Analysis of Golfer Motivations and Constraints by Experience Use History

James F. Petrick

Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences, Texas A&M University Sheila J. Backman, Robert Bixler and William C. Norman Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, Clemson University

With an increasing competition for attracting golfers to individual sites, it is becoming more important for managers to identify the variables which attract and retain their golfing clientele. The segmentation of golfers into homogeneous markets allows for the comparison of consumer variables by groups and can assist management in formulating consumer-oriented marketing strategies. The current study utilized experience use history (EUH) to create distinct, identifiable segments of users by examining their past behavior and experience levels in order to identify distinct motivations and constraints by segment. Subjects (N=1,397) were randomly selected at six different Cleveland Metroparks golf courses. Results show that golfers with different experience use histories differed on both their motivations and constraints to play golf. Specific managerial and theoretical implications are discussed.

KEYWORDS: Motivations, constraints, experience use history, golfer behavior, golf course management

Introduction

While little change has occurred in the total number of golfers in the past decade, the number of golf courses is quickly increasing. In 1998 the United States saw a record 485 new golf courses built ("1998 Looming as Banner Year," 1998). However, since 1990, the total number of golfers has decreased from 27.8 million to 26.5 million (National Golf Foundation, 1998). Further, the average number of rounds played per person, per year has consistently declined over the past two decades (National Golf Foundation, 1998). Hence there is increasing competition for attracting golfers to individual sites, and it is becoming more important for managers to identify the variables which attract and retain their golfing clientele. Therefore, the current study analyzed differences in the reasons why golfers participate (motivations), and the barriers that must be negotiated in order to participate (constraints).

Motivations

Motivations are a "collective term for processes and effects with common parameters: in a particular situation, a person chooses a certain behavior for its expectant results" (Gnoth, 1997, p. 288). The analysis of recreationists' motivations has been shown to be very useful to leisure service practitioners in helping to construct services that people both want and need (Prentice, 1993; Staurowsky, Parkhouse, & Sachs, 1996).

A common finding of research related to outdoor recreation motivations is that recreationists often differ in the factors which motivate them to participate (Prentice, 1993). Many researchers have developed scales to measure the multidimensional character of leisure motivations (Gitelson & Kerstetter, 1990; Hamilton-Smith, 1987; Loundsbury & Polik, 1992). A majority of these studies have attempted to identify the underlying dimensional structure of leisure motivations using factor or cluster analysis (Williams, et al, 1990). While some consensus exists concerning core motivations (Manfredo, Driver, & Brown, 1996), many researchers have conducted their own factor analyses on motivational inventories and have reported dimensions of motivations that are unique to their particular study (Graefe, Ditton, Roggenbuck, & Schreyer, 1981).

A "key issue is whether the instability observed in standardized measures of leisure motivation may be explained in terms of variations in the way people interpret or structure motivations in their own minds" (Williams et al., 1990, p. 38). The "cognitive set" or frame of reference of the individuals involved in different studies has been identified as an important source of this instability (Ward & Russell, 1981). According to Ward and Russell (1981), a "cognitive set" is a "state of mind which presumably can influence perception, cognition, and/or behavior" and is usually inferred from the subject's past history, or functional orientation to the setting (p. 612). Therefore, within the same recreational experience, it may be anticipated that individuals with different use histories, may have differing motivational factors for participation.

One of the most common methods for analyzing leisure participants' motivation is to focus on the desired goal states attained through participation (Manfredo et al., 1996). Numerous Recreation Experience Preference (REP) scales have been developed for measuring these goal states. An experiential approach suggests that leisure pursuits should not be viewed as mere activities (e.g. golf, tennis, boating), but should be conceptualized as a self-rewarding, psychophysiological experience that is a result of free choice (Manfredo, Driver, & Brown, 1983).

Manfredo et al. (1996) recently conducted a meta-analysis of REP scales. Results identified 19 distinct factors generated from 36 different studies, and revealed high average inter-item correlations within scales and domains, yet relatively low average correlations between domains and scales. Some of the motivational factors identified included; family togetherness, skill development, achievement/stimulation, and to enjoy nature. The authors suggest that in order to best utilize REP scales, that future research identify and use those items most important to the participants studied.

