

JOHN DOUVIS

Lecturer, University of Athens, Department of Sports Sciences

ABSTRACT

Despite its rapid growth, in the last few years the Greek Professional Basketball League has been concerned with the significant decrease in the general interest surrounding the game of basketball, which has resulted in a fewer number of fans attending the league's games. The Basketball Spectator Non-Attendance Scale is an instrument that facilitates the identification of factors associated with non-attendance at professional basketball games in Greece. The scale was successfully tested for validity and reliability with a convenience sample of 270 students at the University of Athens. The design of the instrument, its practical applications and results from our initial findings are reported and explained. The paper also provides a review of attendance and non-attendance studies at sporting events, which are discussed in the context of current theoretical perspectives. Tentative recommendations are made for reaching this rather sizable non-attendance market.

KEY WORDS: *basketball, spectator, non-attendance scale, professional basketball league*

INTRODUCTION

Despite its rapid growth, in the last few years the Greek Professional Basketball League has been concerned with the significant decrease in the general interest surrounding the game of basketball, which has resulted in a fewer number of fans attending the league's games.

By focusing its efforts on retaining the fans that already attend games, the league is ignoring some very important segments of the population consisting of people who, for various reasons, do not attend games, or attend only very infrequently. It is very important for the league to identify these segments and investigate the various reasons that people have for not attending basketball games. These market segments are quite considerable in size and represent a big opportunity for growth through the expansion of the current fan base. Therefore, to attract spectators, it is necessary to identify the factors that influence spectator decision-making to attend games. This question has never been investigated with respect to any professional sports in Greece and such information will, therefore, provide athletic organizations and researchers with a better understanding of the factors associated with non-attendance.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN ATTENDANCE AND NON-ATTENDANCE CONTRIBUTING VARIABLES:

A literature review

Very few studies deal with the problem of non-attendance. Even those studies which attempted to investigate the problem, did it with data collected from attending individuals, during sporting events. The major contribution of the present study is that it provides an instrument for measuring non-attendance, which uses data collected from people who do not attend sporting events. Zhang et al (6), stressed the importance for inclusion of the non-attending population in future research on spectator game attendance.

Although factors influencing attendance may be different from factors influencing non-attendance at sporting events, the following two studies by Hansen and Gauthier (2) and Tomlinson et al (5), played a very significant role in the conceptualization of the present study. After an exhaustive review of the related literature, these two studies summarized and grouped the attendance and non-attendance contributing variables. The variables that applied to Greek professional basketball, were used for the construction of the «Basketball Spectator Non-Attendance Scale». Tomlinson's study becomes even more important as it represents the most relevant reference for comparison of results from future studies, which will use the «Basketball Spectator Non-Attendance Scale» as their measuring instrument.

Hansen and Gauthier (2), in their study of factors affecting attendance at professional sport events, used forty variables which were identified from previous research. On table 1 there is a listing of these 40 attendance influencing factors, which were grouped by the authors in four different categories.

Table 1. *Factors Affecting Attendance at Professional Sport (Hansen & Gauthier, 1989).*

Economic Factors

Television coverage of the home game in local area
 Price of season ticket for home games
 Television coverage of another major sport event at time of your home game
 Price of ticket for home game
 Price of other forms of entertainment available during games
 Existence of other sport teams in your area
 Average income of population
 Other professional franchises in your area

Socio-demographic factors

Population size of your area
 Ethnic mix of population
 Existence of minor league sports for children and youth

Attractiveness of the game factors

Record (won-loss) of home team
 Record (won-loss) of visiting team
 Your team's place in the league standings
 Your team's place in the division standings
 Your team's involvement in race for a playoff spot
 Your team's involvement in race for first place
 Number of star athletes on the visitor team
 Number of star athletes on the home team
 Record breaking performance of athletes on the home team
 Record breaking performance of athletes on the visiting team
 Offensive output of your team (goals, points, assists, T.D.s, home runs, stoles bases, number of yards total, yards passing etc.)
 Defensive output of your team (goals against, steals, blocked shots, number of sacks etc.)
 Closeness of the competition (between teams during the season)
 Rivalry between competing home team and opponent
 Special event occasion (bat day, special groups day, etc.)

