful descriptive statistics. Without complicating the questionnaire, the demographic variables of age, golf playing frequency and time of ticket purchase could be filled in by the subjects. Once the descriptive statistics were calculated, each variable could be categorized as needed. This would allow for a more detailed, more accurate profile of the golf spectator.

Total Sample

The comparisons of the major LPGA tour event to the regular LPGA and PGA tour events demonstrated only minor differences between the LPGA events and more substantial differences between the LPGA and PGA events. The major LPGA tour event was differentiated from the regular LPGA tour events by the reasons due to the number of big names and event noted for great golf. Promotions should accentuate these differences. The major LPGA tour event was also seen as being noted for great golf, being able to get close to golfers, being able to pick up tips on how to play shots, and being full of excitement in the final round as compared to the regular PGA tour events. From this descriptive analysis, LPGA events are indeed unique events separate from the PGA and even the regular LPGA events. It would be interesting to see what sort of results would come out of a quantitative analysis of the differences between the tours (regular and major LPGA, PGA, and Sr.PGA). The quantitative analysis could provide

a clearer distinction of what exactly it is that attracts spectators to the different tours and types of tours.

Gender Differences

One demographic trend that was noted was the difference in the number of rounds played by male and female spectators. Female spectators reported that they played fewer rounds of golf per year than their male counterparts. The percentage of female golfers continues to increase, as they are taking up the game at a higher rate than males. It would be interesting to see what the percentages of male and female golfers would be in ten years. Would the gap be narrower or would it remain as it was in this study?

The reasons that were found to be significantly different for female spectators were of an entertainment focus (excitement/drama, adversity). The higher ratings given by female spectators were explained by Disposition theory and level of identification. It was proposed that the female spectators were more highly identified with the female golfers and that in accordance with the disposition theory, they enjoyed the event and golfers to a greater degree than did the male spectators who were had a lower level of identification. The reasons that were rated higher by female spectators were contained in factors 1 - the event, 3 - golfers/players, and 5 - golf product. By promoting these factors and the reasons contained within them, event marketers could possibly attract more females to the golf event.

Male spectators differentiated themselves by reasons related to economics. They were concerned about convenience of getting to the event and the price of ticket packages.

These reasons were contained in factor 4 - attractiveness of the event which was best explained by residual preferences. By emphasizing residual preferences, the male spectators may be more inclined to purchase tickets and attend the event.

It must be stated that although there were some differences, one must not forget that male and female spectators, and all other categories to be discussed, agreed on the top three reasons. Essentially, they all attended for these reasons and differed in the importance placed on some of the reasons.

Golf Playing Differences

Each category of golfer more or less emphasized a different aspect of the golf spectating experience. Non-golfers attended primarily for non-learning, non-golfing related reasons. The lower interest in learning and golfing reasons was explained by the concept of Kinesthetic Satisfaction contained under Salubrious Effects theories. Because non-golfers did not play the game of golf, they lacked the empathetic understanding needed to appreciate what was involved in a skill and the game of golf as a whole. This lack of Kinesthetic Satisfaction led to a lower involvement in the event and lower ratings of the reasons related to the event, golfers and golf. Non-golfers did however rate some non-significant reasons higher and these reasons could be used to attract more non-golfers to the event. Emphasizing the course scenery, fitness benefits of walking the course, convenience of getting to the event, social reasons, and the charity supported by the event, more non-golfers may be attracted to the event. Non-golfers' reasons were contained in factors 2 - marketing/promotions and 6 - course/locale.

Occasional golfers also rated reasons contained in factor 2 - marketing/promotions higher than the other golfers. They distinguished themselves by being interested in the advertising of the event, media coverage, business reasons, and promotions. While they did have some golf experience (1-7 rounds per year), occasional golfers were still interested in non-golf related reasons.

Frequent golfers did not really distinguish themselves from the other groups of golfers on any of the reasons and hence it was not possible to state a reason that was unique to this group. The explanation put forth was that the category for frequent golfers (8-24 rounds) covered too large a range and that perhaps encompassed people who could be classified as occasional golfers at one end and avid golfers at the other end of the range. In order to better represent the different levels of golfers as well as to better distinguish between them, the categories of the golf playing frequency demographic variable should be reorganized. One option would be to return to the categories used in previous golf spectatorship studies (Gauthier & Hansen, 1993; Hansen & Gauthier, 1993, 1994) while another option would be to devise a new classification. One way would be: non-golfers = 0 rounds, occasional golfers = 1-10 rounds, frequent golfers = 11-20, and avid golfers = 21-plus rounds.

Avid golfers were a unique group in that they rated one reason significantly higher than all three other groups of golfers. As in the previous golf spectatorship studies, avid golfers attended the event in order to make their own decisions about who to watch and from where to watch. This was interesting for two reasons. The first being that it was the only reason significantly different than all three other groups and significant in all

other studies. The explanation ventured for this finding was that avid golfers were more aware of the players and the best parts of their game as well as the golf course. They were able to make informed decisions about what golfers they were going to watch and from what vantage point they were going to spectate.

This finding was also interesting in that it may be something that could separate golf from the other major sports spectator sports. Golf provides the spectator with the freedom to decide what part of the competition he/she wants to spectate as well as the freedom to decide from where he/she is going to spectate. Most sporting venues limit the spectator to one seat (and charge different prices for different seats) in a crowded area and display the entire field of competition in front of them. The spectator has no choice as to what he/she is going to watch. In this respect, golf may be unique. There may be other sports which allow the spectator to choose the locale, but none with the popularity and appeal that golf is achieving.