Constraints

Another construct which is important to golf course management is the factors which restrict or constrain golfers from participation in golf as often as they would like. Constraints to leisure have been defined as anything that restricts one's ability to participate in leisure activities, to spend more time

doing so, to take advantage of leisure services, or to achieve a desired level of satisfaction (Jackson, 1988). According to Jackson (1994), the analysis of constraints to leisure participation can be used in the development and implementation of management strategies in recreation and leisure. More specifically, this information may be used to guide management's philosophy, policies, marketing and program planning (McGuire & O'Leary, 1992).

Relevant to the current study is that constraints do not necessarily block participation, but can prompt substitution of one location for another (Samdahl & Jekubovich, 1997). According to Jackson and Rucks (1995), recreationists do not necessarily react passively to constraints on their leisure (i.e. by ceasing to participate), but often negotiate through constraints to initiate or continue participation. Therefore, leisure constraints should not be viewed as insurmountable restrictions to participation.

Jackson, Crawford and Godbey (1993) stated that the type of negotiation strategy utilized by an individual depends partly, or possibly entirely, on the problem encountered. They argued that these strategies may be either cognitive (to reduce cognitive dissonance) or behavioral (an observable change in behavior). Further, they suggested that the adoption of a behavioral strategy can either involve modifications to the "non-leisure aspects" of life to accommodate leisure desires (e.g., working less or rescheduling other activities) or may involve modifications to leisure itself (e.g., changing frequency of participation, or substituting one activity for another). Jackson et al. (1993) concluded that participation related to the negotiation of constraints is likely to be different from participation in the absence of constraints.

According to McCarville and Smale (1993), four perspectives have emerged from the existing constraints literature. These perspectives include: (1) constraint and participation/nonparticipation, (2) constraint and the individual, (3) constraint and activity characteristics and (4) constraint and contextual variables. Of importance to the current study is constraints and the individual. The few studies which have utilized this perspective have considered individual preferences, participation levels, loyalties or interests in the examination of the relationship between constraints and participation. For example, Backman (1991) examined the relationship between golfers' loyalty and their perception of constraints. Results showed that an individual's loyalty toward an activity may influence their perceptions of selected constraints.

Also, Wright and Goodale (1991) proposed that personal variables may provide insights into how individuals are constrained in their participation. By subdividing participants in terms of frequency of participation and interest in participation they found that non-participants and those less interested in participation were more likely to perceive of themselves as constrained. They concluded that "there is a relationship among attitudes, interests, preferences, and participation/nonparticipation" (Wright & Goodale, 1991, p. 329).

Experience Use History

In order to make the best use of organizational resources it has been suggested that leisure service organizations concentrate their marketing efforts on specific groups (Kotler, Bowen, & Makens, 1996). Past research on golfers has segmented participants by loyalty (Backman, 1991), attachment (Petrick, Backman, & Bixler 1998), profile conjoint analysis (Toy, Rager, & Guadagnola, 1989), demographics (PGA, 1996) and lifestyle (Gray, 1982). While each of these methods can be quite useful, individual segments can not be derived without the utilization of market research.

According to Kotler et al. (1996), market segments must be measurable, substantial, actionable and accessible, if they are to be successfully utilized by management. Further, it is believed that loyalty and attachment are antecedents to behavior, and that a more applicable type of segmentation for managers is one that uses actual behavior. A market segmentation tool that has been shown to create measurable, substantial, actionable and accessible groups of recreationists based on behavior is experience use history. Further, past experience data can often be obtained from existing clientele records.

Past experience can be defined as the "sum of accumulated life experience a recreationist has within a particular recreation activity or style of participation" (Virden, 1992, p. 6). The affect of past experience on an individual is reflected in the skill level of the recreationist, as well as how the recreationist feels, behaves and makes decisions about which leisure opportunities (i.e., programs, services and facilities) to utilize. Unfortunately, many leisure service providers fail to consider the importance of the past experience of the consumer. Virden has recommended that segmenting participants by their experience level can be a beneficial method for both public and private sector leisure service providers to improve the effectiveness of their program and facility marketing. Specifically, Virden (1992) states that "golf, tennis, fitness facilities and outdoor recreation activities such as hiking, horseback riding and wind surfing provide prime examples for past experience based marketing" (p. 7).

Experience use history (EUH), was developed by Schreyer, Lime and Williams (1984), and has been utilized to create distinct, identifiable segments of users by examining their past behavior and experience levels (Williams et al., 1990). Using a composite of three experience variables (total river trips, total number of rivers run, and number of trips on the sample river), they created a six-category measure of "experience use history" to represent previous participation.

