1985 Hall of Fame Fishing Tournament: An Analysis of the Participants' Characteristics, Attitudes and Expenditures

CIRCULATING COPY Sea Creat Depastory

> NALON - SEA GRANT DEPOSITORY TELL LIBRARY BUILDING UPL MARRING DISETT DAY CAMPUS NAROAGENSERT, RI NERRY

Marine Recreation

Robert B. Ditton David K. Loomis Department of Recreation and Parks Texas A&M University



1985 Hall of Fame Fishing Tournament: An Analysis of Participants' Characteristics, Attitudes and Expenditures

by

Robert B. Ditton and David K. Loomis

Texas Agricultural Experiment Station (Recreation and Parks)

> Texas A&M University College Station, Texas 77843

TAMU-SG-88-201 January 1987

Publication of this document partially supported by Institutional Grant No. NA85AA-D-SG128 to the Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program by the National Sea Grant Program, National Ocean and Atmospheric, Department of Commerce.

Price: \$5

Order from:

Marine Information Service Sea Grant College Program Texas A&M University College Station, Texas 77843-4115

R/F-22 TAMU-SG-88-201 250 November 1987

ABSTRACT

The 13th Annual Hall of Fame Saltwater Fishing Tournament was held between May 18 and May 26, 1985, in Galveston, Texas. The tournament attracted 261 participants, of which 153 registered to compete in the inshore division, and 108 in the offshore division. Participants were sent a mail questionnaire one week after the tournament ended. This was followed by a postcard reminder, and if necessary, a second and third mailing of the questionnaire. Seventy-nine percent of the inshore division and 66 percent of the offshore division fishermen returned a usable questionnaire, for an overall response rate of 73.7 percent. Telephone interviews were conducted on a sample of 20 non-respondents. Results were used to correct survey findings for non-response bias.

Most of the respondents were active male fishermen and were employed in skilled or semi-skilled positions. Their average age was 34 years, and the average income category of inshore division anglers was \$30,000-\$39,999, and for those competing in the offshore division \$40,000-\$49,999. Participants in both divisions were equally likely to own a boat, but those owned by offshore anglers were somewhat larger. There was little difference between the two divisions on reported motives for fishing in tournaments.

Total direct purchases associated with the tournament were estimated to be about \$76,000, excluding tournament fees (an additional \$6,600). Because there was only one outof-state participant, no meaningful statewide economic benefits were realized from the tournament. Approximately \$21,600 was spent by out-of-county Texas residents, resulting in a local economic impact of \$43,000 for Galveston County. Unlike other tournaments, the benefits were dispersed across a number of economic sectors.

A comparison with other studies of Texas tournaments showed the Hall of Fame to be relatively small, had small daily expenditures and produced minimal economic impacts for the local economy.

Finally, a comparison of Texas tournament fishermen with a sample of Texas saltwater boat fishermen indicated that tournament fishermen are more active in terms of fishing avidity, and are more committed to the sport.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was funded by the Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program, and was partially supported by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.

A sincere thanks is given to Al McDonald and Robin Boedeker of the Southeast Texas Sportfishing Association for their cooperation and assistance.

Numerous individuals contributed to the completion of this report. Ruperto Chapparo, Jerri Evander, Richard Christian and other members of the Marine Recreation Research Lab provided valuable assistance in compiling this report.

Finally, we would like to thank the Roundup fishermen and women who contributed their time and effort to the survey. We hope this report gives them an opportunity to examine the impact of their expenditures on local economies, and to better understand their fellow tournament fishermen.

