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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine (1) the relationship between participation
motivation and psychological well-being and (2) the relationship between participation
motivation and subjective well-being. Data were collected from 485 golf participants in South
Korea at golf ranges, private sports clubs, and golf country clubs. The results revealed that
participation motivation positively influenced psychological and subjective well-being. Two
intrinsic motivation factors (to experience stimulation and toward accomplishments) and one
extrinsic motivation factor (introjected regulation) were found to have a significant positive
relationship with psychological well-being. Also, two intrinsic motivation factors (to experience
stimulation and toward accomplishments) and one extrinsic motivation (external regulation) were
found to have a significant positive relationship with subjective well-being. Amotivation had no
significant impact on subjective well-being. Limitations and both theoretical and practical
implication of the findings are discussed. In addition, suggestions for future research are
presented.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Over the past few decades, the popularity of golf has continued to grow in many countries and it has become one of most popular leisure activities (Golf 20/20, 2011). As a result, the golf industry has become a major contributor to the U.S. economy and to the economic energy of individual states. Although the U.S. golf economy produced $68.6 billion of goods and services in the year 2011, this represented an overall decline of 19.4% from 2005, when the estimated size of the golf economy was $75.9 billion (Golf 20/20, 2011).

The golf industry in South Korea has also experienced significant growth over the past decade. This increase in popularity of the sport may be due to an increase in available leisure time, personal income, and health consciousness of South Koreans (Kim & Lough, 2007; Korea Golf Business Association, 2006; Lee & Lee, 2007). Although employees in South Korea traditionally have worked a six-day work week, recent changes in government policies have led to implementing a five-day work week for medium-income workers. The shorter work week allows more leisure time and therefore, according to many scholars, has resulted in increased interest in the sport and leisure industry in South Korea (Kim & Lough, 2007).

Furthermore, the increase in popularity of golf in South Korea can also be attributed to the success of golfers such as Seri Park and K. J. Choi over a decade ago. The success of many Korean golfers in competitions around the world, the image of golf as a sport only for the upper social class has slowly been replaced by the image of a public sport that can be enjoyed by
different market segments. As a result, the golf industry in Korea has experienced rapid growth (Cho, Lee, & Chon, 2003).

Despite the increases in golf popularity and participation, Koreans who want to play golf must pay high fees just to have access to a golf course (Kim, 2003). South Korea has a limited number of golf courses, and this has resulted in high green fees, as well as the difficulty in scheduling tee times. Green fees of public golf courses in Korea are much higher than those in the United States. On average, weekday fees in Korea are $120 (without cart and caddie), increasing to $165 on weekends. It has been reported by ABC News that Korean golfers spend an average of $300 per round. These fees are extremely high compared with the U.S. fees of about $36 - $40 (Park, 2010).

Nevertheless, golf is one of the most preferred participation sports especially among working men in Korea. More than 60% of them desire to play golf when they have extra money and time (Moon, 2001). The increased interest and participation in golf has created a Korean golf industry worth over $3 billion dollars (Golf Industry, 2007). As the business environment in the golf industry has become more competitive, managers of golf courses recognized the importance of developing effective marketing strategies, particularly for emerging niche markets (National Golf Foundation, 2004).

As a result of the exorbitant green fees and burdensome travel times to play on traditional, physical golf courses, golf-simulator cafés (called screen golf café) have become extremely popular among Korean golfers for reasons such as practice, socialization, and fun (Fields, 2010). Moon (2008) reported that approximately 300,000 Korean citizens play screen golf, which, according to Jung, Park, Kang, Lee, and Hahn (2010), results in a billion-dollar sport industry in
Korea. The popularity of screen golf is evidenced by the fact that there are about 5,000 screen golf outlets compared to only 175 physical golf courses in Korea (Deutsche Presse-Agentur, 2009).

Interest among sport marketing scholars, has also grown due to the continued increase in golf expenditures and the economic impact of the golf industry (Ahn & Lee, 2005), lifestyles of golf participants (Lim & Nam, 2007), and golf skills (Oh & Oh, 2002). However, few studies (e.g., Ahn, 2003; Connelly, 1999; Kim, 2003) have been conducted to address Korean golfers’ motivation toward participating in golf (Park & Lee, 2006).

Previous sport marketing studies have examined various factors influencing sport consumption behaviors. Studies such as Trail and James (2001) and Wann (1995) identified spectator motivation as an influential variable. Byon, Cottingham and Carroll (2010) reported that previous research has consistently found that motivation is one of the most salient factors influencing sport consumption behaviors.

Numerous scholars have attempted to define motivation, including Bayton (1958, p.282) who explained that motivation refers to “the drives, urges, wishes, or desires which initiate the sequence of events known as ‘behavior’.” Kim, Byon, Yu, Zhang, and Kim (2013) reported that considerable research (e.g., Andrew Kim, O’Neal, Greenwell, & James, 2009; Funk Beaton & Alexandris, 2012; Funk, Filo, Beaton, & Pritchard, 2009; Mahony, Nakazawa, Funk, James, & Gladden, 2002; Pease & Zhang, 2001; Zhang et al., 1997) has been conducted on the relationship between sport consumer motivation and various sport consumption behaviors and outcomes such as revisit and repurchasing intention. In addition, Wann and his colleagues have identified psychological well-being, which is defined as optimal functioning and experience as a significant
outcome variable of spectator and participant motivation (Wann & Pierce, 2005; Wann & Martin, 2011; Wann & Runyon, 2011). In sport participation literature, Charbonneau, Barling, and Kelloway (2001) found that well-being was one of the most salient reasons people participate in leisure activities, demonstrating that participation in structured exercise can improve well-being. Previous research, limited as it may be has suggested the better understanding of well-being and its determinants is imperative agenda to promote participation sport.

Two distinct views of well-being have been addressed by the previous studies: hedonism and eudaimonism (Kahneman et al., 1999; Ryan & Deci, 2001). The hedonic view, which has also been described as Subjective Well-being (SWB), is associated with pleasure and happiness (Kahneman et al. 1999; Ryan and Deci 2001). In contrast, the eudaimonic view, also described as Psychological Well-being (PWB), associates well-being with actualizing human potential, with a focus on life challenges, specifically meaning and self-realization (Ryan & Deci, 2001).

Statement of Problem

Despite the importance of participation motivation and well-being, studies focusing on the relationship between participation motivation and well-being have been limited. Over the last few decades, some theoretical and empirical research on psychological well-being (PWB) has been conducted to investigate intrinsic motivation; however, few studies have focused specifically on the effects of individual motives and both PWB and subjective well-being (SWB). Therefore, this study attempted to fill this gap in the literature by examining participation motivation variables related to well-being (PWB and SWB), thereby contributing to a better understanding of golfers’ psychological reasoning that may in turn affect their participation.
The extant literature has shown a relationship between physical activity and lower levels of depression and negative mood (Ruuskanen & Ruoppila, 1995; Engels, Drouin, Ahu, & Kazmierski, 1998), enhanced levels of life satisfaction (Mihalko & McAuley, 1996), increased self-efficacy (Deforche & Bourdeaudhuij, 2000), enhanced positive mood states (Arent, Landers, & Etnier, 2000), and increased SWB (McAuley, Blissmer, Katula, & Duncan, 2000).

The evidence provided by these studies supporting these established relationships may explain why it is important to investigate the relationship between participation motivation and well-being. Given the growing interest in the sport of golf, there is a need for further research on the relationships among participation motivation and well-being of sport consumers, specifically golf participants. In the sport marketing literature, little is known about what triggers golfers (Korean) to feel happy when participating in the sport. Given that the size of the sport participation industry is much larger than that of the spectator sport industry, more studies are needed to explore participation motivation.

**Purpose of this Study**

In light of the changing demographics and the increasing importance of the golf consumer to sport marketing, the current study attempted to identify whether the participation motivation of consumers may affect their well-being—more specifically, psychological well-being and subjective well-being.

More specifically, this study was designed to examine (1) the relationship between participation motivation and psychological well-being, and (2) the relationship between participation motivation and subjective well-being. The following overall research question
guided this study: How does participation motivation affect the psychological and subjective well-being of golf participants?

As the theoretical framework guiding this study, the Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000) was employed to investigate the relationship between participation motivation and well-being. Ryan, Kuhl, and Deci (1997) described SDT as an approach to human motivation and personality employing traditional empirical methods as well as organismic meta-theory that emphasizes the importance of individuals’ inner resources for personality development and behavioral self-regulation.