The six categories created were: novices (persons making their first river trip ever), beginners (persons with a low amount of experience on a few rivers), collectors (persons who have floated a large number of rivers but have little experience on any one river), locals (persons with high experience on the sample river but low experience elsewhere, visitors (persons who have a large amount of total river running experience but little experience on the sample river) and veterans (persons with a large amount of experience on

the sample river and on other rivers). The authors explained that while the six categories formed were mutually exclusive, they did not represent ordinal levels of increasing experience, but instead distinct patterns of activity experience.

Schreyer and Bealieu (1986) applied experience use history to investigate preferences for various environmental attributes as they influence the choice of a specific recreational setting. They hypothesized that the influence of amount of previous experience and activity commitment were related to the ways in which participants process and store information about their recreation activities. A composite index based on questions concerning the length of time the respondent had participated in wild land recreation, the average number of trips made per year and the number of different wild land areas visited were utilized to measure experience. Commitment was measured with responses to two, ten-point Likert scale questions. The first one asked respondents to rate the relative importance of wild land recreation to their lives while the second asked respondents to rate wild land recreation as it compares to other aspects of their leisure.

Results indicated that respondents with varying levels of experience and commitment did not appear to differ significantly in the types of attributes they feel are important in selecting wild land recreation environments. Differences were found in the way respondents structured information about attributes. Persons with more experience and commitment were more likely to be more specific in the attributes they identified. Further, respondents also identified more attributes as being important in the decision process. These results suggested that users of outdoor recreation refer to more salient attributes while in the decision process, and are more likely to be persuaded to revisit with specific attribute based messages.

A similar conceptualization of experience use history was employed by Shinew (1993), who examined the affect of travel importance and travel frequency on attractiveness ratings of organizational reward options. While travel frequency was found to have no effect on attractiveness ratings, significant differences were found in travel importance.

Williams, Schreyer and Knopf (1990) examined the affect experience use history had on motivations to participate in river rafting. The primary purpose of their research was to determine whether factor structures of leisure motivation are stable across levels of experience history. More specifically, they wished to examine experience use history's effect as a developmental frame of reference on the dimensional structure of motivations to participate in river floating. The 36-item Recreation Experience Preference (REP) scale was administered to each of the six categories of experience use history. Results showed evidence that participants' motivations were different for participants with differing experience use histories. The largest differences between groups, was found between the most experienced (veterans) and the least experienced (beginners).

The aforementioned studies have shown that experience use history can be an effective tool for segmenting recreationists. Beyond simply asking "level of participation," EUH simultaneously segments users by frequency of participation, type of participation, and place of participation. Specifically categorizing participants into homogeneous segments.

Also, EUH data can often be obtained with existing information, and is thus an economically efficient segmentation tool. Past research has further shown that the identification of differing segments' motivations (Fodness, 1994) and constraints (Jackson, 1994) can assist management in formulating consumer-oriented marketing strategies for the proper allocation of resources. Therefore, the current study utilized experience use history as a segmentation tool to examine differences in golfers' motivations and constraints to participation.

Purpose

Several researchers (Shinew, 1993; Williams et. al, 1990) have contended that an individual's past experiences can mediate their present leisure behavior. Further, the identification of leisure participants' motivations and constraints have numerous managerial implications. Yet, relatively little is known about how motivations and constraints influence golfers' participation. Therefore, an examination of how golfers' perceived constraints and motivations differ by use histories should provide insight into means for not only making services more accessible, but also how current participants may be retained. Further, this knowledge should benefit the field of leisure by providing a better understanding of the possible utilization of experience use history. Thus, the purpose of the present study is to examine how golfers with varying experience use histories differ in their motivations for and constraints to the game of golf.

Three research questions were developed in order to guide this study:

1) Can golfers be segmented using experience use history?

2) Do golfers with differing use histories differ in their factors of motivations to play golf?

3) Do golfers with differing use histories differ in their constraints to playing golf?

Methods

Sample

Golfers (N = 1,688) were chosen to participate in this study based on randomly selected tee times stratified by weekday and weekend at all six Cleveland Metro Park municipal golf courses during a six month span. The six months comprising the data collection were the only full months of play at the courses due to climate. When a foursome approached the tee master at a tee time that had been randomly selected, the tee master asked one of the golfers to participate. In order to reduce selection bias within groups, a randomly selected shirt color was paired with each randomly selected tee

time. The golfer with the highest proportion of the matching shirt color was asked to participate in the study. If none of the golfers in the group were wearing the randomly selected shirt color, the next shirt color on the random list was chosen. For incentive, golfers were told their name would be entered in a drawing, with one chance in five of winning a pass for a 9-hole round of golf.