> RBD DKL

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
The Hall of Fame Tournament	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Objectives	4
METHODOLOGY	5
RESULTS	7
Demographic Characteristics	7
Tournament Fishing Participation	9
General Fishing Participation	13
Tournament Fishing Motives	18
Consumptive Aspects	21
Tournament Expenditures	24
Inshore Division Fishing Expenses	24
Offshore Division Fishing Expenses	25
Location of Purchases	26
Inshore Division Purchases	28
Offshore Division Purchases	29
Economic Impact Analysis	29
Revenues	30
Statewide Economic Impacts	31
Economic Impact on Galveston County	31
Inshore Division Impact on Galveston County	31
Offshore Division Impact on Galveston County	32
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	33
The Hall of Fame Tournament	33
Comparisons With Other Texas Tournaments	35
Comparison of Tournament Participants With Saltwater Boat Fishermen	36
Negative Impacts of Tournaments	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY	41
APPENDIX	
A. Mail Survey Instrument	44
B. Cover Letter	53
C. Non-Response Survey Form	54
D. Non-Respondent Expenditures	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Status of Tournament Questionnaire Response
Table 2.	Frequency Distributions of Respondent Age by Tournament Division
Table 3.	Frequency Distributions of Occupation Categories of Respondents by Division
Table 4.	Frequency Distributions of Income Categories of Respondents by Division
Table 5.	Frequency Distributions of Days Fished During the Tournament by Division
Table 6.	Frequency Distributions of the Location of Respondents' Residence by Division
Table 7.	Frequency Distributions of Miles Respondents Traveled to Compete in the Hall of Fame Tournament by Division
Table 8.	Frequency Distributions of Tournament Participation by Division
Table 9.	Frequency Distributions of the Number of Previous Times Participants had Fished in the Hall of Fame Tournament by Division11
Table 10.	Frequency Distributions of the Number of Additional Persons Brought to the Hall of Fame by Division
Table 11.	Frequency Distributions of the Type of Lodging Used By Hall of Fame Participants While in the Galveston Area by Division
Table 12	Frequency Distributions of the Number of Nights Participants Stayed in the Galveston Area by Division13
Table 13	Frequency Distributions of Number of Days Fished During Previous Year
Table 14	Respondents Who Participated in Each Fishing Type During Previous Year by Division14
Table 15	. Frequency Distributions of Type of Bait Usually Fished With by Division
Table 16	. Fish Species Most Sought by Inshore Division Respondents 15
Table 17	. Fish Species Most Sought by Offshore Division Respondents
Table 18	Distributions of Species Participants Specialized in Catching by Division
Table 19	. Frequency Distributions of Lengths of Respondent-Owned Boats by Division

Table 20.	Mean Annual Expenditures For Fishing Equipment and Bait by Division
Table 21.	Importance of Tournament Fishing Motives To Inshore Division Respondents
Table 22.	Importance of Tournament Fishing Motives To Offshore Division Respondents
Table 23.	Frequency Distribution of Responses to Consumptive Aspects of Fishing by Inshore Division Respondents
Table 24.	Frequency Distribution of Responses to Consumptive Aspects of Fishing by Offshore Division Respondents
Table 25.	Total Expenditures of Inshore Division Fishermen by Type of Purchase
Table 26.	Total Direct Purchases by Inshore Division Participants
Table 27.	Total Expenditures of Offshore Division Fishermen by Type of Purchase
Table 28.	Total Direct Purchases by Offshore Division Participants
Table 29.	Location of Purchases by Inshore Division Fishermen
Table 30.	Location of Purchases by Offshore Division Fishermen
Table 31.	Distribution of Registration Fees Relative To Local Economic Impacts
Table 32.	Economic Impact of Purchases by Inshore Division Fishermen on Galveston County
Table 33.	Economic Impact of Purchases by Offshore Division Fishermen on Galveston County
Table 34.	Cross-Tournament Comparison on Tournament Characteristics
Table 35.	Cross-Tournament Comparison on Expenditure/Economic Impact Characteristics
Table 36.	Comparison of Tournament and Sport Fishermen on Selected Demographic Variables
Table 37.	Comparison of Tournament and Sport Fishermen on Measures of Commitment to Sportfishing 38

INTRODUCTION

This report examines and describes the characteristics and expenditure patterns of fishermen participating in the 1985 Southeast Texas Sportfishing Hall of Fame Tournament in Galveston Island, Texas. In addition to descriptive information, an estimate is provided of the tournament's economic impact at the state and local level.