Self-determination theory (SDT) distinguishes three motivation levels (i.e., intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation). By more closely examining the effect of each of these three levels of motivation, this study provides the theoretical implication that participation motivation directly impacts participants’ well-being. It has been suggested that individuals participate in sport for reasons that can be organized along a continuum of self-determined behavior (Deci & Ryan, 1985). In addition, this study has practical implications for sport marketers. Specifically, a better understanding of the relationship between motivation and the participants’ PWB and SWB can benefit sport marketers in developing more effective strategies for golf participants. The following section is a review of relevant literatures and also includes detailed explanations of concepts, variables, and the theoretical foundation of this study. Hypotheses and the proposed model were presented as well.
Chapter 2

Review of Literature

This section presents a review of the literature on participation motivation and well-being. Definitions and clarification of each variable are included. Furthermore, relevant theories are discussed, including Maslow’s (1943) Need Hierarchy Theory and Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Based on this literature review, hypotheses were developed and the model for this study was presented.

Self-Determination Theory

Deci and Ryan (1985) developed SDT to differentiate between types of motivation based on various reasons or goals responsible for a certain action. Two types of motivation, intrinsic and extrinsic, are the most basic distinctions. Considerable research has demonstrated that the quality of experience and performance can vary dramatically depending on whether an individual is motivated by intrinsic or extrinsic reasons (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

More specifically, individuals who feel competent, autonomous, and related to others are more likely to be intrinsically motivated. Individuals feel competent when they feel efficacious and able to achieve success, while they feel autonomous when they are able to make choices, voice their own views, and act accordingly. Perceived relatedness describes the feeling of being securely connected and cared about as well as understood by others. Ryan and Deci (2000) further explained SDT with the example that the atmosphere developed by a coach has an
important impact on athletes’ intrinsic interest in the sports activity through influencing the satisfaction of their needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness.

A diary-based study conducted by Gagne, Ryan, and Bargmann (2003) found that changes in daily satisfaction of competence, autonomy, and relatedness predicted such changes in well-being as subjective vitality, self-esteem, and positive affect. Stebbings, Taylor, and Spray (2011) indicated that coaches’ psychological well-being could be positively predicted by satisfaction of their basic psychological needs of autonomy and competence but not relatedness. Several studies have shown that autonomy support influences motivation through satisfaction of the fundamental psychological needs including the need for relatedness, autonomy, and competence; people in all cultures seek to satisfy these needs to achieve healthy development and well-being (Deci, 1996; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Vallerand, 1997).

SDT has been employed in various studies (e.g., Goldstein & Iso-Ahola, 2008) as a theoretical framework to support the view that people are motivated differently for given context and can be intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated, or amotivated (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000; Vallerand, 1997). In their motivation research incorporating SDT, Vallerand and Losier (1999) explained that social factors affect psychological mediators, and these mediators influence motivation and behavioral outcomes.

A study by Funk, Beaton, and Alexandris (2012), guided by SDT, investigated how autonomy control orientations influencing sport event attendance, sport media use, and purchase of licensed sport products are utilized by sport consumers to regulate individual motives that explain a wide range of sport consumer behaviors. Their results provide evidence of the benefit
of applying SDT, one of the most commonly used motivational theories, to explicate the ‘‘why’’ of sport consumer behavior (Funk, Beaton, & Alexandris, 2012).

**Motivation**

Bayton (1958) defined motivation as “the drives, urges, wishes, or desires which initiate the sequence of events known as ‘behavior’ (p. 282).” Alderson (1955) distinguished motivation as being either a conscious experience or subconscious condition, influencing an individual’s behavior and social conduct. According to Alderson (1955), the purpose of studying consumer motivation is to investigate how past behavior influences current decision-making. Similarly and more recently, Evans, Jamal, and Foxall (2009) explained that motivation is the driving force behind an individual’s actions.

One of the most popular motivation theories is Maslow’s (1943) Needs Hierarchy Theory. This theory includes five categories of five basic human needs, in order of importance to the individual: physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization. According to Maslow (1943), individuals may work their way through this hierarchy as they satisfy their needs. In the sport literature, these basic needs, except safety needs, have been demonstrated to be motivating factors for sport participation (McDonald, Milne, & Hong, 2002).

A great deal of effort has been made over the last three decades to understand participation motivation, and this has resulted in the development of various scales. Beard and Ragheb (1983) created the Leisure Participation Motivation Scale, which has been utilized by many studies on sports or leisure. This scale includes four dimensions: intellectual need, social need, competence-mastery, and stimulus avoidance. The analysis of recreationists’ motivation 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). Ryan and Deci (2000) explained that motives could range from extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation. Prior to this study, research in this area posited that behavior could be motivated in one of three ways: intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated, or amotivated (Deci, 1975; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1991).

Ryan and Deci (2000) defined intrinsic motivation (IM) as the “tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise one’s capacities, to explore, and to learn” (p.70). Intrinsic motivation leads to enjoyment and better psychological health (Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1993). Individuals who are intrinsically motivated tend to perform the behavior voluntarily without material rewards or external constraints (Deci & Ryan, 1985). In contrast, extrinsic motivation (EM) refers to engaging in various behaviors as a means to an end rather than for their own sake (Deci, 1975). Originally, extrinsic motivation was thought to refer only to non-self-determined behavior, in other words, those behaviors prompted only by external contingencies, such as rewards. However, Deci and Ryan (1985), as well as their colleagues (e.g. Ryan, Connell, & Grolnick, 1990), have asserted that different kinds of extrinsic motivation can be ordered on a self-determination continuum. Amotivated individuals are neither intrinsically nor extrinsically motivated. These individuals do not perceive contingencies between their behavior and the outcomes of such behavior, which results in their experiencing feelings of incompetence and lack of control (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Although some previous studies (e.g., Deci, 1980; Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992) employed a uni-dimensional approach to examining intrinsic motivation, other studies (e.g., Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, Tuson, Briere, & Blais, 1995;Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992) used a
multi-dimensional perspective and have described three sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are intrinsic motivation to know (i.e., engaging in sport activity to experience pleasure while trying to understand new skills), intrinsic motivation towards achievement and/or accomplishment (i.e., participating in sport activity for the satisfaction, fun and pleasure while attempting task mastery or making something new), and intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation (i.e., being involved in sports to experience fun, excitement, aesthetic pleasure, and stimulation (Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, Tuson, Briere, & Blais, 1995).

In addition, Deci and Ryan (2000) proposed three sub-dimensions to describe regulation of extrinsic motivation: external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation. External regulation is considered the lowest level of extrinsic motivation, next to amotivation (Bryan & Solmon, 2007). Participating in sport activity just to avoid punishment or to gain a reward is engaging in lower levels of external regulation (Standage, Treasure, Duda, & Prusak, 2003); in other words, if the desired outcome is removed, the individual will most likely not participate in the physical activity (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Individuals at this introjected regulation level often participate in sport due to feelings of obligation, guilt, or coercion (Bryan & Solmon, 2007). Ego involvement, according to Ryan and Deci (2000), is a basic form of introjected regulation. Identified regulation is the “threshold of autonomy,” based on Whitehead and Corbin’s (1991) definition. This refers to participation in an activity because individuals want to do so and not because they have to. In other words, the physical activity is considered to have relevance to their purposes, which indicates a greater level of external regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000).
Amotivation, the absence of motivation, is characterized by the belief that sport participation is not valuable and success is not possible (Standage Treasure, Duda, & Prusak 2003, Ryan 1995). In addition, it has been noted by some researchers that amotivated individuals are not encouraged to participate in physical activity or exercise (Biddle, 1999). As explained by Bandura (1986), amotivated individuals participate in sport activity with feelings of incompetence. In fact, amotivation is thought to be similar to learned helplessness (Seligman, 1975).

**Sport Participation Motivation**

Martens (1970) provided the initial investigation of participation motives in a sport setting to determine “the effect of affiliation and task motivation on the success and satisfaction of college intramural basketball teams” (p. 510). To be motivated to participate in physical activity, individuals must not only be interested in a physical activity but also perceive themselves to be capable of achieving success in the physical activity (Sonstroem, 1978).

According to Shank (1990), it is important for sport marketers to understand what motivates consumers to participate in sports as well as benefits they receive from their participation. Researchers have investigated more than 100 motivational factors explaining why consumers participate in sport (Ko, Park, & Claussen, 2008).

McDonald, Milne, and Hong (2002) investigated 13 motivation constructs (i.e., physical fitness, risk taking, stress reduction, aggression, affiliation, social facilitation, self-esteem, competition, achievement, skill mastery, aesthetics, value development and self-actualization) for participants in nine popular sports (i.e., baseball, basketball, bowling fishing, football, golf, softball, tennis and volleyball) in the U.S. The results of this study showed a significant
difference among the sport participants on 11 of the 13 motivational factors, with the exceptions being achievement and self-esteem.