Once a golfer agreed to participate, s/he was asked for a mailing address. The questionnaire was then sent to their given address, and if no response was received after the first week, reminder postcards were sent. Three weeks after the questionnaire was first sent, non-respondents were sent another questionnaire, and after four weeks a final reminder postcard was sent. Using this procedure, 1,397 out of 1,688 questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 83%. Of the golfers that participated, the average age was 49.9, 70.2% were married, 79.9% were male, and the median household income was \$50,000 to \$59,999.

In order to ensure there were no differences between respondents and non-respondents, a non-response bias check was conducted on the variables of age, marital status, gender, income, and average golf score. Results found no significant differences (p < .05) between respondents and nonrespondents on all variables measured.

Instrument

The questionnaire was developed by the Division of Research and Program Evaluation at Cleveland Metro Parks in order to examine their clientele's perceptions, motivations, constraints, satisfactions and demographics. The original instrument was reviewed by the golf and marketing staff at the six golf courses. Additionally, several golfers were asked to critique the questionnaire in a pilot test. This critique aided the development of constraint and motivation items to be included. The final questionnaire consisted of an 8 and a half by 11 inch booklet with a front cover and seven pages of questions.

Numerous constraints to participation have been identified. Samdahl and Jekubovich (1993) broadly defined constraints in only four main categories: time, money, health and social relationships. On the other extreme, Henderson, Stalnaker and Taylor (1988) developed a scale including 55 items. Yet, according to Jackson (1988), even this list does not capture the entire range of leisure constraints, as "a survey of the literature indicates that a total of well over one hundred distinct items have been administered in previous studies" (p. 206).

Constraints were measured with a 10 item 5-point Likert-type scale with choices of (0) not a barrier, (1) a slight barrier, (2) somewhat of a barrier, (3) an important barrier, and (4) an extreme barrier. Only golfers that stated that they would like to play more golf (on the previous question), were asked, "If you would like to play more golf, how important are each of these barriers in limiting how much golf you can play?" Examples of barriers included;

work responsibilities, family responsibilities, cost of greens fees and cart rental, and lack of time to play golf.

Motivation items utilized in the current study were selected from a list of REP items by an expert panel (consisting of college professors, golf course management and golf professionals). Beyond the additional list, the panel developed additional items related to the golfing experience. The resultant list was then pilot tested in order to examine the importance of each item. Items scoring the highest ratings of importance were utilized.

Motivations were measured with a 14 item, 5-point Likert type scale with choices of (1) not important, (2) a little important, (3) somewhat important, (4) very important and (5) extremely important. The question asked of repsondents, "People play golf for many reasons. Listed below are reasons why someone might play golf. Please circle an answer indicating how important each reason is to you." Examples of reasons included: to be outdoors, to get exercise, to have fun and to do something relaxing.

In order to measure experience use history, respondents were asked how often they play golf on the study course, the total number of rounds they have played, and the number of different golf courses they have played. The final section included questions focusing on demographics.

Data Analysis and Results

Similar to Schreyer et al. (1984), experience use history was operationalized with the use of three variables: total rounds of golf played, total number of courses played and percentage of rounds played on the study course. Each of the three variables was transformed into simple bivariate categories of "high" and "low," creating eight possible combinations. Six categories were ultimately used as two cells were collapsed into logical categories. Descriptive labels were given to each of the categories for purposes of imageable identification:

- 1) Infrequents (11.3%)—golfers with low experience on few courses.
- 2) Loyal-Infrequents (23.3%)—golfers with low experience, but majority on the study course.
- 3) Collectors (15.9%)—golfers who have played many courses, little experience on any one.
- 4) Locals (11.3%)—golfers with high experience on study course only.
- 5) Visitors (24.3%)—golfers with high total experience, but little experience on study course.
- 6) Veterans (13.8%)—golfers with high total experience on many courses.

Though the final categories are similar to those generated by Schreyer et al. (1984), a few variations exist. With 88.3% of the respondents indicating that they play golf at least once per week, the categories of novice and beginner (as used by Schreyer et al., 1984) were transformed into Infrequents. Golfers which have played a high percentage of rounds on the test course,

but have played little golf formed a new segment termed Loyal-Infrequents. While this category was not identified for boaters (Schreyer et al. 1984), it appears to be a substantially important market of golfers. Also incongruent with Schreyer et al.'s (1984) results was the inclusion of high and low total courses played for the segment of Visitors. It was determined that regardless of how many courses played, if a golfer plays many rounds, with the majority not on the study course, s/he is a visitor. While the segments formed are mutually exclusive, they do not represent ordinal levels of increasing experience, but instead distinct patterns of golfer experience.