Residual preferences factors

Afternoon game
First quarter of the season
Cleanliness of the facility
Behavior of fans during games
Easy and/or multiple access to your facility (via subway, highways, transit)
Evening games
Second quarter of the season
Availability of parking at or near facility
Unobstructed view of game for 80% of more fans
Size of the facility (Seating capacity)
Weekend games (Friday night, Saturday and/or Sunday)
Number of years your franchise has been in the area
Third quarter of the season
Fourth quarter of the season

These forty attendance items comprised a questionnaire using a Likert 5-point scale to describe the relative importance of each factor from the view of the heads of marketing of 117 sport franchises in seven major professional sporting leagues. Previous research showed that all 40 variables were important justifying their inclusion in the Hansen and Gauthier study (2). As it is indicated on Table 1, the variables employed by the authors, were grouped into categories using Schoefield's suggestions (economic, attractiveness of game, socio-demographic and residual preferences). The data were collected through a mail survey research design. The fact that marketing managers were surveyed instead of directly surveying people who attended, could be questioned. Not all marketing managers would have correct and in-depth knowledge of their customers in order to provide reliable and valid responses. The collected information would rely heavily on the amount of research individual teams had conducted to determine the preferences of their fans. The findings showed that managers believe that fans place more importance on the attractiveness of the game and residual preferences factors. The results revealed significant differences between leagues regarding attendance items such as the scheduling of games in terms of weekends afternoons, nights, and quarters of the season; the quality of team rosters as represented by star player, and players attaining team or league records; ticket prices; the existence of other forms of entertainment in the area of the franchise and residual preference items such as seating, cleanliness and accessibility. These results show that marketing managers perceived fans to place less value on the economic and socio-demographic factors. A factor analysis which was performed by the authors identified ten factors. Most of the attendance variables loaded on the first three factors.

All nineteen variables that loaded on these three factors were related to game scheduling, convenience of the fans and quality of player performance.

There are suggestions that what encourages fans to attend may not be reflected in what discourages fans from attending. Tomlinson et al (5), found that the factors, which motivate fans to attend games, are different from those which motivate non-attendance. The authors found that ticket pricing is by far the most important element followed by the game being shown on TV, absence of children's facilities, accessibility to stadium and parking availability. On the other hand factors such as the general atmosphere of the game, «live» sport action, stadium design, tradition of the team, and «social opportunities» were identified as attendance motivators. Tomlinson et al (5) claim that this finding might be called a «Herzberg effect» since it parallels Herzberg's findings on employee motivation. Herzberg et al (3), identified two sets of factors in their research (motivators and peer relationships), which are associated with job satisfaction. Their absence was not associated with job dissatisfaction. Hygiene factors such as pay and working conditions were associated with job dissatisfaction. Even when management gets these factors right (from the employee's perspective) they are not associated with job satisfaction. They are simply associated with an absence of job dissatisfaction. The parallel here is that attendance factors are equivalent to motivators and non-attendance factors are equivalent to hygiene factors. This means that attendance and non-attendance in sports are two different things and that is how they should be viewed and studied.

Tomlinson's investigation suggested that attendance is more likely to be connected to the entertainment value of the event and the general atmosphere, interactions and services experienced in the stadium. Conversely, it was found that a different set of factors was more powerful in causing spectator non-attendance (Table 2).

Data for the study were collected by questionnaire, which was administered outside sports stadia. Eight games from the three major professional sports (NBA, Major League Baseball and NFL) were selected for the study. The questionnaire contained demographic and buying behavior items and a list of thirty-four factors, which had been suggested in the literature to be connected to game attendance. The informants were requested first to rate each factor in terms of its significance in their decision to attend and second to identify those factors where poor provision would prevent them from attending. Based on Lovelock's (4), classification of customer service activities, all factors were categorized as front-room, back-room or circumstantial (Table 3).

Front-room factors influence the game experience while the service is being delivered. Back-room are the rest of the factors that contribute to the game experience and are amenable to management control. Circumstantial factors are the uncontrollable factors (weather, TV broadcasting of the game, team performance etc). Front-room factors were found to be the most impor-

Table 2. *Percentage of Fans Answering «Yes» to the question: Which of the following factors could prevent you from attending the game? (Tomlinson et al, 1995)*