To attract all levels of golfers, event marketers should promote the top common reasons. To attract, or increase attendance, of the various levels of golfers, it would be best to focus on the aspects of the spectating experience that differentiated them from the other groups. Non-golfers enjoyed reasons in factor 2. Occasional golfers were also interested in factor 3 but for different reasons. As said, frequent golfer did not distinguish themselves but avid golfers did by emphasizing reasons in factors 1 and 5 which have an entertainment focus.

Day of Attendance Differences

Weekend spectators were attracted to the excitement and entertainment of the final rounds. This was borne out by their emphasis on entertainment reasons. The drama, excitement and entertainment came from the intensified competition due to the cut that occurred after Friday's round as well as the daring all-for-nothing plays. Although attendance is usually higher at weekend rounds anyway, event organizers could further increase attendance by promoting reasons contained in factors 1 - event, 3 - players, and 5 - golfers. Each of these factors was best accounted for by entertainment theories and thus weekend spectators attended for entertainment reasons.

Weekday spectators were a little more ambiguous in terms of what exactly drew them to the event. One could only guess at what it was that drew them to the weekday rounds. Insight is needed to pinpoint why people chose to attend one round over the others. Was it because the crowds were smaller or because all of the golfers were competing or both? This information would be beneficial to marketers as they try to attract more people to the early rounds of the event.

Factor Analysis

Matching the sports spectatorship theories to golf spectatorship reasons was not a simple task. The theories are very ambiguous and much overlap exists between them. In order to be useful in further studies, they need to be clearly defined. For example, when people attend to feel the excitement/drama, are they attending for reasons explained by Stress and Stimulations theories or Entertainment theories. The theories are just not

defined specifically enough to be empirically tested. As mentioned previously, Salubrious Effects could very easily become a subset of entertainment theories. More work needs to be done to operationalize the theories.

Regardless of the ambiguity, entertainment theories emerged as the sports spectatorship theory best able to explain attendance at the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event. Not only were the top three reasons linked to entertainment theories but so too were many of the significantly different reasons. It can be fairly confidently stated that golf spectatorship appealed to spectators because of its entertainment value.

APPENDIX A
STRATIFIED RANDOM SAMPLE

Stratified Sample by the Intercept Method

Daily Suggested Sample per Person

N = 40

Age	Location	Males N = 24	Females N = 16
18-35	Par 3 holes	1	1
	Par 4 holes	2	1
	Par 5 holes	2	1
	Other locations	1	1
		N = 6	N = 4
36-55	Par 3 holes	3	2
	Par 4 holes	3	2
	Par 5 holes	3	2
	Other locations	3	2
		N = 12	N = 8
56 +	Par 3 holes	2	1
	Par 4 holes	1	1
	Par 5 holes	1	1
	Other locations	2	1
		N = 6	N = 4

APPENDIX B
SPECTATOR-INTERCEPT LOCATION PROTOCOL

Location Protocol and Interviewer Schedule

LPGA DuMaurier Classic

1. <u>Robert</u>			2. <u>Tara</u>		
hole #	location	par	hole #	location	par
10	Fairway	5	9	Green	5
14	Tee/Fairway	4	15	Tee	3
13	Green	4	18	Green	5
11	Fairway/Green	4	1	Tee/green	4
3. <u>Karen</u>			4. <u>Robert L</u>		
hole #	location	par	hole #	location	par
6	Green	5	9	Fairway	5
7	Tee/Fairway	4	15	Green	3
8	Green	3	16	Tee	4
9	Tee/Fairway	5			
16	Green/concession	5			
5. <u>Kim</u>			6. <u>Greg</u>		
hole #	location	par	hole #	location	par
18	Tee	5	3	Green	4
17	Green	3	4	Tee	4
2	Fairway/Green	4	5	Tee/Green	3
3	Tee	4	6	Fairway/ concession	5



Classique du Maurier Ltée/Ltd. Classic

Ottawa Hunt & Golf Club
1994 Course Layout

TOURNAMENT YARDAGE AND TEEING GROUNDS

Front Nine - South Nine

Back Nine - West Nine

HOLE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	OUT	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	IN	TOTAL
YARDAGE	393	341	401	342	190	493	400	177	541	3267	507	368	376	340	405	164	374	147	452	3133	6400
PAR	4	4	4	4	3	5	4	3	5	36	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	5	36	72



LEGEND

- MAN SCOREBOARD
- LEADERBOARD
- CROSSWALK
- CONCESSION STAND
- ADMISSION AREA
- PUBLIC PARKING
- COMFORT STATIONS
- MEDIA AREA
- VOLUNTEER AREA
- WALL CALL
- BLEACHER

APPENDIX C
LPGA DUMAURIER CLASSIC GOLF QUESTIONNAIRE

SPECTATOR REASONS TO ATTEND SPORT EVENT

EVENT: DU MAURIER CLASSIC

H. HANSEN, R. GAUTHIER '94
Univ. of Ottawa, Ont., Can

Thurs ____ Fri. ____ Sat. ____ Sun. ____

GENERAL: Please (✓) response

- I (1) Male ____ Female ____ (5) How many rounds/year of golf do you play? ____
(2) Age: 18-25 ____ 26-35 ____ 36-45 ____
46-55 ____ 56-65 ____ 66+ ____ 0 ____ 1-7 ____ 8-24 ____ 25+ ____
(3) Residence: (6) Most of the time I play golf at: Private course ____
I live locally ____ Public course ____
I am a visitor to the area ____ Semi-Private course ____
(4) Which indicates your household income: (7) I decided to attend this event: today ____ last week ____
35,000 or less ____ 51-75,000 ____ 2-3 weeks ago ____
36-50,000 ____ 76-100,000 ____ 1-3 months ago ____
100,000+ ____ 3 or more months ago ____
(8) I got ticket(s) from the event office ____ my golf club ____
an outlet (eg. retail store etc.) ____ given to me as a gift ____
given to me due to association with sponsor(s) ____ other ____

II What words come to mind when you think of the LPGA tour?