Sportfishing events like the Hall of Fame Tournament are supposed to attract people to the coastal region of Texas. When fishermen and their families visit the coast, they bring new money to the coastal area. Fishermen spend money on a variety of goods and services including fishing tackle and bait, boats and motors, gasoline, food, lodging and transportation. The spending and eventual re-spending of this new, nonlocal money leads to economic impacts that are both substantial and beneficial. To the extent that a tournament can attract non-local fishermen and visitors to a host community, there can be important economic benefits to that area. Because tournaments generate costs and benefits for host communities (Ellerbrock and Milon, 1984), information concerning these benefits and costs can be used by tournament planners and local officials alike to enhance the economic benefit to the community and region.

In addition to providing a better understanding of tournament-related expenditures, this report examines the socioeconomic characteristics, desired outcomes and fishing patterns of the participants. The tournament fishing experience involves dimensions other than simply catching fish. People engage in recreational activities such as fishing tournaments to satisfy various personal needs (Holland, 1985; Pierce, 1980), and to experience different packages of outcomes (Driver and Cooksey, 1977). Knowledge of the socioeconomic characteristics and motives of tournament participants allows businessmen and planners to better understand and serve this market group. The results of this study should prove useful to host communities and sponsors of current tournaments, and to those planning or organizing future tournaments. The report also provides a methodology for evaluating the expenditures and economic impact associated with a tournament that can be applied elsewhere.

This is the last in a series of three studies conducted by the Marine Recreation Research Lab in the Department of Recreation and Parks examining saltwater fishing tournaments along the Texas coast. The first examined the 1983 Texas International Fishing Tournament (TIFT), held at South Padre Island (Ditton and Loomis, 1985). The second report evaluates the 1984 Deep Sea Roundup (DSR) held in Port Aransas (Ditton and Arneson, 1986).

The Hall of Fame Tournament

The 1985 Hall of Fame Saltwater Fishing Tournament was the 13th annual edition. It took place in Galveston, Texas, between May 18 and May 26, 1985. Although competition began on the 18th, fishermen could register for the tournament any time up to the 26th, the final day of fishing. Registration fees were \$40 for the combination inshore-offshore division (hereafter referred to as the offshore division), and \$15 for inshore-only participants. A total of 261 individuals registered for the tournament; 153 for the inshore division and

108 for the offshore division. Over the years the tournament has grown in size. Participation in 1985 increased, with approximately 30 percent more inshore and 10 percent more offshore fishermen registering than the previous year (Boedeker, 1986).

The tournament is organized annually by the Southeast Texas Sportfishing Association (SETSFA), a non-profit organization. The goal of SETSFA, and primary purpose for sponsoring the tournament, is to promote saltwater fishing along the Gulf coast (Boedeker, 1986). Currently SETSFA is in its fourth year (1986) of providing financial support to Texas A&M University at Galveston for marine research purposes. Funds from SETSFA have been used in the past for research on local game fishes in the Galveston Island area. Previous studies include red snapper tagging, age and growth of black drum, and age and growth of speckled trout. It is expected that with the success of the 1985 tournament, the amount of support and number of research studies will increase.

The tournament is promoted and advertised, but only in the Houston-Galveston area. Tournament organizers see the event as local, and have no plans to extend advertising beyond the local area. There is no requirement that participants be members of SETSFA in order to participate.

Both the inshore and offshore divisions had seven species-specific categories, with first, second, and third place cash prizes awarded in each category. Species sought in the offshore division were king mackerel, ling, tigershark, bullshark, hammerhead shark, red snapper and offshore "open." Inshore species sought were trout, flounder, stingray, jackfish, gafftop, gar and inshore "open."