Factor analysis was employed to determine distinct dimensions of golfer motivation. Reasons why someone might play golf were assessed using a 14 item, 5 point Likert-type scale anchored by 0 "not important" and 4 "extremely important." Exploratory factor analysis with a Varimax rotation was utilized to group the items, since this is the initial examination of the items used.

Four factors were identified on the basis of eigenvalues which exceeded one and accounted for 56.0% of the total variance (Table 1). Items were allocated to each factor (based on a minimum .45 loading) and were grouped to create dimensions or scales of motivations for use in the analysis. The first factor "leisure" had six variables loading on it ("To do something

Table 1
Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis: 14 Motivation Items

Factors / Items	Factor 1 Leisure	Factor 2 Status	Factor 3 Family	Factor 4 Compete
To be in a natural area	.783	.198	.046	131
To be outdoors	.756	.220	.071	093
To do something relaxing	.668	121	.051	.162
To have fun	.655	175	646	.335
To get exercise	.576	.108	.141	.205
To be with adult friends	.496	.272	.196	.031
To be around the type of people who play golf	.171	.807	.035	.021
To play a high status sport	005	.753	.001	.036
To meet other golfers	.314	.538	.168	.259
To be with business colleagues	.024	.450	.089	.173
To be with my spouse	.120	.017	.823	106
To share the golf experiencewith other family members	.102	.143	.815	.109
To practice and develop mygolf skills	.167	.106	.064	.825
To play a competitive sport	.023	.401	103	.644
Reliability coefficient (alphas)	.76	.65	.62	.56
Eigenvalue	3.65	1.76	1.38	1.05
% of variance explained	26.1	12.6	9.8	7.5
Cumulative variance explained	26.1	38.7	48.5	56.0

relaxing," "To be outdoors," "To be in a natural area," "To have fun," "To get exercise," "To be with adult friends") and explained 26.1% of the variance. The second factor "status" had four variables loading on it ("To play a high-status sport," "To be around the type of people who play golf," "To meet other golfers," "To be with business colleagues") and explained 12.6% of the variance. The third factor "family" had two variables loading on it ("To be with my spouse," "To share the golf experience with other family members") and explained 9.8% of the variance. The final factor "compete" had two variables loading on it ("To play a competitive sport," To practice and develop my golf skills") and explained 7.5% of the variance.

Research has stated that alpha coefficients for scales with few items (6 or less) can be much smaller (.60 or higher) than scales with more items, and still be acceptable (Cortina, 1993). Further, it has been suggested that scales with only 2 items can be even smaller (.50) and still be acceptable (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Thus, all four scales were deemed to have an acceptable degree of reliability, as indicated by Cronbach's alpha scores ranging from .76 (6 item scale) to .56 (2 item scale) (Table 1).

In order to examine whether or not the individuals comprising the EUH categories differ in their motivations to play golf, multivariate analysis of variance was used (MANOVA). A significant ($F_{4,\ 1057}=7,206.8\ p<.001$) multi-variate effect of motivations was found which explained 96.5% of the variance (Wilks' Lambda = .035). Follow-up One-way ANOVA's were utilized to examine differences in factor motivations. Significant differences were found between groups for "leisure" ($F=2.7,\ p=.019$), "status" ($F=3.7,\ p=.003$) and "compete" ($F=12.6,\ p<.001$).

Post hoc analysis was done with Tukey's HSD t-tests. Tukey's HSD was chosen because it controls for different error rates between groups, while allowing for groups of different sizes. Further, Tukey's HSD was chosen because it is moderately conservative. According to Ott (1993), Tukey's is more conservative than Fisher's least significant difference test and Student-Newman-Keuls procedure, yet less conservative then Scheffe's method for multiple comparison.

Results found that Locals (mean = 2.80) were significantly (p < .05) more likely to be motived by leisure than both Collectors (mean = 2.58) and Loyal-Infrequents (mean = 2.63). It was also found that Visitors (mean = 1.13) were significantly (p < .05) more likely to be motived by status that both Infrequents (mean = .87) and Loyal-Infrequents (mean = .91). Further, Visitors (mean = 2.95) and Collectors (mean = 2.8) were found to be significantly (p < .05) more motivated by competition than Loyal-Infrequents (mean = 2.4), Locals (mean = 2.5) and Infrequents (mean = 2.5) (Table 2).