Other previous studies have focused on different motivational factors. For example, in a study examining participation in risky sports, Shoham (1998) found that seeking thrill and adventure is the major motivational factor for participants in some risky sports such as hang gliding, parachuting, and skydiving. It has also been demonstrated that people participate in high-risk sports to escape from the routine of daily life (Celsi, Rose, & Leigh, 1993).

In a segmentation study conducted by Rohm, Milne, and McDonald (2006), participation motives were employed as a base to segment recreational runners. The subjects were subscribers to Runner’s World magazine. Based on the open-ended responses of the participants, running motives were categorized as follows: addiction, fitness, competition, self-esteem, mental health, weight control, social reason, spiritual, it’s who I am, and goal striving. A study by Vlachopoulos, Karageorghis, and Terry (2000) reported that consistent research findings about participation in sport activities indicated that motivation, self-confidence, and success are positively related.

Previous studies have examined participation motivation in relation to a variety of socio-demographic variables, including education level, work environment, and age. For example, Clark (1995) showed that highly educated individuals tend to participate more in physical activity than those with low levels of education. Furthermore, adults who work in a professional environment were shown to be more involved in exercise than those who work in manual labor jobs (Burton & Turrell, 2000).

Previous research has investigated the impact of motivation on physical activity behavior change over time (Fortier, Kowal, Lemyre, & Orpana, 2009; Courneya, Nigg, & Estabrooks,
2000, 2001; Ntoumanis, 2001; Sarrazin, Vallerand, Guillet, Pelletier, & Cury, 2002; Standage, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2003). A study by Brodkin and Weiss (1990) explored the changes in participation motives for swimmers that occur “throughout the lifespan” (p. 261). They proposed that developmental levels of participant affect their motives for participation. Based on their findings, they concluded that “developmental level were delineated as specific age groups that were chosen based upon underlying criteria identified in the literature…” (p. 250). Fortier et al. (2009), integrating both Theory of Planned Behavior and SDT, studied the intentions and actual physical activity behavior change in sample of middle-aged women. The results of their study showed that the relationship between intentions and change in physical activity behavior was modest and that intentions predicted such change only over time. Some studies have examined sport participation motivation with regard to the age of the participants. As described by Coakley (1998), youth sports participation in the United States is “an accepted part of growing up” (p. 118). Maehr and Nicholls (1980) found that a high level of ability and the attempt to perform a task as well as possible were the major motives for youth sport participation. The participation motivation of adolescents and children was found to be partially the consequence of several factors, such as family characteristics and parental influences, associated with the specific experiences to which they were exposed (Koivula, 1999).

Previous studies have focused on adult participation in physical activities and have revealed various motivations: personal challenge, a sense of achievement, weight loss, physical fitness, enjoyment, affiliation, and overall health improvement (Kilpatrick, Hebert, & Bartholomew, 2005; Mathes & Battista, 1985; Summers, Machin & Sargent, 1983).
The participation motivation of older individuals has also received the attention of some researchers. Kirkby, Kolt, Habel, and Amans (1999) examined participation motivation factors of physical activity in older Australian individuals. They found that fun, enjoyment, social experiences, and fitness were most important motives for participation. Another study conducted by Kolt, Driver, and Giles (2004) revealed that among older Australians the most important motives for participating in exercise and sport were health, fitness, enjoyment of activity, and relaxation. Paxton, Browning and O’Connell (1997), in their study on the sport participation of older female Australians, found that the most common motives were physical and mental health and socialization.

**Well-being**

Well-being describes an individual’s condition of optimal functioning and experience (Ryan & Deci, 2001). However, optimal functioning has not been precisely explained, resulting in differing conceptions of well-being. Feelings of optimal functioning have been assessed by SDT-based research that utilized subjective vitality as a variable. Ryan and Frederick (1997) explained subjective vitality as an individual’s conscious experience of having energy and aliveness.

Most conceptions of well-being are based on two different philosophies: hedonism and eudaimonism (Kahneman et al. 1999; Ryan & Deci 2001). The hedonic view of well-being associates well-being with pleasure and happiness (Kahneman et al. 1999; Ryan & Deci 2001). In contrast, the eudaimonic view of well-being refers to cultivating personal strengths and contributing to the greater good (Aristotle, trans. 2000), behaving according to one’s inner nature and values (Waterman, 1993), realizing one’s true potential (Ryff & Keyes, 1995), and
experiencing the purpose or meaning of life (Ryff, 1989). These two approaches (hedonic and eudaimonic) have been distinguished further by the extent to which they depend on subjective or objective criteria to determine wellness (McMahan & Estes, 2011). The hedonic and eudaimonic approaches have also distinguished well-being as either psychological or subjective.

**Psychological well-being**

The construct of psychological well-being (PWB) is complex. For the last several decades, various scholars have made efforts to distinguish PWB-related concepts (e.g. Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976; Stull, 1987). For instance, Catolico (1997) proposed categories based on three attributes: affect, ability, and personal perception. PWB was also evaluated by Ryff (1989) from the perspective of psychological happiness, specifically self-acceptance, personal growth, relatedness, autonomy, relationship, environmental mastery, and purpose in life.

Furthermore, the Personally Expressive Activities Questionnaire (PEAQ) Measure, developed by Waterman et al. (2008), employed both eudemonic and hedonic perspectives on happiness. Telfer (1980) maintained that the hedonic and eudaimonic perspectives are not completely independent of each other, thus proposing some particular relationship between the two perspectives.

A multidimensional model of PWB and positive psychological functioning was developed by Ryff (1989). This model consisted of six components that describe an individual’s PWB: Autonomy, Self-acceptance, Environmental Mastery, Purpose in Life, Positive Relationships with Others, and Personal Growth. First, an Autonomous person has an internal locus of control and, based on personal standards, evaluates him/herself. Second, someone with high Self-acceptance has a positive attitude toward him/herself, which most likely will lead to
self-actualization and optimal functioning. Third, an individual who is described as having Environmental Mastery has the ability to deal with complex environments, adapting them to his or her own development. The fourth component is Purpose in Life, which describes an individual whose actions are guided by goals and a sense of direction. An individual with Positive Relationships with Others is capable of exhibiting empathy, affection, and warmth. Finally, one who pursues actualization, growth, and full potential is representative of the sixth component, Personal Growth (Ryff & Singer, 1996).

Subjective Well-being

Related to subjective well-being, Seligman (2003) described the pleasant life domain in his theory of authentic happiness. This theory emphasizes the positive subjective experiences in the past, present, and future. In the past, these experiences include pride, satisfaction, and contentment; in the present, flow and pleasure; and in the future, optimism, hope, and confidence (Seligman, 2003; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

Diener (1984) reported that subjective well-being (SWB) has been explored in relation to one’s cognitive and affective assessment of his or her life. Such examination has broken down SWB into the emotional components Positive Affect (PA) and Negative Affect (NA), and the cognitive component Satisfaction with Life (SWL). An individual with high SWB would typically exhibit high PA, low NA, and high SWL.

Hypotheses Development

The relationship between motivation and well-being. Previous studies have shown a positive correlation between psychological well-being (PWB) and basic needs satisfaction (e.g., Wilson, Rodgers, Fraser, Murray, & McIntyre, 2004; Wilson, Muon, Longley, & Rodgers, 2005),
while others (e.g., Georgiadis, Biddle, & Chatzisarantis, 2001; Wilson & Rodgers, 2002; Standage et al., 2003, 2006) revealed that PWB and autonomous motivation in exercise were positively correlated.

Arunya and John (2005) revealed a significant relationship between higher levels of PWB and successful stress management. Some studies (Chida & Steptoe, 2008; Collins, Glei, & Goldman, 2008; Howell, 2009) found that PWB was significantly associated with a low mortality rate. Chida and Steptoe (2008), using meta-analyses, demonstrated that positive psychological well-being had a favorable effect on the survival of both healthy and diseased populations. A review by Howell (2009) investigated the effect of positive psychological well-being on mortality in 21 studies in healthy populations and 19 studies in people with existing illness. The results showed that positive PWB reduced the risk of mortality in both populations. Compared with the total sample, PWB was found to be more protective in healthy people over 60 years of age. In addition, a study by Andrews (2001) showed a relationship between PWB and increased confidence to face challenges and the ability to find specific ways to respond to life events. Additionally, research has provided evidence supporting a moderate and positive relationship between PWB and gratitude (Wood, Joseph, & Maltby, 2009). In contrast, low PWB was found to be a risk factor for psychiatric illness as well as to have a positive correlation with depression (Wood & Joseph, 2010).