Forty-two cash prizes totaling \$6,475 were presented; thirty-four of the prizes were sponsored by local merchants, with SETSFA sponsoring the remainder. The value of the prizes ranged from \$500 for the largest king mackerel (offshore division) to \$25 for the third place fish in the inshore open.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Fishermen's expenditures and economic impacts of saltwater fishing tournaments have been the focus of numerous studies. Smith and Moore (1980) interviewed 417 of the 461 boat captains registered in the third annual Arthur Smith King Mackerel Tournament held in 1979 at Little River, South Carolina. Based on this sample, an estimated 1,844 fishermen participated in the tournament. They brought 4,740 friends or family members with them and spent \$650,000. The total economic impact of expenditures made by fishermen, family members and friends during the two-day event was approximately \$879,000.

The First Annual Greater Jacksonville Natural Light Kingfish Tournament attracted 515 boats (Milon et al., 1982). A survey was distributed to all registered boat captains during the initial orientation meeting. Of these, 358 were completed and returned (69.5%). From this it was estimated that 2,355 anglers participated in the three-day event (1,481 were Greater Jacksonville Area residents and 874 were not) and total direct expenditures for this tournament were approximately \$428,000. These expenditures produced an economic impact of \$642,000 (Ellerbrock et al., 1983).

The Second Annual Fort Pierce Sportfishing Club Open, held in 1982, was a smaller tournament with only 186 boats entered. Of the 186 surveys distributed to boat captains, 78 (42 percent) were returned (Ellerbrock and Milon, 1984). An estimated 784 anglers participated in the event, of which 44 percent were Fort Bend residents. Total expenditures of \$186,000 produced an economic impact of \$407,000.

Approximately 1,140 fishermen participated in the 1981 Milford World Championship Weakfish Tournament, held near Milford, Delaware (Falk et al., 1981). A questionnaire was mailed to 891 identifiable participants; 666 were returned in usable form (a 75 percent response rate). Results indicated that only 3 percent of the tournament fishermen were residents of Milford, the host community. Total expenditures of \$110,000 resulted in a statewide economic impact of \$172,000, and a local impact of \$137,000.

The 1983 Texas International Fishing Tournament, held in South Padre Island, Texas, generated substantial economic impacts on the local economy (Ditton and Loomis, 1985). This was a five-day event with three days of fishing. All 446 participants registered in the tournament were mailed a questionnaire. About 50 percent (220) were returned in usable form. Results show total expenditures to be approximately \$449,000, with local economic impacts of \$561,000.

A study of another Texas saltwater tournament, the 1984 Deep Sea Roundup, produced similar results (Ditton and Arneson, 1986). This event, held at Port Aransas, Texas, lasted five days, of which two were for fishing. The 218 of 451 registered anglers (48.3%) who responded to the mailed questionnaire reported spending \$285,000 for tournament-related goods and services. This resulted in a local economic impact of \$334,000.

The economic impacts generated by tournaments will undoubtedly lead to the formation of new businesses, the growth of existing ones and the creation of new jobs. This can in turn enlarge the tax base. These benefits depend, of course, on the ability to sustain the fish stocks targeted by tournament fishermen. The opportunities and problems associated with fishing tournaments are not inconsequential given their number and popularity. It has been estimated worldwide over 3,000 fishing tournaments (freshwater and saltwater) were held in 1984, with 1,223 in the United States alone (O'Hara, 1984). At least 56 saltwater tournaments available to sport fishermen were held along the Texas coast in 1983 (Christian and Trimm, 1986). These events attracted 15,500 participants.

Objectives

The principal objectives of this study are:

1. To provide a demographic and economic profile of participants in the 1985 Hall of Fame Tournament.

2. To test for significant differences in a variety of sportfishing-related variables between participants in the inshore and offshore divisions.

3. To estimate the economic impact of the 1985 Hall of Fame Tournament on Galveston County and the State of Texas.

4. To evaluate approaches for enhancing the economic benefit accruing to host communities.

5. To compare participants in the Hall of Fame Tournament (and their expenditure levels and economic impacts) with those of TIFT and the Deep Sea Roundup in order to draw implications for tourism development.