MANOVA was also employed to examine how individuals comprising the EUH categories differed in their perceptions of constraints to playing golf as often as they would like. Nine constraints were measured on a scale from 0 "not a barrier" to 4 "an extreme barrier." A significant ($F_{10,746} = .486$, p < .001) multivariate effect of constraints was found which explained

Veterans

	Leisure	Status	Compete
EUH Category	Means ¹	Means ¹	Means ¹
Infrequents	2.66	0.87^{B}	2.50^{B}
Loyal Infrequents	2.63^{B}	0.91^{B}	2.40^{B}
Collectors	2.58^{B}	0.98	2.80^{A}
Locals	2.80^{A}	1.11	2.50^{B}
Visitors	2.67	1.13^{A}	2.95^{A}
Veterans	2.69	1.06	2.85^{A}

Table 2
Analysis of Variance Results for EUH Categories by Motivation Factors

Green Fees Tee-Time Lack of Cost **Availability** Time **EUH Category** Means1 Means1 Means Infrequents 1.29 0.64^{B} 2.20 Loyal Infrequents 1.26^{B} 0.80^{B} 2.32^A Collectors 1.76^{A} 0.95^{B} 2.10 Locals 1.13^{B} 0.70^{B} 1.97 1.88^{B} 1.27^{A} Visitors 1.57

 0.94^{B}

2.13

Table 3

Analysis of Variance Results for EUH Categories by Constraints

1.33

86.7% of the variance (Wilk's Lambda = .133). One-way ANOVA's revealed significant differences between groups for "green fees cost" (F=4.1, p < .001), "tee-time availability" (F=5.82, p < .001), and "lack of time" (F=2.44, p=.033). No differences were found for "work responsibilities," "family responsibilities," "lawn responsibilities," "equipment costs," "finding a partner" and "poor health."

Post hoc analysis was done with Tukey's t-tests. Results revealed that Collectors (mean = 1.76) were significantly (p < .05) more likely to be constrained by "green fees costs" than both Locals (mean = 1.13) and Loyal-Infrequents (mean = 1.26). It was also found that Visitors were significantly (p < .05), more likely to be constrained by "tee time availability" than all other groups; Infrequents (mean = .64), Locals (mean = .7), Loyal-Infrequents (mean = .8), Veterans (mean = .94) and Collectors (mean = .95). Further, Loyal-Infrequents (mean = 2.32) were found to be significantly

 $^{^{1}0}$ = not important to 4 = extremely important means with different letters (vertically) are significantly different at the p < .05 level tukey's post hoc test was used

 $^{^{1}0}$ = not a barrier to 4 = an extreme barrier means with different letters (vertically) are significantly different at the p < .05 level tukey's post hoc test was used

(p < .05) more constrained by "lack of time to play" than Visitors (mean = 1.88) (Table 3).

Discussion

Since the identification of differences among recreation participants has been a major goal of leisure research (Wellman, Roggenbuck & Smith, 1982) it is believed that results of the current study will be useful to leisure researchers and golf course managers. Results showed that EUH can be very useful in segmenting golfers into distinct, homogeneous groups. While the segments derived were similar to past research (Schreyer et al., 1984), it was found that unique segments exist within a golf setting. This finding is of importance to golf course management, as EUH segments can be defined with the simple use of existing data (from registration sheets), and a couple simple questions (frequency of play and number of courses played).

Further, the motivations to play golf were found to be uniquely different by groups. The current study suggests that Locals are more likely to be motivated by leisure than Collectors and Loyal-Infrequents. This suggests that advertisements in local mediums may be more successful if they are based on the leisure aspects of golf (e.g. to relax and get away), while broad based marketing may be less successful utilizing this strategy.

Also, Visitors appear to be motivated by status more than Infrequents and Loyal-Infrequents. This implies that golfers that play infrequently may be intimidated by promotions utilizing "status" as a marketing push. Conversely, those players with high total experience on other courses, but few experiences on the study course (Visitors), may be drawn to play with advertisements or tournaments which stress being around other "golfers" and "status." Thus, marketing efforts which emphasize golf as an elitists sport, should be more effective for Visitors, than for those that play locally, but infrequently.