III	Please circle (0) importance of these reasons for you to attend the event	DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE				
		1 NO	2 SLIGHT	3	4 STRONG	5
1.	To enjoy the personality of golfers-----	1	2	3	4	5
2.	To take in the scenery of the course-----	1	2	3	4	5
3.	To see the finesse of shot making-----	1	2	3	4	5
4.	To feel the excitement/drama-----	1	2	3	4	5
5.	To see golfer(s) overcome adversity-----	1	2	3	4	5
6.	To see golfer(s) make a "charge"-----	1	2	3	4	5
7.	To pick up tips on how to play shots-----	1	2	3	4	5
8.	To see "live" action-----	1	2	3	4	5
9.	To see "the best" perform-----	1	2	3	4	5
10.	To make my own decisions about who to watch and where to watch-----	1	2	3	4	5
11.	To feel the presence of golfers-to be close to golfer(s) in the field of competition-----	1	2	3	4	5
12.	To enjoy the excitement of weekend play-----	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Due to the number of "big names" in the event-----	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Because of promotions associated with the event---	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Because of charity(ies) supported by the event---	1	2	3	4	5
16.	To enjoy the excitement of final round play-----	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Since the event is noted for great golf-----	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Because of business reasons-----	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Due to convenience of getting to the event-----	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Because of the value of ticket package(s) price---	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Due to image of the event-----	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Because of social reasons-----	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Because of the entertainment value of this event--	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Due to the advertising of the event-----	1	2	3	4	5
25.	To enjoy the excitement of the first two rounds---	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Because of the media coverage of the event-----	1	2	3	4	5
27.	To enjoy the fitness benefit of walking the course		2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D
INTERVIEWER PROTOCOL

Protocol for Golf Course Survey of
Spectator Reasons to Attend

General Thoughts

- A) People have a right to say no. It is our experience that people will cooperate if approached with politeness. If a negative response is given at the outset, the interviewer should still say "thank you for your time" and move on to someone else. People may not have their reading glasses or they may not complete all of the questionnaire particularly question #2. If you see blanks (non-responses on the form) you ask the person if they forgot to answer and if they would mind completing the questions. Sometimes the interviewer can write down the three words/phrases for #2 on behalf of the person who tells the interviewer what they are.
- B) If weather is bothersome (especially rain) adjust your totals for the day. That is, collect as many as possible and add additional numbers to the next day's quota so that the guide target of 250 for each day period is met.
- C) Interviewers must be aware of golf play and etiquette (no noise, rustling paper, talking to fans, etc) while interviewing fans on the course areas.
- D) Administer the questionnaires during the time period of 11 am to 3 pm for crowds.
- E) Do not give copies of the questionnaire to anyone. Refer people to coordinator for information on the questionnaire. That is, get responses per sheet and use the sheets for data collection not for samples.

F) Each day completed questionnaires should be collected by one person and stored in a secure area along with boards and pens. Put questionnaire from Thursday and Friday (Saturday and Sunday) in identified envelopes.

G) The numbers needed are about 500-600 for the tournament broken down evenly per day with about 250 for Thursday/Friday and 250 for Saturday/Sunday. It is OK to collect more.

H) The sample is distributed on a 60-40 gender basis (male/female). Most respondents should be in the age range of 35-50 but have some young people in 20's and some older people in 60's. When collecting on the golf course, be aware of gender and age when asking fans to complete the questionnaire. A suggestion for each interviewer is to use the 60-40 gender guide: have at least 50% age group 35-50; 25% 20's and 25% 60's.

APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

- E1 - Demographic data LPGA DuMaurier Classic total sample**
- E2 - Demographic data LPGA DuMaurier Classic gender sample**
- E3 - Demographic data LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf playing frequency sample**
- E4 - Demographic data LPGA DuMaurier Classic day of attendance sample**

Table E1

Demographic data for the total sample

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	male	539	58.8
	female	378	41.2
Age	18-25	77	8.1
	26-35	197	20.7
	36-45	220	23.1
	46-55	224	23.6
	56-65	141	14.8
	66+	92	9.7
Area	local	755	80.0
	visitor	189	20.0
Income	35 000-less	139	15.7
	36 000-50 000	140	15.8
	51 000-75 000	263	29.6
	76 000-100 000	189	21.3
	100 000+	157	17.7

Table E1 continued

Variable	Category	n	%
Rounds	0	46	5.1
	1-7	190	21.0
	8-24	267	29.5
	25+	402	44.4
Where golf	private	240	28.2
	public	392	46.0
	semi	220	25.8
When	today	105	12.0
	last week	205	23.4
	2-3wks ago	159	18.2
	1-3mos ago	158	18.1
	3+ mos ago	248	28.3
Where tickets	office	242	25.9
	club	58	6.2
	outlet	127	13.6
	gift	281	30.0
	sponsor	103	11.0
	other	125	13.4

Table E2

Demographic data for the gender sample

Variable	Categories	Male		Female	
		n	%	n	%
Age	18-25	51	9.5	25	6.7
	26-35	111	20.7	80	21.3
	36-45	121	22.5	91	24.3
	46-55	130	24.2	85	22.7
	56-65	70	13.0	62	16.5
	66+	54	10.1	32	8.5
Live	local	443	83.4	283	75.5
	visitor	88	16.6	92	24.5
Income	35 000-less	67	13.2	66	19.1
	36 000-50 000	80	15.7	55	15.9
	51 000-75 000	161	31.7	95	27.5
	76 000-100 000	108	21.3	72	20.9
	100 000+	92	18.1	57	16.5
Rounds	0	19	3.8	26	7.2
	1-7	88	17.4	90	24.9
	8-24	158	31.2	96	26.5
	25+	241	47.6	150	41.4