Ferssizidis et al. (2010) investigated how motives and commitment to social values affect the well-being of individuals of different ages. They found that, consistent with Self-Determination Theory, behavior commitment to intrinsically motivating social values was positively related to life satisfaction and positive affect. In the field of psychology, Burton,

Scholars have emphasized the importance of intrinsic motivation in enhancing not only physical but also PWB (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Vallerand & Ratelle, 2002; Waterman, 2005). As previously discussed, intrinsic motivation consists of three factors: intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation, and intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments (Vallerand et al., 1992).

H1: Intrinsic Motivation to participate in golf has a direct positive effect on Well-being.

H1a: Intrinsic motivation to know has a direct positive effect on Psychological Well-being.

H1b: Intrinsic motivation to know has a direct positive effect on Subjective Well-being.

H1c: Intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation has a direct positive effect on Psychological Well-being.

H1d: Intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation has a direct positive effect on Subjective Well-being.

H1e: Intrinsic Motivation toward accomplishment has a direct positive effect on Psychological Well-being.

H1f: Intrinsic Motivation toward accomplishment has a direct positive effect on Subjective Well-being.

Research has shown that behavior commitment to extrinsically motivating values was positively related to negative affect (Ferssizidis, Adams, Kashdan, Plummer, Mishra, & Ciarrochi (2010). Burton, Lydon, D’Alessandro, and Koestner (2006) investigated the
relationship between extrinsic motivation (identified regulation) and PWB, and found that identified regulation had no effect on PWB.

H2: Extrinsic motivation to participate in golf has a direct positive effect on Well-being.

   H2a: External regulation has a direct positive effect on Psychological Well-being.
   H2b: External regulation has a direct positive effect on Subjective Well-being.
   H2c: Introjected regulation has a positive effect on Psychological well-being
   H2d: Introjected regulation has positive effect on Subjective Well-being.
   H2e: Identified regulation has a direct positive effect on Psychological Well-being.
   H2f: Identified regulation has a direct positive effect on Subjective Well-being.

Amotivation has been explained as not valuing an activity (Ryan, 1995), not feeling competent to participate in the activity (Bandura, 1986), or not expecting a desired outcome from participating (Seligman, 1975). In a study conducted by Baker (2004) in the field of psychology, amotivation was shown to have a strong negative effect on well-being.

H3: Amotivation has a negative effect on well-being.

   H3a: Amotivation has a negative effect on Psychological Well-being.
   H3b: Amotivation has a negative effect on Subjective Well-being.

The conceptual framework regarding the relationships among participation motivation, psychological well-being, and subjective well-being was proposed, as presented in Figure 1.
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Methods

Participants

Participants for the current study were selected by the community intercept sampling method, based on the traditional mall intercept sampling method adapted for use in other public places (e.g. movie theaters, sports bars, and shipping centers) in order to find a more representative sample (Brenner, 1996). Using this approach, a total number of 520 questionnaires were distributed at golf practicing ranges or golf country clubs in South Korea. A total number of 35 questionnaires that were incomplete or incorrectly filled in were excluded. Thus, the remaining 485 questionnaires were used for data analyses.

Golf participants of ages 18 and above, and of both genders were recruited. Willing participants were informed of the purpose and the use of the data collected, and then were given a questionnaire to complete in a convenient place.

Instruments

The questionnaire that was used in this study consisted of four sections: (a) demographics and golf-related experience, (b) participation motivation, (c) subjective well-being, and (d) psychological well-being. The instruments for this study were selected based on a comprehensive literature review.
**Demographic questions.** Participants responded to a number of questions to gather demographic information. These questions were related to the participants’ age, gender, marital status, educational background, and annual household income. In addition, participants answered questions related to their golf experience.

**Sport Motivation Scale.** More than 20 scales have been developed to measure sport motivation (Ostrow, 1996). Many of the scales have focused on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, concepts that are fundamental to this proposed study. One of such scales is the Sport Motivation Scale (SMS) (Pelletier, et al., 1995), which was considered to be appropriate for the measurement in this study. As the language of the original scale was French, Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, Tuson, Briere, & Blais (1995), it was later translated into English by Pelletier et al., (1995), who provided of the validity and reliability of the English version of the SMS.

The SMS scale was considered to be an appropriate measure for this study in that the design of this scale is based on self-determination continuum (SDC) developed by Deci and Ryan (1985) and Ryan and Deci (2000). Many sport and recreational studies have utilized the SMS, and most of these studies provided very good results for reliability and validity on the SMS (e.g., Pelletier et al., 1995; Vallerand & Lossier, 1994, 1999; Zahariadis, Tsorbatzoudis, & Grouios, 2005; Nunez, Martin- Albo, Navarro, & Gonzalez, 2006; and Charbonneau, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001).

Regarding the structure of the SMS, the scale is composed of the following seven subscales: amotivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation, intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to accomplish, and intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation. This study employed 21 items of the original 28-item SMS, using a seven-point
Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 7 (“strongly agree”) with the midpoint being 4 (“neutral”) (Pelletier et al., 1995). Nine items measured three types of intrinsic motivation – intrinsic motivation to know (e.g., “for the pleasure of discovering new training techniques”), intrinsic motivation to accomplish things (e.g., “for the satisfaction I experience while I am perfecting my abilities”) and intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation (e.g., “for the pleasure I feel in living exciting experiences”). In addition, nine items measured three constructs of regulation for extrinsic motivation: identified regulation (e.g., “because it is a good way to learn lots of things which could be useful to me in other areas of my life”), introjected regulation (e.g., “because I must do sports to feel good about myself”), and external regulation (e.g., “because it allows me to be well regarded by people that I know”) (Pelletier, 1995).

Amotivation was measured with three items (e.g., “it is not clear to me anymore; I do not really think my place is in sport”).

Well-Being

**Psychological Well-Being Scale.** The Psychological Well-Being scale (PWB; Ryff, 1989) has both long (84 items) and short (18 items) forms. The latter, consisting of 18 items, was used to measure six dimensions of Psychological Well-Being: Autonomy (AU), Environmental Mastery (EM), Personal Growth (PG), Positive Relations with Others (PR), Purpose in Life (PL), and Self-Acceptance (SA). Based on the results of the pilot study, six items were selected for this study. Sample items for each dimension include the following: Autonomy (“I am not afraid to voice my opinions even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people”); Environment Mastery (“I am good at juggling my time so that I can fit everything in that needs to get done”); Personal Growth (“For me, life has been a continuous process of learning,
changing, and growth”); Positive Relations with Others (“I know I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me”); Purpose in Life (“I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself”); and Self-Acceptance (“I like most aspects of my personality”)

This PWB measure rates items on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 7 (“strongly agree”), with higher scores on each of the subscales indicating higher levels of that dimension after reverse scoring particular items.

**Satisfaction with Life Scale.** To assess overall quality of life, this study used the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS). This scale consists of the following five items: “in most ways my life is close to my ideal,” “the conditions of my life are excellent,” “I’m satisfied with my life,” “so far I have gotten the important things I want in life,” “if I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.” This instrument employs a five-item Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 7 (“strongly agree”). Total scores range from 5 (low satisfaction) to 35 (high satisfaction), with higher scores representing higher SWL. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .89.

All scales measuring sport participation motivation, psychological well-being, and subjective well-being are presented in Appendix 1.

**Data Collection Procedures**

As the scales used in this study were originally developed in English, it was necessary to translate the items into Korean. Following the guideline suggested by Brislin (1990), a back translation was performed to ensure translation accuracy as follows: The original scales were first translated into Korean by a native Korean who was fluent in English. Then, to ensure its accuracy and equivalence, the translated version was converted back into English by a scholar.
fluent in both English and Korean. The back translation ensured that there were no discrepancies between the two versions. The scales employed in this study, which were originally developed in English, were translated into Korean, following Brislin’s (1990) suggestions. To confirm the accuracy of translation, a back translation was performed. First, the original scales were translated into Korean and checked for accuracy by the researcher, a university professor, and a doctoral student, all of whom are native Korean speakers who are also fluent in English. Then, the translated version was converted back into English by the aforementioned to ensure its accuracy and equivalence. As indicated by the back-translation procedures, there were no discrepancies between the two versions.

The researcher visited golf courses, golf practice ranges, and private sports clubs in South Korea. Multiple visits to each location resulted in the recruitment of a sufficient number of participants. Permission from management at each location was secured before data collections began.