Results also show that Visitors, Veterans and Collectors are more likely to be motivated by competition while Loyal-Infrequents, Locals and Infrequents are less likely to be motivated by competition. This outcome suggests that golfers who have played more courses are more apt to want a competitive setting in which to play (e.g., tournaments or leagues), while golfers that generally play just at the local course, are less likely to be motivated to play for competitive reasons. This finding suggests that marketing efforts stressing competition will be more successful in enticing more frequent players, while being less enticing for infrequent players.

In regards to constraints, Collectors consider green fees to be a larger barrier to playing as often as they would like than both Locals and Loyal-Infrequents. It appears as if Collectors are shopping around for the best value in a course, while golfers that are most loyal to the local course (Locals and Loyal-Infrequents) are content with the price. Therefore marketing efforts emphasizing lower prices and/or value, should be targeted at Collectors.

Also, Visitors were found to be much more constrained by tee time availability than all other groups. This implies that golfers who play a lot of golf, but little of it at your course, may be more apt to play more frequently if tee-times are easier to obtain. This may be solved by reserving starter times (reserved tee times) for players that call from outside the local area.

Finally, Loyal-Infrequents considered lack of time to play to be a larger barrier to playing as often as they would like than Visitors. This suggests that promotions for weekend or after work play, may aid Loyal-Infrequents in negotiating this constraint. Further, the largest segment in the current study (Visitors) appear to be less constrained by lack of time to play. This group may respond to advertisements for special rates on tee times that generally go unfilled.

Conclusions

The fact that there are many new courses being built annually, while the number of new golfers remains stagnant, is disconcerting. To survive this trend, it has become more important than ever for golf course managers to identity the factors which motivate and constrain golfers from playing the game. Of further importance to golf course management, is that golfers' motivations and constraints may be used to guide marketing strategies by delivering a message which coincides with golfers' experience use histories.

Based on the results of this study, it is believed that EUH has shown its potential as a procedure to segment recreationist, in this case, golfers at a metropolitan park and recreation district's facilities. However, further research is needed that continues to incorporate EUH in the study of the relationship between leisure behavior and attitudes, feelings and motives. It is recommended that future research be conducted on recreationist in other activities, in a variety of recreational environments and settings, and with commercial, nonprofit and public leisure service providers as partners. Also, the range of attitudinal variables that could be examined using EUH is limitless. As a result, further theoretical and conceptual development of the EUH construct is needed. Research is needed that goes beyond the current usage of EUH as a descriptive segmentation tool and focus on hypothesis testing of those cognitive measures that are conceptually related to past leisure behavior. Finally, it is recommended for future study that a conversion study be utilized to identify the success of marketing strategies developed to respond to golfers' motivations and constraints.

Whether the goal is to develop and implement marketing strategies that focus on diversity and equity or to maximize usage and revenues, EUH provides commercial, nonprofit and public sector recreation managers with a conceptually sound technique to segment recreationist on their past experience. Additionally, EUH provides leisure service providers with a frame of reference for better understanding the linkage between an individual's leisure behavior (i.e., usages patterns, familiarity and past experience) and their feelings, preferences, motives and constraints. By improving the understand-

ing of the cognitive systems of the recreationist, leisure service managers can make improved decisions regarding the leisure experience (e.g., benefits sought), resource allocation (e.g., staffing and maintenance), new product development (e.g., type and location of course), pricing policies (e.g., resident versus nonresidents, wealthy versus poor) and facility operations (e.g., hours of operation, reservation systems).