Table E2 continued

Variable	Categories	Male		Female	
		n	%	n	%
Where golf	private	136	28.0	97	29.0
	public	225	46.4	150	44.8
	semi	124	25.6	88	26.3
When	today	63	12.9	37	10.5
	last week	119	24.3	77	21.9
	2-3wks ago	88	18.0	67	19.0
	1-3mos ago	80	16.4	71	20.2
	3+ mosago	139	28.4	100	28.4
Where	office	130	24.8	107	28.7
	club	28	5.3	20	5.4
	outlet	77	14.7	45	12.1
	gift	162	30.9	107	28.7
	sponsor	60	11.4	39	10.5
	other	68	13.0	55	14.7

Table E3

Demographic data the golf playing frequency sample

Variable	Categories	0		1-7		8-24		25+	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender	male	19	42.2	88	49.4	158	62.2	241	61.6
	female	26	57.8	90	50.3	96	37.8	150	38.4
Age	18-25	6	13.0	22	11.6	22	8.2	25	6.3
	26-35	11	23.9	44	23.3	80	30.0	55	13.8
	36-45	8	17.4	54	28.6	68	25.5	75	18.8
	46-55	10	21.7	35	18.5	57	21.3	112	28.0
	56-65	7	15.2	26	13.8	21	7.9	79	19.8
	66+	4	8.7	8	4.2	19	7.1	54	13.5
Live	local	39	84.8	162	86.2	213	80.7	301	76.0
	visitor	7	15.2	26	13.8	51	19.3	95	24.0
Income	35 000-less	10	22.7	30	16.9	45	17.8	48	13.2
	36-50 000	6	13.6	25	14.0	38	15.0	61	16.7
	51-75 000	14	31.8	52	29.2	76	30.0	109	29.9
	76-100 000	8	18.2	42	23.6	47	18.6	83	22.7
	100 000+	6	13.6	29	16.3	47	18.6	64	17.5

Table E3 continued

		0		1-7		8-24		25+	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Golf	private	3	42.9	25	13.5	52	20.2	160	40.3
	public	2	28.6	130	70.3	152	58.9	104	26.2
	semi	2	28.6	30	16.2	54	20.9	133	33.5
When	today	7	15.9	34	18.7	31	12.3	33	8.4
	last week	15	34.1	54	29.7	74	29.4	60	15.3
	2-3wks ago	5	11.4	32	17.6	52	20.6	68	17.4
	1-3mos ago	9	20.5	33	18.1	38	15.1	77	19.7
	3+ mosago	8	18.2	29	15.9	57	22.6	153	39.1
Where	office	10	22.7	46	24.9	72	27.4	105	26.5
	club	3	6.8	13	7.0	11	4.2	27	6.8
	outlet	2	4.5	20	10.8	34	12.9	63	15.9
	gift	20	45.5	62	33.5	79	30.0	105	26.5
	sponsor	4	9.1	21	11.4	36	13.7	34	8.6
	other	5	11.4	23	12.4	31	11.8	62	15.7

Table E4

Demographic data the day of attendance sample

Variable	Categories	1		2		3		4	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender	male	149	62.3	131	58.5	128	56.6	131	57.5
	female	90	37.7	93	41.5	98	43.4	97	42.5
Age	18-25	27	11.3	18	7.5	13	5.5	19	8.1
	26-35	41	17.1	50	20.8	15	24.7	48	20.3
	36-45	56	23.3	62	25.8	46	19.6	56	23.7
	46-55	56	23.3	44	18.3	65	27.7	59	25.0
	56-65	40	16.7	41	17.1	22	9.4	38	16.1
	66+	20	8.3	25	10.4	31	13.2	16	6.8
Live	local	186	78.2	197	82.4	194	82.9	178	76.4
	visitor	52	21.8	42	17.6	40	17.1	55	23.6
Income	35 000-less	35	15.7	38	17.2	34	15.2	32	14.5
	36-50 000	38	17.0	35	15.8	34	15.2	33	15.0
	51-75 000	69	30.9	72	32.6	64	28.6	58	26.4
	76-100 000	45	20.2	42	19.0	55	24.6	47	21.4
	100 000+	36	16.1	34	15.4	37	16.5	50	22.7
Rounds	0	11	4.7	13	5.8	9	4.1	13	5.8
	1-7	51	22.0	48	21.2	48	21.6	43	19.1
	8-24	63	27.2	62	27.4	75	33.8	67	29.8
	25+	107	46.1	103	46.5	90	40.5	102	45.3

Table E4 continued

Variable	Categories	1		2		3		4	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Course	private	74	33.0	59	27.7	49	23.2	58	28.4
	public	94	42.0	97	45.5	108	51.2	93	45.6
	semi	56	25.0	57	26.8	54	25.6	53	26.0
When	today	27	12.1	28	12.8	25	11.5	25	11.6
	last week	45	20.1	54	24.8	55	25.5	51	23.7
	2-3wks ago	39	17.4	46	21.1	39	17.9	35	16.3
	1-3mos ago	37	16.5	36	16.5	43	19.7	42	19.5
	3+mosago	76	33.9	54	24.8	56	25.7	62	28.8
Where	office	67	28.9	63	26.7	59	25.2	53	22.6
	club	13	5.6	9	3.8	17	7.3	19	8.1
	outlet	42	18.1	34	14.4	27	11.5	24	10.3
	gift	57	24.6	69	29.2	73	31.2	82	35.0
	sponsor	21	9.1	23	9.7	33	14.1	26	11.1
	other	32	13.8	38	16.1	25	10.7	30	12.8