Rank	Factor	Percent
1	Price of ticket	85%
2	Game live on TV	52%
3	Child facilities	28%
4	Ease of access to stadium	27%
5	Parking available	24%
6	Food and drink available	24%
7	Other games on TV	24%
8	General atmosphere	18%
9	Stadium design	16%
10	Actual seat available	13%
11	Fans behavior	10%
12	Clean Stadium	9%
13	Good weather	7%
14	Public transportation	4%
15	Evening game	4%
16	Weekend game	3%
17	Cheerleaders	3%
18	Off field entertainment	3%
19	Pre match entertainment	2%

Table 3. *Classification of factors (Tomlinson et al, 1995).*

Front Room	Back Room	Circumstantial
General atmosphere	Tradition	Family outing
Food & drink available	Evening game	Live sport action
Clean stadium	Price of tickets	Time in season
Stadium design	Ease of access to stadium	Chance of winning
Cheerleaders	Parking available	Team league position
Social opportunity	Weekend games	Recent performance
Pre match entertainment	Game live on TV	Other games on TV
Off field entertainment	Star players	Other clubs close
Fans behavior	Community support	Good weather
Band	Child facilities	Team win record
Actual seats available		Special event
		Opposition
		Public transportation

tant in the decision to attend a game, followed by the back-room factors and in clear third place the circumstantial factors. The most important front-room factor was the general atmosphere of the game. Other significant front room factors were stadium design, social opportunity, food and drink available, clean stadium, fan behavior and cheerleaders. These findings, which are very important for sport managers, suggest that team performance is not of paramount significance. Back-room factors were the most important in determining non-attendance. Ticket pricing was by far the most important factor, followed at some distance by the game being shown on TV. These two factors were followed, again at some distance, by absence of children’s facilities, accessibility to the stadium and parking availability. Table 4 shows the factors that are highly correlated with the different demographic data.

Table 4. *Factors that correlate highly with specific demographic criteria (Tomlinson et al, 1995).*

Lower than 25% attendance fans (light)	Factors relating to performance
Demographic criterion	Motive
Above 75% attendance fans (heavy)	Live sport action
Low income and education	Factors relating to performance
Age less than 26 years	Factors relating to performance
Lower than 25% attendance fans (light)	Front room factors
Age of over 30 years	Entertainment factors
Female over 25	Child facilities
Male over 25	Back room factors

These results showed evidence of benefit segmentation. Heavy users were found to value live sport action. Less educated and lower income people were found to value team performance. Front room factors were particularly important for irregular attenders.

Literature on non-attendance is scant. For that reason, and despite Tomlinson’s opinion, the study of attendance variables is also very important, as it is the next most relevant subject that can be found in the literature. Studies on both attendance and non-attendance were used for the construction of the «Basketball Spectator Non-Attendance Scale». Their theoretical import along with other socio-motivational theories, were combined in the development of the instrument, in order to provide a deeper understanding of the motivation of sports fans, one of the most important tasks of sport managers (1). The instrument goes beyond just looking at the Non-Attendance causing factors, and with a set of «Socio-motivational» items, asks the Non-Attendees

«What could possibly bring them back to the arenas». Social motivation goes well beyond entertainment and takes a form of emotional involvement between sport teams, the community and the individual.

INSTRUMENT

«The Basketball Spectator Non-Attendance» Scale was developed and tested by Douvis and Yiannakis at The Laboratory Of Sport Leisure And Exercise of The University Of Connecticut. The instrument is divided into five parts. The first part consists of four questions, necessary for the screening and classification of the subjects in one of the three groups described in the design section. Question number one, which asks for the age of the respondent, is used to screen out subjects that are under 18 years of age. Subjects that answered YES to the second question: «Do you attend professional A1 Greek Basketball league games?», were instructed to skip to question number four: «Do you attend more than 5 games per season?». If they answered YES in question number four, they are considered out of the target population and the telephone session ends. If they answered NO, they are classified as «Infrequent-Attendees». Subjects that answered NO to the second question, skipped to question number three: «Did you attend professional A1 Greek Basketball league games in the past?». If they answered NO on question number three, they were classified as «Never-Attendees». If they answered YES, they were classified as «Past-Attendees».

The second part consists of twenty-three statements which measure the importance of non-attendance factors on the decision to attend a professional A1 Greek Basketball league game. All factors derive from the related literature and are modified through focus group discussions and interviews with experts. The statements are presented in a 1-5 Likert scale format, with one being «unimportant», three being «of medium importance», and five «very important». At the end of the second part there is an additional open-ended question, asking the respondent for any additional reasons of his/her non-attendance that are not included in the questionnaire.