References

- 1998 looming as banner year for golf course construction. (1998, March/April). Golf Market Today, 38 (2), 1-3.
- Backman, S. J. (1991). An investigation of the relationship between activity loyalty and perceived constraints. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23, 332-344.
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78 (1), 98-104.
- Crompton, J. C., & Lamb, C. W. (1986). *Marketing Government and Social Services*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Fodness, D. (1994). Measuring tourist motivation. Annals of Tourism Research, 21, 555-581.
- Gitelson, R. J., & Kerstetter, D. L. (1990). Insights into the repeat vacation phenomenon. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11, 199-217.
- Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism motivation and expectation formation. Annals of Tourism Research, 24 (2), 283-304.
- Graefe, A. R., Ditton, R. B., Roggenbuck, J. W., & Schreyer, R. (1981). Notes on the stability of the factor structure of leisure meanings. *Leisure Sciences*, 4 (1), 51-65.
- Gray, P. (1982). A differential description of golfers on the basis of benefits sought and class variables. (as cited in Crompton, & Lamb, 1993).
- Hamilton-Smith, E. (1987). Four kinds of tourism? Annals of Tourism Research, 14, 332-344.
- Henderson, K. A., Stalnaker, D., & Taylor, G. (1988). The relationship between barriers to recreation and gender-role personality traits for women. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20, 69-80.
- Jackson, E. L. (1988). Leisure constraints: A survey of past research. Leisure Sciences, 10, 203-215.
- Jackson, E. L. (1994). Activity-specific constraints on leisure participation. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 12 (2), 33-49.
- Jackson, E. L., Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1993). Negotiation of leisure constraints. Leisure Sciences, 15 (1), 1-11.
- Jackson, E. L., & Rucks, V. C. (1995). Negotiation of leisure constraints by junior-high and highschool students: An exploratory study. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27 (1), 85-105.
- Kotler, P., Bowen, J., & Makens, J. (1996). Marketing for Hospitality and Tourism. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Loundsbury, J. W., & Polik, J. R. (1992). Leisure needs and vacation satisfaction. Leisure Sciences, 14, 105-119.
- Manfredo, M. J., Driver, B. L., & Brown, P. J. (1983). A test of concepts inherent in experience based setting management for outdoor recreation areas. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 15, 263-983
- Manfredo, M. J., Driver, B. L., & Tarrant, M. A. (1996). Measuring leisure motivation: A metaanalysis of the recreation experience preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28 (3), 188-913
- McCarville, R. E., & Smale, B. (1993). Perceived constraints to leisure participation within five activity domains. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 11 (2), 40-59.
- McGuire, F. A., & O'Leary, J. T. (1992). The implications of leisure constraint research for the delivery of leisure services. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 10 (2), 31-40.

- National Golf Foundation (1998). The Growth of United States Golf [Brochure]. Jupiter, FL.
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). Psychometric Theory (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ott, R. L. (1993). An introduction to statistical methods and data analysis (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Inc.
- Petrick, J. F., Backman, S. J., & Bixler, R. D. (1998). An investigation of selected factors on golfer attachment. Visions in Leisure and Business, 17 (1), 4-10.
- PGA of America (1996). All about Golf II: A Research Study Profiling the Golfer as a Consumer.
- Prentice, R. (1993). Motivations of the heritage consumer in the leisure market: An application of the Manning-Haas demand heirarchy. *Leisure Sciences*, 15 (4), 273-290.
- Samdahl, D. H., & Jekubovich, N. J. (1993). Constraints and Constraint Negotiation in Common Daily Living. Paper presented at the Seventh Canadian Congress on Leisure Research, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Samdahl, D. H., & Jekubovich, N. J. (1997). A critique of leisure constraints: Comparative analysis and understandings. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 29 (4), 430-452.
- Schreyer, R., & Bealieu, J. (1986). Attribute preferences for wildland recreation settings. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 18, 231-247.
- Schreyer, R., Lime, D. W., & Williams, D. R. (1984). Characterizing the influence of past experience on recreation behavior. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 16 (1), 34-50.
- Shinew, K. J. (1993). The attractiveness and effectiveness of organizational reward options. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Clemson University, Clemson, SC.
- Staurowsky, E. J., Parkhouse, B., & Sachs, M. (1996). Developing an instrument to measure athletic donor behavior and motivation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 262-277.
- Toy, D., Rager, R., & Guadagnolo, F. (1989). Using hybrid conjoint analysis in strategic marketing of recreation and leisure studies. Proceedings of the NRPA Leisure Research Symposium (p. 42). San Antonio, Texas.
- Virden, R. J. (1992). Integrating past experience into leisure marketing strategies. Leisure Information Quarterly, 16 (1), 6-8.
- Ward, L. W., & Russell, J. A. (1981). The psychological representation of molar physical environment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 110 (2), 121-152.
- Wellman, J. D., Roggenbuck, J. W., & Smith, A. C. (1982). Recreation specialization and norms of depreciative behavior among canoeists. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 14 (4), 323-340.
- Williams, D. R., Schreyer, R., & Knopf, R. C. (1990). The effect of the experience use history on the multidimensional structure of motivations to participate in leisure activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23, 36-54.
- Wright, B., & Goodale, T. (1991). Beyond nonparticipation: Validation of interest and frequency of participation categories in constraints research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23, 314-331.