APPENDIX F

CHI-SQUARE RESULTS

- F1 - Results of the chi-square test for the gender sample**
- F2- Results of the chi-square tests for the golf playing frequency sample**
- F3 - Results of the chi-square tests for the day of attendance sample**

Table F1

Results of the Chi-square tests for the gender sample

Reason	Chi-square Value*	P	n
Personality of golfers	5.41	0.25	904
Scenery of the course	0.11	0.99	909
Finesse of shotmaking	1.79	0.77	914
Feel excitement/drama	15.23	0.00	912
Golfers overcome adversity	5.11	0.28	910
Golfers make a charge	2.12	0.71	901
Pick up tips	9.25	0.06	909
To see live action	10.90	0.03	912
To see best perform	2.18	0.70	913
Make own decisions	0.99	0.91	905
To be close to golfers	6.34	0.18	906
Excitement weekend play	17.85	0.00	898

Note. * df =4

Table F1 continued

Reason	Chi-square Value*	<u>P</u>	<u>n</u>
Number of big names	4.79	0.31	905
Promotions of event	3.77	0.44	899
Charity supported	1.53	0.82	898
Excitement of final round	28.74	0.00	885
Event noted for great golf	11.27	0.02	896
Business reasons	4.09	0.39	890
Convenience getting to event	9.46	0.05	899
Value of ticket package	13.29	0.01	894
Image of event	4.39	0.36	897
Social reasons	3.16	0.53	895
Entertainment value	16.38	0.00	899
Advertising of event	5.57	0.23	889
Enjoy first two rounds	1.75	0.78	885
Media Coverage	6.64	0.16	899
Fitness Benefits of walking	8.39	0.08	907

Note. * df = 4

Table F2

Results of the Chi-square tests for the golf playing frequency sample

Reason	Chi-square Value*	P	n
Personality of golfers	16.12	0.19	893
Scenery of the course	20.79	0.05	899
Finesse of shotmaking	72.43	0.00	902+
Feel excitement/drama	12.21	0.43	899
Golfers overcome adversity	1.52	0.00	898
Golfers make a charge	45.53	0.00	891
Pick up tips	107.59	0.00	897
To see live action	24.56	0.02	900+
To see best perform	35.07	0.00	901
Make own decisions	26.23	0.01	894
To be close to golfers	21.09	0.05	894
Excitement weekend play	23.77	0.02	887

Note. * df = 12

Note. + 30-40% of the cells have expected counts less than 5. Chi-square may not be a valid test.

Table F2 continued

Reasons	Chi-square Value	P	n
Number of big names	13.26	0.35	893
Promotions of event	12.65	0.39	887
Charity supported	24.71	0.02	885
Excitement of final round	40.41	0.00	875
Event noted for great golf	28.95	0.00	884
Business reasons	45.96	0.00	877
Convenience getting to event	18.29	0.11	888
Value of ticket package	10.18	0.60	882
Image of event	15.09	0.24	885
Social reasons	21.46	0.04	883
Entertainment value	26.80	0.01	888
Advertising of event	19.51	0.08	876
Enjoy first two rounds	23.52	0.02	876
Media Coverage	32.17	0.00	886
Fitness Benefits of walking	19.98	0.07	895

Note.* df = 12

Note.+ 30-40% of the cells have expected counts less than 5. Chi-square may not be a valid test.

Table F3

Results of the Chi-square tests for the day of attendance sample

Reasons	Chi-square Value*	P	n
Personality of golfers	3.81	0.43	943
Scenery of the course	3.39	0.49	948
Finesse of shotmaking	9.72	0.04	953
Feel excitement/drama	18.76	0.00	950
Golfers overcome adversity	18.99	0.00	949
Golfers make a charge	8.31	0.08	940
Pick up tips	2.02	0.73	948
To see live action	7.07	0.13	951
To see best perform	8.06	0.09	952
Make own decisions	3.67	0.45	944
To be close to golfers	8.22	0.08	945
Excitement weekend play	34.88	0.00	936

Note. * df =4

Table F3 continued

Reasons	Chi-square Value*	P	n
Number of big names	14.25	0.01	943
Promotions of event	9.46	0.05	936
Charity supported	6.32	0.18	936
Excitement of final round	61.11	0.00	924
Event noted for great golf	13.09	0.01	934
Business reasons	0.74	0.95	926
Convenience getting to event	7.27	0.12	937
Value of ticket package	8.33	0.08	931
Image of event	8.59	0.46	935
Social reasons	4.68	0.32	932
Entertainment value	8.96	0.06	937
Advertising of event	4.29	0.37	926
Enjoy first two rounds	61.51	0.00	924
Media Coverage	5.60	0.22	937
Fitness Benefits of walking	5.69	0.22	946

Note. * df = 4

APPENDIX G
SAMPLE SIZE, MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR
GOLF PLAYING FREQUENCY SAMPLE

Appendix G

Sample sizes, means and standard deviations for the 27 reasons by golf playing frequency of spectators attending the LPGA DuMaurier Classic golf event