Golf participants were approached at each location and asked to participate in the survey. The researcher introduced himself and provided the purpose of the survey, the future use of data collected, and the explanation that participation was voluntary and anonymous. Each participant was asked to read and sign the informed consent form before participating in the survey. Participants who agreed to participate were given the questionnaire, which took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. The data collection for this study required the assistance of 10 colleagues, who were given the instructions for data collection. Participants were provided a convenient and comfortable place to respond to the questionnaire, as well as pencil or pen. No identification or notes were written on the collected questionnaires.
Data Analyses

Data analyses for the current study were performed in the following order: descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to determine motivation and PWB groupings, and linear regression analysis to examine the relationship between each of the sport motivation scale factors and PWB and SWB factors. The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS 20) was used for all data analyses.

Descriptive Statistics. To examine the basic characteristics of the data in this study, procedures from the SPSS 20 software package were used to calculate descriptive statistics. These procedures included central tendency (e.g., mean), measures of variability (e.g., standard deviation), and data normality (e.g., skewness and kurtosis).

Psychometric Properties. Psychometric properties were examined to ensure the reliability and validity of the constructs used in the model. The total sample, consisting of 485 participants, was split into two halves. The first data set (n = 145) was employed for the EFA, while the second set (n = 340) was used for the regression analysis. SPSS version 20.0 (SPSS, 2012) procedures were performed to calculate descriptive statistics for demographics, motivation, psychological well-being, and subjective well-being, to conduct EFA, and calculate reliability coefficients. As the factors and items in the scales employed in this study were taken from existing scales, an EFA was performed to examine the factor structure of the Sport Motivation Scale (SMS), Psychological Well-being (PWB), and Subjective Well-being (SWB) EFA was performed to examine the factor structure of the measures. The main purpose of the EFA was to reduce redundant data by identifying unique and reliable simple factor structures that have the potential to be generalized from a sample of variables to a universe of variables.
In the EFA, alpha factoring extraction was utilized as the preferred approach with the intention of enhancing the reliability and generalizability of factors (Kaiser & Caffrey, 1965). The promax rotation approach was applied to identify distinct factors (Hendrikson & White, 1964). This rotation approach was developed through combining the advantages of varimax (orthogonal) and oblique rotation techniques (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999). The factors and their items were determined according to the following criteria: (a) a factor’s eigenvalue should be equal to or greater than 1.0 (Kaiser, 1974), (b) an item’s factor loading should be equal to or greater than .40 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), (c) a factor should have a minimum of 3 items (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006), and (d) an identified factor and retained items must be appropriate for the theoretical context. To determine the number of extracted factors, a scree plot test was also conducted (Cattell, 1966).

**Testing Hypotheses.** The purpose of conducting multiple regression analyses was to test the hypothesized relationships between the independent variable (motivation) and dependent variables (psychological well-being and subjective well-being).

To investigate the relationships between participant motivation factors and well-being factors (PWB and SWB), multiple regression analyses were conducted. The independent variables (IVs) were the seven participant motivation factors, while the dependent variables (DVs) were PWB and SWB.
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Results

This chapter presents the results of the data analyses performed for the current study. Three scales (Sport Motivation Scale, Psychological Well-Being Scale, and Satisfaction with Life Scale) were employed to measure participation motivation and well-being among sport participants who played golf at golf practicing ranges, private sports clubs, or golf country clubs in South Korea. The results are discussed in the following order: (1) descriptive statistics, (2) psychometric properties, and (3) hypothesis testing.

Demographics. Of the 485 respondents participating in this study, 83.7% were male and 16.3% were female. Regarding age, 37.1% of the respondents were 50-59 years of age, and only 1.6% were 20-29 years of age; this sample population reflected the higher proportion of older golf participants at golf ranges and courses in South Korea. Of the total participants, 11.1% were single and 87.8% were married. The sample represented a broad annual household income distribution: 14% above $100,000, 30.3% between $75,000 and $100,000, 27.8% between $50,000 and $74,999, 12.0% between $35,000 and $49,999, and 8.4% below $34,999. Regarding education level, 72.2% of the respondents reported having an undergraduate degree; 12.8%, high school degree; 15.0%, graduate degree. A large proportion (26.8%) of the participants had 7-9 years of golf experience, with only 7.6% having less than 1 year golf experience. Detailed information of respondents’ demographic characteristics is presented in Table 1.
Descriptive statistics

**Motivation.** Descriptive statistics for motivation are listed in Table 2. Utilizing a 7-point Likert scale, the means of all motivation items ranged from 2.55 to 5.53. Standard deviations ranged from 1.05 to 1.69. These scores indicate that most respondents perceived a moderately positive and favorable motivation. The item “For the satisfaction I experience while I am perfecting my abilities” had the highest mean \((M = 5.53; SD = 1.06)\), and the item “Because I must play golf to feel good about myself” had the lowest mean \((M = 2.55; SD = 1.35)\). In addition, absolute values of skewness ranged from .88 to 1.29, and those of kurtosis ranged from -.13 to 2.55.

**Psychological Well-Being.** Descriptive statistics for PWB are presented in Table 3. On the 7-point Likert scale, the means of all 6 items ranged from 4.79 to 5.39, with standard deviations ranging from .99 to 1.14. These scores reflect the overall positive outlook on the PWB of most respondents. The item “For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth” had the highest mean score \((M = 5.39; SD = .99)\), and the item “I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition of most people” had the lowest mean score \((M = 4.87; SD = 1.14)\). Additionally, absolute values of skewness ranged from .20 to .95, and those of kurtosis ranged from .38 to 1.50.

**Subjective Well-Being.** Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics for satisfaction with life. On the 7-point Likert scale, the means of all 5 items ranged from 5.06 to 5.32, and standard deviations ranged from 1.01 to 1.25. These scores reflect that most respondents felt a fairly high level of SWL. The item “So far I have gotten the important things I want in life” had the highest mean score \((M = 5.32; SD = 1.05)\), and the item “I am satisfied with my life” had the lowest
mean score ($M = 5.06; SD = 1.12$). Absolute values of skewness ranged from .30 to 1.10, and those of kurtosis ranged from .24 to 1.45.

**Bi-Variate Correlation.** Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to evaluate the relationship between each motivation factor and PWB and SWB. Significant positive correlations were found for the relationships between each of six factors (intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation, intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments, external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation) and PWB (ranging from $r = -0.89$ to .54, $p < .001$). However, amotivation had no correlation with PWB ($r = -.79, N = 485, p > .05$).

Furthermore, significant positive correlations were found for the relationship between each of six motivation factors (intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation, intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments, external regulation, introjected regulation, and amotivation) and SWB ranging from $r = -.21$ to .47, $N = 485, p < .001$). However, no correlation was found between identified regulation and SWB ($r = .075, p > .05$). Table 5 presents the correlation matrix for this study. Overall, positive correlations were found for the relationship between most motivation factors and PWB and SWB.

**Exploratory Factor Analyses**

An EFA was conducted with the first data set to identify a simple structure among the SMS items. According to Kaiser (1974), the cut-off value for the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure is .70; therefore, the KMO sampling adequacy value in the current study (.796) was considered acceptable. Thus, the sample was determined to be adequate for a factor analysis. The hypothesis of the variance and covariance matrix of the variables as an identity matrix was
rejected, based on a Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (BTS) value of 2381.140 (p < .001). As a result, a factor analysis was considered appropriate. Emerging from the EFA were seven factors with 28 items that met the retention criteria, explaining a total of 77.20% variance among the variables. The scree plot test indicated that the seven-factor model was most interpretable. Table (3) shows the results of the rotated pattern matrix from promax rotation. For the SMS, seven items with the low factor loading (ranging -.739 to .856) were eliminated (i.e., For the pleasure it gives me to know about golf, which I practice, Because I like feeling of being totally immersed in the activity, Because I feel a lot of personal satisfaction while mastering certain difficult training techniques, Because people around me think it is important to be in shape, Because it is absolutely necessary to play golf if one wants to be in shape, Because it is one of the best ways to maintain good relationships with my friends, I often ask myself; I can’t seem to achieve the goals that I set for myself). For the PWB, 12 items were removed due to the low factor loading (ranging -.634 to 668) or having only one or two items loaded on the respective factors (i.e., the demands of everyday life often get me down, I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world, when I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how thing have turned out, I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions, I don’t have a good sense of what it is I am trying to accomplish in life, I feel like I get a lot out of my friendship, for the most part, I am proud of who I am and the life I lead, its’ difficult for me to voice my opinions on controversial matters, some people wander aimlessly through life but I am not one of them, in general, I feel that I continue to learn more about myself as time goes by; I have difficulty arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me).
Final EFA results showed a KMO sampling adequacy value of .753. The Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (BTS) value was 1608.482 (p < .001). Thus, a factor analysis was considered appropriate. Emerging from the EFA were seven factors with 21 items that met the retention criteria, explaining a total of 77.20% variance among the variables.