4

METHODOLOGY

Data collection was accomplished through a mail survey of participants entered in the 1985 Southeast Texas Hall of Fame Tournament. Fishermen could register for the tournament in one of three divisions: offshore, inshore, and youth. Because of a limited registration for the youth division (and their probable low level of expenditure), these participants were excluded.

A total of 261 individuals registered to fish in either the inshore or offshore division. Complete mailing information was available for only 252 of the registrants. Nine self-registration forms had important information missing, or were illegible. These entrants were not included in the mail survey.

A questionnaire was mailed to each registered participant on June 4, 1985. With the questionnaire, each fisherman was mailed a cover letter describing the intent of the survey and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope (Appendices A, B). One week later a postcard reminder was sent. It served as both a thank-you for those who had responded, and as a friendly and courteous reminder for those who had not. Three weeks after the initial mailing, a second questionnaire, cover letter and return envelope were sent to those who had not responded. Tournament registrants who had not responded after seven weeks were sent, by certified mail, a third complete set of materials. The mailing procedure and timing followed closely those advocated by Dillman (1978).

للوالية المتعالية الم

Ĭ

The questionnaire contained items used in previous studies of fishermen and tournaments on the Texas coast (Ditton and Arneson, 1985; Ditton and Loomis, 1985; Ditton and Holland, 1984; Ditton and Fedler, 1983; Ditton et al., 1980). Each participant was asked to estimate individual expenditures for items such as fishing tackle, snack foods and beverages, bait, ice, and gas and oil for autos and boats. Participants were also asked to estimate group expenditures for lodging and restaurants, thus accounting for family members and friends not surveyed.

Participants were asked their age, gender, occupation, income, their year-round fishing activity and methods, and expenditures. They were questioned about their level of satisfaction with the tournament, their likes and dislikes, how the tournament could have been improved and how they learned about the Hall of Fame Tournament. Finally, participants were asked about the psychological outcomes sought from saltwater fishing tournaments.

Means, medians, and standard deviations were calculated for all variables. T-tests and Mann-Whitney U-tests were performed to determine if significant differences exist between inshore and offshore division respondents.

Two hundred and fifty-two questionnaires were mailed out (Table 1). Fourteen were returned as non-deliverable by the U.S. Postal Service. Another six questionnaires were returned by individuals who, although registered in the tournament, did not participate due to illness. These 20 members of the sample represent a type of mortality, and hence were eliminated from all further response-rate calculations. From the effective sample of 232 registrants, 171 usable questionnaires were returned, for an adjusted response rate of 73.7 percent. Sixty-three were not returned (26.3 percent).

		Div	rision			
	Insl	hore	Offs	shore]	otal
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Registered	153	58.6	108	41.4	261	100.0
Mortality*					_	
Non-Mailable	2		7		9	
Non-Deliverable	11		3		14	
Did Not Fish	5		1		6	
Total Mortality	18		11		29	
Total Effective						
Sample	135	58.2	97	41.8	232	100.0
Non-Returned	28	12.1	33	14.2	62	26.3
Usable	107	79.3	64	66.0	171	73.7

Table 1. Status of Tournament Questionnaire Response

*Mortality includes those questionnaires that for certain reasons could not be delivered to elements of the sample, or those questionnaires whose inclusion would be inappropriate.

Since the survey obtained information from just 171 of the 232 participants, study results could possibly be biased if respondents differed significantly from non-respondents (non-response bias). To check for any non-response bias, a sample of 20 non-respondents (10 offshore, 10 inshore) was interviewed by telephone. The non-response interview did not obtain all the information sought in the mail questionnaire. Instead it covered some key variables and spending patterns of non-respondents during the tournament (Appendix C). The interviews revealed that expenditures differed for respondents and non-respondents. This bias was corrected by calculating the expenditures for respondents and non-respondents separately, then combining them to determine total expenditures for the full tournament. No other bias was detected.