Reason	Rounds of golf											
	0			1-7			8-24			25+		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
personality of golfers	46	2.78	1.28	187	3.18	1.12	263	2.29	1.12	397	3.29	1.13
scenery of the course	45	3.71	1.24	189	3.53	1.06	267	3.54	1.05	398	3.35	1.18
finesse of shotmaking	46	3.93	1.16	190	4.46	0.73	266	4.53	0.70	400	4.64	0.72
feel excitement/drama	46	3.57	1.20	189	3.91	0.95	266	3.87	0.95	398	3.87	0.98
golfers overcome adversity	46	3.28	1.26	188	3.59	0.95	267	3.59	1.00	397	3.69	1.12
golfers make a charge	46	2.89	1.29	186	3.55	0.96	265	3.62	1.08	394	3.70	1.13

Appendix G continued

LPGA Golf Product 177

Reason	Rounds of golf											
	0			1-7			8-24			25+		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
to pick up tips	46	2.41	1.36	189	3.55	1.12	264	3.78	1.10	398	3.83	1.20
to see live action	46	4.02	1.22	190	4.36	0.82	265	4.41	0.81	399	4.48	0.84
to see best perform	46	4.24	1.25	189	4.59	0.67	264	4.52	0.80	402	4.59	0.85
make own decisions	45	3.18	4.43	188	3.45	1.16	265	3.49	1.21	396	3.74	1.14
to be close to golfers	46	3.33	1.42	186	3.64	1.09	263	3.68	1.09	399	3.76	1.12
excitement weekend play	43	2.98	1.41	189	3.49	1.16	264	3.46	1.13	391	3.58	1.12
number of big names	45	3.47	1.36	188	3.62	1.04	263	3.62	1.17	397	3.69	1.16

Appendix G continued

Reason	Rounds of golf											
	0			1-7			8-24			25+		
	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
promotions of event	45	3.44	1.29	188	2.31	1.16	260	2.20	1.07	394	2.20	1.16
charity supported	45	2.80	1.44	188	2.69	1.10	263	2.59	1.20	389	2.79	1.29
excitement of final round	46	3.29	1.62	183	3.68	1.15	259	3.59	1.36	388	3.66	1.41
event noted for great golf	45	3.44	1.31	187	4.01	0.91	261	3.94	1.04	391	4.03	1.06
business reasons	45	1.80	1.36	185	1.88	1.21	262	1.82	1.12	385	1.46	0.92
convenience getting event	46	2.78	1.29	187	2.68	1.30	263	2.71	1.37	392	2.68	1.46
value of ticket package	44	2.55	1.34	186	2.56	1.33	261	2.59	1.34	391	2.58	1.43

Appendix G continued

Reason	Rounds of golf											
	0			1-7			8-24			25+		
	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
image of event	45	2.98	1.32	187	3.16	1.23	262	3.11	1.27	391	3.29	1.34
social reasons	45	2.36	1.37	183	2.31	1.21	263	2.29	1.19	392	2.04	1.19
entertainment value	46	3.41	1.36	188	3.83	0.99	260	3.71	1.13	394	3.88	1.18
advertising of event	45	2.29	1.31	183	2.33	1.10	259	2.17	1.13	389	2.28	1.25
enjoy first two rounds	46	2.26	1.18	184	2.67	1.21	260	2.79	1.32	386	2.87	1.34
media coverage	46	2.15	1.15	186	2.32	1.02	261	2.16	1.06	393	2.13	1.19
fitness benefits of walking	46	3.13	1.26	187	2.84	1.31	265	2.72	1.32	397	2.73	1.41

APPENDIX H
LOADING AND FACTORS FROM THE FACTOR ANALYSIS

Appendix H

Loadings and Factors from the total sample of the Principle components varimax
rotation factor analysis

Factor	Reason	Loading	Theory
Factor 1	number of big names	0.72033	Disposition
	excitement weekend play	0.70416	Entertainment
	excitement final round play	0.67735	Entertainment
	event noted for great golf	0.57987	Entertainment
	(to be close to golfers)	(0.49233)	Disposition/ Entertainment
Factor 2	promotions of event	0.74717	Entertainment
	business reasons	0.71382	Disposition/ Achievement
	social reasons	0.61123	Entertainment/ Disposition
	media coverage	0.56790	Entertainment/ Achievement
	advertising of event	0.55413	Salubrious/ Entertainment
	(charity supported)	(0.49846)	Salubrious

Appendix H continued

Factor	Reason	Loading	Theory
Factor 3	golfers overcome adversity	0.67506	Stress/Entertainment
	feel excitement/drama	0.64383	Stress/Entertainment
	golfers make a charge	0.60176	Entertainment
	enjoy first two rounds	0.59197	Entertainment
	personality of golfers	0.53529	Entertainment
Factor 4	value of ticket package	0.67349	Entertainment/ Residual Preferences
	convenience getting to event	0.67333	Entertainment/ Residual Preferences
	image of event	0.58334	Disposition/ Achievement
	(entertainment value)	(0.44852)	Entertainment
Factor 5	pick up tips	0.73379	Entertainment
	finesse of shotmaking	0.63947	Entertainment
	to see live action	0.57513	Entertainment
	to see best perform	0.56839	Entertainment
Factor 6	scenery of the course	0.77163	Salubrious
	fitness benefits of walking	0.68583	Salubrious