The third part consists of eight questions that provide additional information on the subject's behavior as a sport fan. The fourth part of the instrument consists of nine statements measuring the importance of several socio-motivational factors on the spectator decision to attend a professional A1 Greek Basketball league game. This part uses the same Likert scale format as part number two and all the socio-motivational factors included derive from the related literature. The fifth part consists of six questions asking the subjects to give information on their demographic characteristics.

The Basketball Spectator Non-Attendance Scale was developed at the item level. Its development was based on the review of literature and the experience of the authors.

The instrument was pre-tested using Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability estimate. A convenience sample of two hundred and seventy students from the University of Athens was used for that purpose. The alpha coefficient value was .75 for the non-attendance factors (items 5-27) and .77 for the socio-motivational factors (items 37-45), each indicating satisfactory reliability.

The instrument was initially developed in English and then translated into Greek. To ensure the accuracy of the translation the method of reverse translation was employed. First the instrument was translated from English into Greek by two experts in the field and then from Greek into English by two other experts. The results were almost identical.

The face and content validity of the instrument was assessed by a panel of six experts who examined and approved each of its items separately. Items which had the approval of fewer than four judges were reconsidered, modified, or eliminated from the final version of the instrument.

Construct validity was established by using the known-groups technique. In this method, the investigator administers a measuring instrument to groups of people with known attributes, which in the present study were the three test non-attendance groups. Stepwise discriminant analyses were run with a test sample of two hundred and seventy students from the University of Athens in order to determine whether the predictor variables differentiated among the three levels of the criterion variable. The criterion variable was non-attendance groups and consisted of three levels (Never-attenders, Past-attenders, Infrequent-attenders). The input variables were items 5-27 (non-attendance variables) and items 37-45 (socio-motivational variables) from the Basketball Non-attendance Scale. For the non-attendance variables the overall Wilk's lambda was .84 indicating that there were significant differences (at the .05 level) among the three groups across the predictor variables (Table 5). For the socio-motivational variables the overall Wilk's lambda was .92 also indicating significant differences (at the .05 level) among the three groups across the predictor variables (Table 6). Six additional stepwise discriminant analyses were also run, in order to investigate for significant differences in every possible pair of non-attendance groups. For the non-attendance variables significant differences were found in every possible pair of non-attendance variables. Between never-attenders and past-attenders Wilk's lambda was .91, between past-attenders and infrequent-attenders Wilk's lambda was .85 and finally between never-attenders and infrequent-attenders Wilk's lambda was .89, all being significant at the .05 level (Table 5). For the socio-motivational variables significant differences were found in two of the three possible pairs of non-attendance groups. Between never-attenders and past-attenders Wilk's lambda was .90 and between past-attenders and infrequent-attenders Wilk's lambda was .90, both being significant at the .05 level (Table 6). For the socio-motivational variables the differences between never-attenders and infrequent attenders were not significant at the .05 level.

Table 5. *Stepwise Discriminant Analysis of Non-Attendance Factors by Non-Attendance Groups*

Never-Attenders, Past-Attenders and Infrequent-Attenders

Eigenvalues

Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	.157	82.0	82.0	.368
2	.034	18.0	100.0	.182

First 2 functions were used in the analysis.

Wilk's lambda

Test of Function(s)	Wilk's lambda	Chi-square	df	Significance
1 Through 2	.836	47.268	8	.000
2	.967	8.889	3	.031

Never-Attenders and Past-Attenders

Eigenvalues

Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	.095	100.0	100.0	.294

First 1 function was used in the analysis.

Wilk's lambda

Test of Function	Wilk's lambda	Chi-square	df	Significance
1	.914	17.729	2	.000

Past-Attenders and Infrequent-Attenders

Eigenvalues

Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	.178	100.0	100.0	.389

First 1 function was used in the analysis.

Wilk's lambda

Test of Function	Wilk's lambda	Chi-square	df	Significance
1	.849	15.833	3	.001

Never-Attenders and Past-Attenders

Eigenvalues

Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	.136	100.0	100.0	.346

First 1 function was used in the analysis.