**Hypothesis testing.**

To investigate the relationships between golf participation motivation and well-being (PWB and SWB), two multiple regression analyses were performed. The Durbin-Watson statistic was evaluated to check assumption of independent errors. Based on Field’s (2009) suggestion values less than 1 or greater than 3 indicate violation of the assumption. The regression model utilized in this study indicated that the assumption was met. For assessment of assumption of multicollinearity, tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) scores were evaluated. According to Menard (1995), a tolerance score less than 0.2 would be indicative of a problem. In addition, based on Bowerman and O’Connell’s (1990) explanation, a VIF score greater than 10 would warrant concern for multicollinearity. For the current PWB model, tolerance statistics ranged from .37 (motivation to know) to .78 (introjected regulation), and VIF values ranged from 1.28 (introjected regulation) to 2.99 (motivation toward stimulation), indicating that all values were well within the suggested criteria. For the SWB model, tolerance statistics ranged from .34 (motivation toward stimulation) to .60 (external regulation), with VIF values ranging from 1.74 (amotivation) to 2.98 (motivation toward stimulation). These values were well within the suggested criteria. Therefore, based on these statistics, multiple regression analyses were considered to be appropriate.
First, regression analysis revealed that golf participation motivation had a significant influence on both PWB, \((F (6, 478) = 43.515, p < .001, R^2 = .345)\) and SWB \((F(6, 478) = 28.618, p < .001, R^2 = .255)\). As proposed in hypothesis 1a, intrinsic motivation to know was expected to positively influence PWB. This hypothesis was not supported by the regression results showing that intrinsic motivation had no significant influence on PWB \((\beta = .097, p > .05)\).

Although hypothesis 1b predicted that intrinsic motivation to know would have a positive effect on SWB, no significant effect was found, thus providing no support for this hypothesis \((\beta = -.086, p > .05)\). Hypothesis 1c predicted that intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation would have a positive influence on PWB. Supporting this hypothesis, the results indicated that the influence of intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation had a significant impact on PWB \((\beta = .246, p < .001)\). As hypothesis 1d predicted, intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation had a significant positive effect on SWB \((\beta = .134, p < .05)\). The results supported hypothesis 1e that the influence of intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments on PWB was significant \((\beta = .178, p < .01)\). It was predicted in hypothesis in 1f that intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments would have a positive effect on SWB. The results revealed a significant positive effect, therefore supporting H1f \((\beta = .138, p < .05)\). Hypothesis 2a predicted that external regulation had a positive effect on PWB. However, this hypothesis was not supported, as external regulation was shown to have no significant effect on PWB \((\beta = .041, p > .05)\). Hypothesis 2b proposed that external regulation would positively affect SWB. The results supported this hypothesis by showing a significant positive relationship between external regulation and SWB \((\beta = .345, p < .001)\). Hypothesis 2d proposed that introjected regulation had a significantly positive effect on SWB \((\beta = -.070, p < .05)\). However, the results revealed no significant relationship \((\beta = .315, p \)
Hypothesis 2e predicted that identified regulation would positively influence PWB, and this was supported by the results ($\beta = .192, p < .001$). Hypothesis 3 predicted that amotivation would have a negative effect on SWB; however, the results indicated no significant relationship ($\beta = -.071, p > .05$).
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Discussion

The purpose of this study was to identify whether the participation motivation of golf participants may affect their well-being—more specifically, SWB and PWB. This research was designed to examine the theoretical and empirical evidence on the structural relationships between motivation and well-being. This study investigated seven motivation factors: intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation, intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments, external regulation, intronjected regulation, identified regulation, and amotivation. This chapter consists of four sections: (a) summary of findings, (b) implications, and (c) limitations and future research.

Summary of Findings

The current study utilized Self-Determination Theory (SDT) as a theoretical framework to support that people are motivated differently for given context and can be intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated, or amotivated (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000; Vallerand, 1997). The Sport Motivation Scale (SMS) was employed in this study to measure intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation.

Three sub-dimensions of intrinsic motivation were examined – intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation, and intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments. Of the three intrinsic motivation factors, intrinsic motivation to know was reported in a previous study (Baker, 2004) to have a significant positive relationship with well-
being, as postulated in this study. However, inconsistent with this hypothesis, the findings revealed that psychological well-being and subjective well-being were not influenced by intrinsic motivation to know. This finding may be explained by the fact that the majority of golf participants in this study had more than three years of golf experience. As intrinsic motivation to know refers to the constructs of exploration, curiosity, and learning goals (Pelletier et al., 1995), it would be expected that the well-being of experienced golf participants would not be influenced by intrinsic motivation to know.

Furthermore, the high green fees limit the opportunity for many Koreans to participate in golf. Therefore, this culture-specific fact may explain the lack of curiosity and motivation to learn about golf in Korea. A previous study conducted with Korean students in the United States reported that intrinsic motivation had a significant positive effect on level of golf participation (cite). However, in Korea participation is not only limited by expensive fees but also by the fact that access to golf courses is mostly restricted to members of private golf clubs.

Furthermore, the lack of significant of intrinsic motivation to know, as reported in this study, could be explained by the cultural climate in Korea. Being a collectivistic culture, Korea is characterized by status-oriented attitudes and behaviors, which may be one of the most influential factors on Korean golf participation. Individuals in collectivistic cultures generally have the desire to maintain social status and reputation in order to receive praise from others. Thus, Koreans consider golf participation as a status symbol.

On the other hand, both intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation and intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments were shown to have a significant positive effect on PWB and SWB. These findings supported H1c, H1d, H1e, and H1f proposed in this study. Evidence of
this positive relationship has also been provided by previous studies, such as Sheldon and Kasser (1998) and Kasser and Ryan (2001), who found that such intrinsic motives as personal growth and community contribution enhance well-being.

Three sub-dimensions of extrinsic motivation were also investigated – external regulation, introjected regulation, and identified regulation. Findings varied as to the effects of extrinsic motivation on PWB and SWB. In contrast to H2a, which postulated that a positive relationship existed between external regulation and PWB, the results of this study indicated no significant relationship. This finding was in agreement with that of Deci and Ryan (1985). On the other hand, both introjected regulation and identified regulation were shown to have a significant positive effect on PWB, thus providing support for H2c and H2e. This finding disagrees with the results of a study conducted in the U.S. (Baker, 2004), which demonstrated that extrinsic motivation had no significant impact on well-being. As previously discussed, this difference could be explained, at least in part, by culture differences that are representative of collectivistic societies such as Korea.

The current study revealed a significant positive effect of external regulation on SWB, thus supporting H2b. Previous studies such as Vallerand (1997) also provided evidence of the significant positive relationship between external regulation and well-being. In contrast to H2d, introjected regulation was found to have no significant influence on SWB. Therefore, H2d was not supported. This finding was in agreement with previous research revealing that extrinsically motivated values had no effect on well-being (Ferssizidis, Adams, Kashdan, Plummer, Mishra & Ciarrochi, 2010).
Amotivation would be expected to have negative consequences in that the participants are neither intrinsically nor extrinsically motivated to participate in sports activities such as golf (Fortier, Vallerand, Briere, & Provencher, 1995). In fact, Fortier et al (1995) reported that individuals who are amotivated are likely to drop out of such activities. As expected and hypothesized in the current study, amotivation was found to have a negative effect, though not significant, on the SWB of golf participants. This finding can be explained by the understanding that amotivation is the result of not valuing an activity (Ryan, 1995), or lacking a feeling of competence to do it (Deci, 1975), or not believing that an activity will produce desired outcome (Seligman, 1975).

Theoretical Implications

A theoretical implication from the findings of this study is that participation motivation has a direct effect on participants’ well-being. Deci and Ryan (1985) suggested that individuals choose to participate in sport for reasons that can be organized along a continuum of self-determined behavior. Self-determination theory (SDT) distinguishes three motivation levels (i.e., intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation).