References

- Anderson, D. F. (1979). Sport spectatorship: Appropriation of an identity or appraisal of self. Review of Sport and Leisure, 4(2), 115-127.
- Arms, R.L., Russell, G.W., & Sandilands, M.L. (1979). Effects on the hostility of spectators of viewing aggressive sports. Social Psychology Quarterly, 42, 275-279.
- Arms, R.L., Russell, G.W., & Sandilands, M.L. (1980). Effects of viewing aggressive sports on the hostility of spectators. In R.M. Suinn (Ed.), Psychology in Sports: Methods and Applications (pp.133-142). MN: Burgess.
- Baade, R.A., & Tiehen, L.J. (1990). An analysis of major league baseball attendance, 1960-1987. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 14(1), 14-32.
- Becker, M.A., & Suls, J. (1983). Take me out to the ballgame: The effects of objective, social, and temporal performance information on attendance at major league baseball games. Journal of Sport Psychology, 5(3), 302-313.
- Beisser, A. (1963). The Madness in Sports. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Bergier, M.J. (1981). A conceptual model of leisure-time choice behavior. Journal of Leisure Research, 13(2), 138-159.
- Brandmeyer, G.A., & Alexander, L.K. (1986). "I caught the dream": The adult baseball camp as fantasy leisure. Journal of Leisure Research, 18(1), 26-39.
- Branscombe, N.R., & Wann, D.L. (1991). The positive social and self concept consequences of sports team identification. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 15(2), 115-127.

Brooks, C.M. (1994). Sports Marketing: Competitive Business Strategies for Sports. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Bryant, J., Brown, D., Comisky, P.W. & Zillmann, D. (1982). Sports and spectators: Commentary and appreciation. Journal of Communication, 32(1), 109-119.

Cialdini, R.B., Borden, R.J., Thorne, A., Walker, M.R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L.R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34(3), 366-375.

Cialdini, R.B., & De Nicholas, M.E. (1989). Self-presentation by association. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57(4), 625-631.

Cialdini, R.B., & Richardson, K.D. (1980). Two direct tactics of image management: Basking and blasting. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39(3), 406-415.

Cochran, A.J., & Farrally, M.R. (1994). Science and Golf II: Proceedings of the World Scientific Congress of Golf. London: E & FN Spon.

Cox, R.H. (1994). Sport psychology: Concepts and applications, third edition. Dubuque, IA: Brown and Benchmark Publishers.

Cratty, B.J. (1989). Psychology in contemporary sport, third edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cuneen, J., & Hannan, M.J. (1993). Intermediate measures and recognition testing of sponsorship advertising at an LPGA tournament. Sport Marketing Quarterly, 2(1), 47-56.

- Duncan, M.C. (1983). The symbolic dimensions of spectator sport. Quest, 35, 29-36.
- Elias, N., & Dunning, E. (1970). The quest for excitement in unexciting societies. In G. Luschen (Ed.), The cross-cultural analysis of sport and games (pp.31-51). Champaign, Il: Stipes Publishing Company.
- Felshin, J. (1972). The socialization of sport. In: E.W. Gerber (Ed.), Sport and the Body: A Philosophical Inquiry (pp.227-229). Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Gantz, W. (1981). An exploration of viewing motives and behaviours associated with television sports. Journal of Broadcasting, 25(3), 263-275.
- Gantz, W., & Wenner, L.A. (1991). Men, women, and sports: Audience experiences and effects. Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 35(2), 233-243.
- Gates, R., & Solomon, P.J. (1982). Research using the mall intercept: State of the art. Journal of Advertising Research, 22(4), 43-49.
- Gauthier, R., & Hansen, H. (1993). Female spectators: Marketing implications for professional golf events. Sport Marketing Quarterly, 2(4), 21-28.
- Godbey, G., & Robinson, J. (1979). The American sports fan: "Spectatoritis" revisited. Review of Sport and Leisure, 4(1), 1-11.
- Goldstein, J.H. (1989). Violence in sports. In J.H. Goldstein (Ed.), Sports, games, play: Social and psychological viewpoints, Second Edition (pp.279-297). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goldstein, J.H., & Arms, R.L. (1971). Effects of observing athletic contests on hostility. Sociometry, 34(1), 83-90.

- Graham, P.J. (1994). Characteristics of spectators attending professional tennis tournaments in two regions of the U.S. Sport Marketing Quarterly, 3(3), 38-??.
- Guttmann, A. (1986). Sports Spectators. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hall, A., Slack, T., Smith, G., & Whitson, D. (1991). Sport in Canadian society. Toronto, Ontario: McClelland & Stewart Inc.
- Hansen, H., & Gauthier, R. (1989). Factors affecting attendance at professional sport events. Journal of Sport Management, 3(1), 15-32.
- Hansen, H., & Gauthier, R. (1991). Spectator reasons for attendance at professional golf events. Report to American Golf Sponsors. San Diego, California
- Hansen, H., & Gauthier, R. (1993). Spectators' views of LPGA golf events. Sport Marketing Quarterly, 2(1), 17-25.
- Hansen, H., & Gauthier, R. (1994). The professional golf product: Spectators' views. Sport Marketing Quarterly, 3(4), 9-16.
- Harris, D.V. (1973). Involvement in sport: A somatophytic rationale for physical activity. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.
- Hirt, E.R., Zillmann, D., Erickson, G.A., & Kennedy, C. (1992). Costs and benefits of allegiance: Changes in fans' self-ascribed competencies after team victory versus defeat. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63(5), 724-738.
- Hocking, J.E. (1982). Sports and spectators: Intra-audience effects. Journal of Communication, 32(1), 100-108.
- Howard, D.R. (1992). Participation rates in selected sport and fitness activities. Journal of Sport Management, 6(3), 191-205.

Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1980). Attributional determinants of decisions to attend football games. Scandinavian Journal of Sports Science, 2(2), 39-46.

Johnson, A.T. (1993). Rethinking the sport-city relationship: In search of partnership. Journal of Sport Management, 7(1), 61-70.

Kennedy, R. (1980). More victories equals more fans equals more profits, right? Wrong, wrong, wrong. Sports Illustrated, 52(18), 34-36, 39-40, 45.