The survey response rate achieved in this study is approximately 20 percent higher than was obtained in two previous studies of Texas saltwater tournaments (Ditton and Loomis, 1985; Ditton and Arneson, 1986). Although it is not possible to say with certainty what is responsible for this improvement, it is believed to be the result of following many of the mail survey procedures advocated by Dillman (1978).

Special attention was given to "personalizing" the survey. Cover letters were addressed to a specific person, not to the generic "Dear Fisherman," and were hand-signed in blue ink. Envelopes were hand addressed (no mailing labels) and affixed with a postage stamp. The purpose was to eliminate all appearance of a bulk mailing. Finally, the questionnaire itself was formatted in a way that would allow the respondent to move easily down the pages.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics

There was no significant difference in average age between inshore and offshore fishermen (Table 2). Respondents ranged in age from 16 to 61 in the inshore division and from 17 to 53 in the offshore division.

	Insh	ore	Offshore			
Age	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT		
16.24	10	17.0	=	70		
10-24	17	17.9		44.4		
2J-34 95 44	4/	44.3	20			
30-44	19	17.9	26	41.3		
45-54	15	14.2	4	6.3		
55-61	6	5.7	0	0.0		
No Response	1		1			
Totals	107	100.0	64	99.9		
Mean age	34.2 years		33.9 years	i		
t = 0.28 not significant at .05 level						

Table 2.	Frequency	Distributions	of	Responder	ıt A	ge b	ŋy -	Division
----------	-----------	---------------	----	-----------	------	------	------	----------

Î

-

The overwhelming majority of respondents are male. Only 7.5 percent of the inshore fishermen and 7.9 percent of the offshore fishermen are female. In contrast, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (1982) reported that 34.1% of the saltwater fishermen in Texas were female.

A majority of the inshore division respondents (52.4 percent) are employed in skilled or semi-skilled occupations (Table 3). Although the largest percentage of offshore division respondents (35.0 percent) are also employed in skilled or semi-skilled positions, a relatively large proportion are employed in other occupations.

There was a significant group difference in income levels between respondents in the two divisions (Table 4). The median annual household income of inshore division anglers is between \$30,000 and \$39,999, and for offshore division respondents between \$40,000 and \$49,999. This finding is supported by Graefe and Ditton (1985) who reported significant differences in income between bay and offshore fishermen.

	ľ	shore	Offshore			
Occupation	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)		
Self-Employed	8	7.6	10	16.7		
Skilled -						
Semi-Skilled	55	52.4	21	35.0		
Professional -						
Technical	13	12.4	13	21.7		
Manager	4	3.8	5	8.3		
Clerical	7	6.7	2	3.3		
Student	6	5.7	0	0.0		
Retired -			-			
Disabled	4	3.8	0	0.0		
Housewife	2	1.9	Ō	0.0		
Sales	6	5.7	9	15.0		
No Response	2		4			
Totals	107	100.0	64	100.0		

Table 3. Frequency Distributions of Occupation Categories of Respondents by Division

Table 4. Frequency Distributions of Income Categories of Respondents by Division

	Ir	nshore	Offshore			
Income	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)		
<10.000	3	3.0	0	0.0		
10-19,999	10	10.1	2	3.5		
20-29,999	19	19.2	10	175		
30-39,999	27	27.3	11	19.3		
40-49,999	21	21.2	12	21.1		
50-59,999	12	12.1	13	22.8		
60-69,999	1	1.0	3	5.3		
>70.000	6	6.1	6	10.5		
No Response	8		7			
Totals	107	100.0	64	100.0		
Median Income	\$30-39	\$30-39,999		19,999		
z = -2.72						

significant at .01 level

Tournament Fishing Participation

i

A total of 261 adult fishermen registered to fish in the tournament. The offshore division attracted 108 participants, and the inshore division 153. All but one of the tournament fishermen were from Texas. The only out-of-state participant was from Kansas, and fished in the offshore division. There was no significant difference in average number of days fished during the tournament. The majority of offshore division respondents, 57.7 percent, fished between 3 and 5 days (Table 5). A slight majority of inshore division participants, 50.1 percent, also fished 3 to 5 days. Only one offshore participant reported fishing the entire nine days. In the inshore division, nearly 20 percent of the respondents fished all nine days.