The findings of the current study have implications for SDT research by more closely examining the effect of each of the three levels of motivation on well-being – more specifically, PWB and SWB. Of the seven motivation factors examined in this study, certain factors were shown to have a significant positive effect on either PWB or SWB. These factors can be considered as important influences on an individual’s decision to participate in golf, therefore advancing the knowledge of the impact of sport participation motivation on well-being. Furthermore, this study contributes to a more comprehensive framework and contributes to the
literature by examining individual motives that may lead to golf participation, which may in turn impact the participant’s well-being.

**Practical Implications**

This study also has practical implications for sport marketers. Generally, the findings can enhance sport marketers’ understanding of the relationship between motivation and well-being. Being more aware of these relationships can benefit sport marketers in developing more effective strategies targeting golf participants. More importantly, the findings reveal the following significant positive effects on PWB and SWB: intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation, intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments, introjected regulation, and identified regulation – PWB; intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation, intrinsic motivation toward accomplishments and external regulation – SWB. The implication for marketers is that, for golf participants in South Korea, satisfying and exciting experiences have significant positive effects on their PWB.

Furthermore, these participants are influenced by internal pressures (e.g., guilt) and extrinsic reasons (e.g., to achieve personal goals). Although the SWB of South Korea golf participants is also influenced by satisfying and exciting experiences, it is also influenced by their motivation to play golf to obtain rewards (e.g., praise) or to avoid negative consequences (e.g., criticisms from parents), rather than just for fun. It is recommended that sport marketers utilize this information in developing effective strategies to attract individuals to golf ranges and golf courses.

As this study found that intrinsic motivation to experience accomplishments had a significant positive effect on well-being, sport marketers should offer free golf clinics at golf
ranges and golf clubs to increase interest in golf participation among individuals regardless of social and economic class, which would provide them with a sense of achievement as well as more access to the sport.

In addition, as external regulation (e.g., praise from others) was shown to have a significant positive impact on SWB, one promotional strategy for sport marketers would be to offer apparel and equipment identifying an individual as a golf participant. Introjected regulation was also found to have a significant positive effect on PWB. One recommendation to sport marketers is that golf ranges and clubs should offer participants, regardless of experience, ongoing free evaluation of golf performance (e.g., golf swing and skill) and advice from golf experts.

Finally, the current study revealed that identified regulation (e.g., to achieve personal goals) had a significant positive effect on PWB. Sport marketers should develop promotions that emphasize how golf participation can foster good relationships with others and also be useful in other aspects of their life.

Limitations and Future Studies

This study is not without limitations. One limitation of this study concerns the generalizability of the findings. Convenience sampling was employed in this study to select participants from golf courses, practicing ranges, and private sports clubs located in South Korea. Therefore, the results and conclusions may only be specific to the South Korea context and not universally applicable.
A second limitation of this research is that the sample was limited in terms of age and experience of the golf participants. This study had a high proportion of older and experienced golfers. Therefore, different results may have been produced with a much broader sample.

A third limitation is that this study examined direct effects of participation motivation factors on PWB and SWB. Other factors may play a mediating role in these relationships. Also, PWB and SWB may function as mediators in the relationship between motivation and behavior intention (cite).

Further research is warranted to address the limitations of this study and provide further evidence supporting the relationships between the motivation factors and the well-being of golf participants. As this study was limited in generalizability because data collection was conducted only in South Korea, future research should replicate this study in other cultures, such as the U.S. and in similar environment where golf is viewed as a luxury sport (e.g., China) providing data that can be used in cross-cultural comparative studies. In addition, future research can include other variables such as behavior intention (e.g. word of mouth and revisit intention). Lastly, the potential moderating effect of age should be explored, given the growing senior population.
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Table 1.

*Descriptive Statistics for Demographics (N=485)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10K</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10K ~ $15K</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15K ~ $20K</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20K ~ $35K</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35K ~ $50K</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50K ~ $75K</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75K ~ $100K</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $100k</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How long</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ~ 3 year less</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ~ 5 year less</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ~ 7 year less</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ~ 9 year</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 year</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

*Descriptive Statistics for Motivation (N=485)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor and Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the pleasure of discovering new training techniques.</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the pleasure that I feel while learning training techniques that I never tried before.</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the pleasure of discovering new performance strategies.</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the pleasure I feel in living exciting experiences.</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the excitement I feel when I am really involved in the activity.</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the intense emotions that I feel while I am playing golf, which I like.</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the pleasure I feel while improving some of my weak points.</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the satisfaction I experience while I am perfecting my abilities.</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the pleasure that I feel while executing certain difficult movements.</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it allows me to be well regarded by people that I know.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the prestige of being an athlete.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To show others how good I am at golf.</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I must play golf to feel good about myself.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I would feel bad if I was not taking time to do it.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I must play golf regularly.</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because, in my opinion, it is one of the best ways to meet people.</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it is a good way to learn lots of things which could be useful to me in other areas of my life.</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I used to have good reasons for playing golf, but now I am asking myself if I should continue doing</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I don’t know anymore; I have the impression that I am incapable of succeeding in this sport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.62</th>
<th>1.45</th>
<th>1.21</th>
<th>.84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is not clear to me anymore; I don’t really think my place is in golf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2.55</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.14</th>
<th>1.39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Well-Being (N=485)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Well-Being</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition of most people.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am good at juggling my time so that I can fit everything in that needs to get done.</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like most aspects of my personality.</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction with Life (N=485)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with Life</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In most ways my life is close to ideal.</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my life</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
*Correlation matrix for this study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mknown</th>
<th>Mstimul</th>
<th>Maccom</th>
<th>Exreg</th>
<th>Introreg</th>
<th>Identireg</th>
<th>Amoti</th>
<th>PWB</th>
<th>SWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mstimul</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maccom</td>
<td>.732**</td>
<td>.740**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exreg</td>
<td>.565**</td>
<td>.561**</td>
<td>.554**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introreg</td>
<td>-.139**</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.098*</td>
<td>-.222**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identireg</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>.110*</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoti</td>
<td>-.171**</td>
<td>-.212**</td>
<td>-.175**</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>.182**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWB</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>.540**</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>-.089*</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>.474**</td>
<td>-.182**</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.213**</td>
<td>.516**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
Table 6.

*Exploratory factor analysis and Descriptive Statistics for Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mknow2</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mknow3</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mknow4</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mstim1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mstim2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mstim3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maccom2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maccom3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maccom4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exreg1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exreg2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exreg4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introreg2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introreg3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introreg4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identireg1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identireg2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identireg3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoti1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoti2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoti3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Factor loadings > .40 are in boldface. Mknow = Intrinsic Motivation to know; Mstim = Intrinsic Motivation to experience stimulation; Maccom = Intrinsic Motivation toward accomplishments; Exreg = External regulation; Introreg = Introjected regulation; Identireg = Identified regulation; Amoti = Amotivation.
### Table 7

**Summary Result for Regression Analysis (N = 485)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable : Psychological well-being</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation to Know</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation to experience Stimulation</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>3.872</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishments</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>2.923</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation- External Regulation</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation – Introjected Regulation</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-2.547</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation-Identified Regulation</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>4.475</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05
Table 8

**Summary Result for Regression Analysis (N = 485)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variable: Subjective well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation to Know</td>
<td>17.585</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>13.951</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation to experience Stimulation</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-1.299</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation toward Accomplishments</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation- External Regulation</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation – Introjected Regulation</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.986</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Motivation-Identified Regulation</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-1.375</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05
Figure 1 Conceptual Framework
Intrinsic Motivation to know
Intrinsic Motivation toward accomplishments
Intrinsic Motivation to experience stimulation
External regulation
Introjected regulation
Identified regulation
Amotivation
Subjective well-being
Intrinsic Motivation to know
Intrinsic Motivation toward accomplishments
Intrinsic Motivation to experience stimulation
External regulation
Introjected regulation
Identified regulation

Psychological well-being

.097
.246***
.178**
.041
-.106**
.192***

Note. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05

Figure 2 Result of the Regression (Psychological Well
Figure 3 Result of the Regression (Subjective well-being)

Note. *** p < .001; ** p < .01; * p < .05
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE OF QUESTIONNAIRE

COVER PAGE

Dear participants,

My name is Youngmoo Lee and I am a master’s student under the direction of Dr. Kevin K. Byon in the Sport Management Program at the University of Georgia. I am currently conducting a research project to study the reasons that motivate individuals to participate in golf. The goal of this study is to gain a better understanding of the relationships among motivation, well-being, behavior intention and age (senior/non-senior).

The attached questionnaire consists of items designed to investigate your perceptions related to your motives, feelings, life satisfaction and general well-being. You will then be asked to provide some basic demographic and golf consumption information. The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

With your permission, I would like to request you to participate in this study. You must be over 18 years old to participate. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. No compensation is provided for your participation. There will be no direct benefits or known physical or psychological risks involved with participation; however, you may skip questions you do not wish to answer. The collected information will be solely used for statistical analyses for the current project. It is anticipated that the research findings will help advance the understanding of golf participants.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this study. Thank you!