Wilk's lambda

Test of Function	Wilk's lambda	Chi-square	df	Significance
1	.880	29.752	3	.000

Table 6. *Stepwise Discriminant Analysis of Socio-Motivational Factors by Non-Attendance Groups*

Never-Attendees, Past-Attendees and Infrequent-Attendees					
<i>Eigenvalues</i>					
Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical	Correlation
1	.090	100.0	100.0		.287
2	.000	.0	100.0		.004
First 2 functions were used in the analysis.					
<i>Wilk's lambda</i>					
Test of Function(s)		Wilk's lambda	Chi-square	df	Significance
1 Through 2		.917	22.874	4	.000
2		1.000	.004	1	.950
Never-Attendees and Past-Attendees					
<i>Eigenvalues</i>					
Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical	Correlation
1	.116	100.0	100.0		.323
First 1 function was used in the analysis.					
<i>Wilk's lambda</i>					
Test of Function		Wilk's lambda	Chi-square	df	Significance
1		.866	21.559	2	.000
Past-Attendees and Infrequent-Attendees					
<i>Eigenvalues</i>					
Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical	Correlation
1	.111	100.0	100.0		.316
First 1 function was used in the analysis.					
<i>Wilk's lambda</i>					
Test of Function		Wilk's lambda	Chi-square	df	Significance
1		.900	10.384	1	.001
Never-Attendees and Past-Attendees					
<i>Eigenvalues</i>					
Function	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical	Correlation
1	.048	100.0	100.0		.213
First 1 function was used in the analysis.					
<i>Wilk's lambda</i>					
Test of Function		Wilk's lambda	Chi-square	df	Significance
1		.955	10.743	9	.249

CONCLUSION

The development of the Basketball Spectator Non-attendance Scale to investigate the factors associated with non-attendance represents a novel and theoretically valid method of assessing the reasons that are responsible for the problem. This instrument, by employing existing theory in both the fields of attendance and non-attendance, together with several socio-motivational theories, is able to provide an identification, description and explanation of the different non-attending segments of the population.

By understanding the differences and similarities among the three non-attendance groups, theoreticians and practitioners will develop a clearer understanding of the factors which are responsible for non-attendance. The Basketball Spectator Non-Attendance Scale could be utilized by the league to periodically reach the non-attending segments of the population and assess their reasons for non-attendance, as these change over time. The instrument can provide managers with updated profiles for each specific group, which may enhance the process of selecting the most appropriate marketing strategies to eliminate the problem.

The next phase of this research should involve the development of similar instruments for other leagues of different sports, or in other countries (cross-cultural), which have similar problems with attendance at sporting events.

APPENDIX

Basketball Spectator Non-Attendance Scale

Lead: Hi, My name is _____ and I am from the University of Connecticut. I am conducting a survey concerning the factors associated with spectator non-attendance at professional basketball games. May I ask you a few questions?

Q1. May I ask your age? _____
(Interviewer: If subject is under 18 years of age, ask to speak to someone in the household who is 18 or older.)

Screening and Classification

Q2. Do you attend professional A1 Greek basketball league games?
 Yes No
(Interviewer: If subject responds «No», go to Q3. If subject responds «Yes», skip to Q4.)

Q3. Did you attend professional A1 Greek basketball league games in the past?
 Yes No

Q4. Do you attend more than 5 games per season?

Yes No

(Interviewer: If subject responds «Yes», terminate interview at this point and thank them.)

(Interviewer: If subject responds «No», continue the interview.)

Non-attendance factors

(Interviewer: Read the following.)

***Now I would like to ask you some questions about the reasons that you don't attend professional A1 Greek basketball league games.

Q.: On a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being unimportant and 5 very important, please rate the impact of the following factors on your decision NOT to attend a professional A1 Greek basketball league game?

1 = unimportant

2

3 = of medium importance

4

5 = very important

	unimportant		of medium importance		very important
Q5. Cost of ticket	1	2	3	4	5
Q6. The game you are interested in is live on cable TV	1	2	3	4	5
Q7. Some other game is live on cable TV at the same time	1	2	3	4	5
Q8. Tired of the large number of basketball games being broadcast on cable TV	1	2	3	4	5
Q9. Difficulty of access to stadium	1	2	3	4	5
Q10. Lack of parking facilities	1	2	3	4	5
	unimportant		of medium importance		very important
Q11. Small number of Greek players participating on the teams	1	2	3	4	5
Q12. Inappropriate behavior of the fans	1	2	3	4	5
Q13. Poor quality of the facility	1	2	3	4	5
Q14. Poor quality of services	1	2	3	4	5
Q15. Poor public transportation	1	2	3	4	5