Lee, B.A., & Zeiss, C.A. (1980). Behavioral commitment to the role of sport consumer: An exploratory analysis. Sociology and Social Research, 64(3), 405-419.

Lee, M.J. (1985). Self-esteem and social identity in basketball fans: A closer look at Basking-In-Reflected-Glory. Journal of Sport Behavior, 8(4), 210-223.

Loy, J.W. (1981). An emerging theory of sport spectatorship: Implications for the Olympic Games. In J. Seagrave & D. Chu (Eds.), Olympism (pp. 262-294). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.

Mann, L. (1974). On being a sore loser: How fans react to their team's failure. Australian Journal of Psychology, 26(1), 34-47.

McPherson, B.D., Curtis, J.E., & Loy, J.W. (1989). Social significance of sport: An introduction to the sociology of sport. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.

Melnick, M.J. (1993). Searching for sociability in the stands: A theory of sports spectating. Journal of Sport Management, 7(1), 44-60.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary (1974). Springfield, MA: G & C Merriam Company.

Murrell, A.J., & Dietz, B. (1992). Fan support of sport teams: The effect of a common group identity. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 14(1), 28-39.

- Ponomarev, N.I. (1980). Sport as a show. International Review of Sport Sociology, 15 (3/4), 73-79.
- Randl, J.R., & Cuneen, J. (1994). Demographic characteristics of racetrack patrons. Sport Marketing Quarterly, 3(1), 47-52.
- Roberts, M. (1976). Fans' How we go crazy over sports. Washington, DC: The New Republic Book Company.
- Rothenbuhler, E.W. (1988). The living room celebration of the Olympic games. Journal of Communication, 38(4), 61-81.
- Russell, G.W. (1981). Spectator moods at an aggressive sports event. Journal of Sport Psychology, 3(3), 217-227.
- Sage, G.H. (1989). Religion, sport, and society. In D.S. Eitzen (Ed.), Sport in Contemporary Society: An Anthology, Third Edition (pp.271-282). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Sapolsky, B.S. (1980). The effect of spectator disposition and suspense on the enjoyment of sport contests. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 11(1), 1-10.
- Schofield, J.A. (1983). Performance and attendance at professional team sports. Journal of Sport Behavior, 6(4), 196-206.
- Schurr, K.T., Wittig, A.F., Ruble, V.E., & Ellen, A.S. (1988). Demographic and personality characteristics associated with persistent, occasional, and non-attendance of university male basketball games by college students. Journal of Sport Behavior, 11(1), 3-17.

Schwartz, J.M. (1971). Causes and effects of spectator sports. International Review of Sport Sociology, 8(3-4), 25-45.

Schweitzer, K., Zillmann, D., Weaver, J.B., & Luttrell, E.S. (1992). Perception of threatening events in the emotional aftermath of a televised college football game. Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 36(1), 75-82.

Shamir, B., & Ruskin, H. (1984). Sport participation vs. sport spectatorship: Two modes of leisure behavior. Journal of Leisure Research, 16(1), 9-21.

Sloan, L.R. (1989). The motives of sports fans. In J.H. Goldstein (Ed.), Sports, Games, and Play: Social and Psychological Viewpoints, Second Edition (pp.175-240). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Smith, G. (1987). The sport hero: An endangered species. In A. Yiannakis, T.D. McIntyre, M.J. Melnick, & D.P. Hart (Eds.), Sport Sociology: Contemporary Themes, Third Edition (pp.60-66). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.

Smith, G.J. (1988). The noble sports fan. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 12(1), 54-65.

Snyder, C.R., Lassegard, M., & Ford, C.E. (1986). Distancing after group success and failure: Basking in reflected glory and cutting off reflected failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(2), 382-388.

Snyder, E.E., & Spreitzer, E.A. (1983). Social Aspects of Sport, Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Stewart, D.A. (1993). Participating in deaf sport: Characteristics of deaf spectators. Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly, 10(2), 146-156.

Stone, G.P. (1958). American sports: Play and dis-play. In E. Larrabee & R. Meyersohn (Eds.), Mass Leisure, (pp. 253-264). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Taylor, C.W., Henschen, K.P., Ewens, J.R., Swisher, C., & Sachau, D. (1985). Golf - The super spectating sport. UAHPERD Journal, 17(autumn), 18-20.

Tutko, T.A. (1989). Personality change in the American sports scene. In J.H. Goldsrein (Ed.), Sports, games, and play: Social and psychological viewpoints, Second Edition (pp.111-128). Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Wagner, R. (1994). An analysis of prize money and domestic coverage of men's and women's professional tennis. Sport Marketing Quarterly, 3(2), 15-20.

Wann, D.L., & Branscombe, N.R. (1990). Die-hard and fair-weather fans: Effects of identification on BIRGing and CORFing tendencies. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 14(2), 103-117.

Wann, D.L., & Branscombe, N.R. (1993). Sports Fans: Measuring degree of identification with their teams. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 24(1), 1-17.

Wenner, L.A., & Gantz, W. (1989). The audience experience with sports on television. In L.A. Wenner (Ed.), Media, Sports, and Society (pp.241-269). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wulk, N.G. (1979). A metacritical aesthetic of sport. In E.W. Gerber & W.J. Morgan (Eds.), Sport and the Body: A Philosophical Symposium, Second Edition (pp.340-344). Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.

Zillmann, D., Bryant, J., & Sapolsky, B.S. (1989). Enjoyment from sports spectatorship. In J.H. Goldstein (Ed.), Sports, Games, and Play: Social and Psychological Viewpoints, Second Edition (pp. 241-278). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Zuckerman, M. (1979). Sensation seeking: Beyond the optimal level of arousal. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.