Sincerely yours,

Young Moo Lee  
Master’s Student  
Sport Management Program  
Department of Kinesiology  
University of Georgia  
Athens, GA 30602  
Tel. (352) 226-4250  
Email: ymlee07@uga.edu

Dr. Kevin K. Byon  
Assistant Professor  
Sport Management Program  
Department of Kinesiology  
University of Georgia  
Athens, GA 30602  
Tel. (706) 756-7422  
Email: kbyon@uga.edu
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Sport Motivation Scale (SMS)

The information below pertains to the following question: *Why do you participate in the sport of golf?*”
Using the scale below, please indicate to what extent each of the following items corresponds to one of the reasons for which you are presently participating in golf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. For the pleasure of discovering new training techniques.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For the pleasure that I feel while learning training techniques that I never tried before.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For the pleasure of discovering new performance strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For the pleasure I feel in living exciting experiences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For the excitement I feel when I am really involved in the activity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For the intense emotions that I feel while I am playing golf, which I like.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. For the pleasure I feel while improving some of my weak points.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. For the satisfaction I experience while I am perfecting my abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. For the pleasure that I feel while executing certain difficult movements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Because it allows me to be well regarded by people that I know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. For the prestige of being an athlete.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To show others how good I am at golf.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Because I must play golf to feel good about myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Because I would feel bad if I was not taking time to do it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Because I must play golf regularly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Because, in my opinion, it is one of the best ways to meet people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Because it is a good way to learn lots of things which could be useful to me in other areas of my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I used to have good reasons for playing golf, but now I am asking myself if I should continue doing it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I don’t know anymore; I have the impression that I am incapable of succeeding in this sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It is not clear to me anymore; I don’t really think my place is in golf.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Psychological well-being scale**

The following set of questions deals with how you feel about yourself and your life. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Choose the response that best describes your present agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in oppositions of most people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I am good at juggling my time so that I can fit everything in that need to get done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I know I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like most aspects of my personality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)**

How satisfied are you about the following.......? (1) strong disagree to (7) strong agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. In most ways my life is close to ideal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am satisfied with my life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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골프참여자의 심리적 웰빙에 대한 설문지

안녕하십니까?

본 연구의 목적은 국민여가인식의 세계화 이후 점차 증가하고 있는 골프참여자의 동기, 행복, 행동의도에 대한 조사 연구를 실시하고 있습니다. 응답내용은 무기명 처리되며, 학술적 연구목적으로만 사용됩니다. 개인적인 생각을 진솔하게 응답해 주시면 진심으로 감사하겠습니다.

설문문항은 맞거나 틀린 답이 없습니다. 각 질문에 대한 당신의 생각에 가장 적합한 답변을 선택해 주십시오.

조지아 대학교
스포츠 경영 석사과정

이영무 ymlee07@uga.edu

1: 동기

아래의 문항들은 다음과 같은 질문을 담고 있습니다. “왜 당신은 골프 연습을 하십니까?” 다음의 척도를 사용하여 당신이 왜 현재 골프를 하는지에 대한 이유에 표시하십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>전히 그렇지 않다</th>
<th>보통이다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>번호</td>
<td>문항</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>새로운 훈련 기술을 발견하는 즐거움을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>홍미로운 생생한 경험에서 느끼는 즐거움을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>악습을 개선하면서 느끼는 즐거움을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>이는 사람들이 나를 존경하게 해주기 때문에</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>골프를 하지 않으면 기분이 좋지 않아서</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>삶의 다른 분야에서 유용할 수 있는 많은 것을 배우는 좋은 방법이기 때문에</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>더는 분명치 않다고 골프가 내 운동이라고 생각하지 않음</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>전에 해보지 않은 훈련 기술을 배우면서 느끼는 즐거움을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>능력을 완성하면서 경험하는 만족감을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>본인의 명성을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>활동에 적정으로 참여했을 때 느끼는 흥분을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>반드시 규칙적으로 골프를 해야 해서</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>골프를 하는 좋은 이유가 있었지만 지금은 계속해야 하는지 자신에게 질문하는 중임</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>내가 골프를 얼마나 잘 하는지 보여주기 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>새로운 전략을 발견하는 즐거움을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>좋아하는 골프를 하면서 느끼는 강렬한 감동을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>내 생각에 사람을 만나는 가장 좋은 방법 중 하나이기 때문에</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>특정한 어려운 움직임을 하면서 느끼는 즐거움을 위해</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>스스로에 대해 좋게 생각하기 위해 반드시 골프를 해야 해서</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>나의 다른 측면을 개발하기 위해 선택한 최선의 방법 중 하나이기 때문에</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>이젠 모르겠고 이 운동에서 잘할 수 있는 능력이 없다는 인상을 받음</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 항: 심리적 웰빙

다음의 질문은 당신 자신과 삶에 대해 어떻게 느끼는지에 대한 것입니다.
54. 대부분의 사람과 반대될 때에도 나의 의견을 말하는데 두려움이 없음
55. 일 처리에 능숙하기 때문에 완수해야 할 모든 것에 뒷받침 수 있음
56. 내게 있어 삶은 계속되는 끊임없는 배움 및 자기성장의 과정이었음
57. 나는 내 친구들을 신뢰할 수 있고 그들도 나를 신뢰할 수 있다는 것을 내가 안다.
58. 나 자신을 위해 정한 계획을 수행하는데 적극적임
59. 내 성격 대부분의 측면을 좋아함

| 60. 내 삶의 대부분은 이상에 가까움 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 61. 내 삶의 조건은 훌륭함 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 62. 내 삶에 만족함 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 63. 지금까지 내 삶에서 원했던 중요한 것들을 가짐 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 64. 다시 살 수 있다면 거의 모든 것을 바꾸고 싶지 않음 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

3 항 삶의 만족도

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>전혀</th>
<th>보통이다</th>
<th>매우 그렇지 않다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60. 내 삶의 대부분은 이상에 가까움</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. 내 삶의 조건은 훌륭함</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. 내 삶에 만족함</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. 지금까지 내 삶에서 원했던 중요한 것들을 가짐</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. 다시 살 수 있다면 거의 모든 것을 바꾸고 싶지 않음</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 항: 인구 통계

만간을 채우거나 원을 그려 다음의 정보를 제공해 주십시오.

1. 성별: (1) 남성 (2) 여성
2. 연령: (당신은 몇 년도에 태어나셨습니까?)
3. 결혼 여부: (1) 미혼 (2) 기혼 (3) 별거/이혼 (4) 미망인
4. 연평균 수입: (1) 1000 만원 또는 이하 (2) 1000 만원~1499 만원 (3) 1500 만원~2499 만원 (4) 2500 만원~3499 만원
매우 감사합니다.

(5) 3500 만원~4999 만원
(6) 5000 만원~7499 만원
(7) 7500 만원~9999 만원
(8) 1억원 또는 이상

5. 학력: (1) 고등학교 졸업
   (2) 대학 재중
   (3) 대학원 졸업
   (4) 대학원 재중
   (5) 기타 ( )

6. 직업: (1) 사무직
   (2) 기술직
   (3) 전문직
   (4) 판매직
   (5) 교육/학생
   (6) 주부
   (7) 무직
   (8) 기타 ( )

7. 일반적으로 골프를 얼마나 치셨나요?
   (1) 1년 미만
   (2) 1년 이상~3년 미만
   (3) 3년 이상~5년 미만
   (4) 5년 이상~7년 미만
   (5) 7년 이상~10년 미만
   (6) 10년 이상

8. 골프 연습장에 얼마나 자주 가시고 얼마나 시간을 보내십니까? ______회/주 ______시간/각 방문

9. 평균 1년에 골프에 얼마나 지출하십니까?
   (1) 50 만원 이하
   (2) 51 만원~99 만원
   (3) 100 만원~149 만원
   (4) 150 만원~199 만원
   (5) 200 만원~249 만원
   (6) 250 만원~299 만원
   (7) 300 만원~399 만원
   (8) 400 만원 이상

10. 골프를 어떻게 배우시나요?
    (1) 티칭프로
    (2) 골프 TV 프로그램
    (3) 인터넷
    (4) 친구 (동료/지인)
    (5) 친지/가족
    (6) 골프교재
    (7) 골프잡지
    (8) 비디오
    (9) 기타 ( )

매우 감사합니다.