Q16. Poor quality of pre match and off field entertainment	1	2	3	4	5
Q17. Low team win record	1	2	3	4	5
Q18. Low team league position	1	2	3	4	5
Q19. Lack of stars on the teams	1	2	3	4	5
Q20. Predictable game results	1	2	3	4	5
Q21. You prefer other forms of entertainment	1	2	3	4	5
Q22. Low quality of competition and spectacle	1	2	3	4	5
Q23. Constant changes on the teams' rosters at the beginning of the season	1	2	3	4	5
Q24. Poor quality of the league's promotional campaign	1	2	3	4	5
Q25. Unattractive advertising of the league	1	2	3	4	5
Q26. Players difficult to approach and interact with	1	2	3	4	5
Q27. Lack of league involvement with community outreach programs	1	2	3	4	5
Q28. Are there any other reasons for not attending that you can think of?					

Please Explain

(Interviewer: Read the following questions)

Q29. What was your favorite sport to play while you were growing up?

Q30. Do you follow basketball on TV? Yes No

Q31. Do you follow any other sport on TV? Yes No

(Interviewer: If subject responds «Yes», ask Q32. If subject responds «No», skip to Q33.)

Q32. What other sports do you follow on TV? _____

Q33. Do you attend games of any other sports? Yes No

(Interviewer: If subject responds «Yes», ask Q34. If subject responds «No», skip to Q35.)

Q34. Games of what other sports do you attend? _____

Q35. Do you have Internet at home? Yes No

Q36. Do you have cable TV at home? Yes No

Socio-motivational

(Interviewer: Read the following)

***Now I would like to ask you some questions about the reasons that might lead you to attend a professional basketball game.

Q.: On a scale form 1 to 5, with 1 being unimportant and 5 very important, please rate the following: What would motivate you to attend a Greek Professional A1 Basketball league game? You would attend a game...

- 1 = unimportant
- 2
- 3 = of medium importance
- 4
- 5 = very important

	unimportant		of medium importance		very important
Q37. if it gave you pleasure and made you feel good	1	2	3	4	5
Q38. if it was stimulating and exciting	1	2	3	4	5
Q39. if it helped you relieve your frustrations and anxiety	1	2	3	4	5
Q40. if it helped to entertain you	1	2	3	4	5
Q41. if it helped you to identify with the success of the team	1	2	3	4	5
Q42. if it gave you the opportunity to meet other people and make friends	1	2	3	4	5
Q43. if it made you feel important and successful	1	2	3	4	5
Q44. if it gave you a sense of belonging	1	2	3	4	5
Q45. if it helped you escape from the routine of everyday life	1	2	3	4	5

(Interviewer: Read the following.)

***Now I would like to ask you some questions about yourself.

Q46. Which of the following best describes your educational status?

- Elementary school graduate
- High school graduate
- Bachelor's degree holder
- Graduate degree holder

Q47. What is your marital status? Are you...

- Married
- Single
- Divorced
- Separated
- Widowed

Q48. Which of the following best describes your professional status?

- Employed full time
- Employed part time
- Home maker
- Student
- Retired
- Unemployed

(Interviewer: If employed ask Q49)

Q49. What kind of work do you do? _____

Q50. Your annual income is:

- Less than 3 million drachmas
- Between 3 and 6 million drachmas
- Between 7 and 10 million drachmas
- More than 10 million drachmas

(Interviewer: Check the following)

Q51. Male Female

(Interviewer: Read the following)

This completes the interview. Thank you for your time.

REFERENCES

1. Brooks CM. Sports marketing: Competitive business strategies for sports. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994.
2. Hansen H, Gauthier R. Factors affecting attendance at professional sport events. *J Sport Manag* 3:15-32, 1989.
3. Herzberg F, Mausner B, Snyderman B. The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley, 1959.
4. Lovelock CH. Managing services: marketing, operations and human resources, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1992.
5. Tomlinson M, Buttle M, Moores B. The Fan as Customer: Customer Service in Sports Marketing. *J Hosp & Leisure Mark* 3(1): 19-33, 1995.
6. Zhang JJ, Pease DG, Smith DW. Relationship between broadcasting, media and minor league hockey game attendance. *J Sport Manag* 12: 103-122, 1998.

Address for correspondence:

John Douvis
 61, Nafsikas street, Palaio Faliro
 17564, Athens
 Greece
 E-mail: john_douvis@yahoo.com