	İne	hom	Offshore				
Days Fished	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)			
1	2	3.6	1	3.8			
2	3	5.4	2	7.7			
3	9	16.1	6	23.1			
4	9	16.1	4	15.4			
5	10	17.9	5	19.2			
6	4	7.1	3	11.5			
7	5	8.9	2	7.7			
8	3	5.4	2	7.7			
9	11	19.6	1	3.8			
No Response	51		38				
Totals	107	100.1	64	99.9			
Mean days fished	5.4	4.7					
Overall mean days fished	5.2						
t = 1.47 not significant at .05 level		,					

Table 5.	Frequency	Distributions	of	' Days	Fished	During	the	Tournament	by	Division
----------	-----------	---------------	----	--------	--------	--------	-----	------------	----	----------

There was a significant group difference in place of residence between respondents in the two divisions (Table 6). Although a majority of participants in both divisions reside in Galveston County, only 20.8 percent of the inshore fishermen and 41.7 percent of the offshore fishermen are from outside Galveston County.

When distance traveled by participants to fish in the tournament is considered, most live in or close to the Galveston County area (Table 7).

9

	In	shore	Offshore			
Location of Residence	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)		
Galveston County	84	79.2	37	61.7		
Texas Other	22	20.8	22	36.7		
Other State	0	0.0	1	1.7		
No response	1		4			
Totals	107	100.0	64	100.1		
Chi-square = 7.32 significant at .05 level						

Table 6. Frequency Distributions of the Location of Respondents' Residence by Division

 Table 7. Frequency Distributions of Miles Respondents Traveled to Compete in the Hall of

 Fame Tournament by Division

	ľr	shore	Offshore			
Miles Traveled	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)		
0-100	106	99.1	62	96.9		
101-200	1	0.9	0	0.0		
201-200	0	0.0	0	0.0		
201-300	õ	0.0	0	0.0		
401-500	õ	0.0	0	0.0		
500+	Ő	0.0	2	3.1		
Totals	107	100.0	64	100.0		

Frequency of participation in saltwater fishing tournaments was significantly different between the two divisions (Table 8). This was the first tournament for 20 percent of the inshore fishermen. Only 9.5 percent of the offshore fishermen had no previous tournament experience. The vast majority of fishermen from both divisions participate in at least 2 or 3 tournaments each year.

Most participants have fished in the Hall of Fame Tournament at least once before (Table 9). The largest proportion of participants have fished in the event between one and three times previously.

	In	shore	Offshore		
Tournaments Entered	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	
My First	21	19.8	6	9.7	
Once every 2-3 Yrs	4	3.8	ĩ	1.6	
Once a year	7	6.6	6	9.7	
2-3 times a year	44	41.5	13	21.0	
4-5 times a year	18	17.0	23	37.1	
More than 5/year	12	11.3	13	21.0	
No response	1		2		
Totals	107	100.0	64	100.1	
z = -3.15 significant at .01 level					

Table 8. Frequency Distributions of Tournament Participation by Division

 Table 9. Frequency Distributions of the Number of Previous Times Participants had Fished in the Hall of Fame Tournament by Division

	In	shore	Offshore		
Number of Times	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	
0	33	30.8	12	19.0	
1-3	41	38.3	30	47.6	
4-6	14	13.1	13	20.6	
7-9	4	3.7	4	6.4	
10+	15	14.0	4	6.4	
No Response	0		1		
Totals	107	99.9		100.0	
z = -0.68 not significant at .05 lev	vel				

There was no significant group difference on the number of additional non-competing family members or friends brought to the tournament (Table 10). Between two and four additional persons were brought by approximately one-third of the anglers in both divisions. Tournament fishermen were asked what type of lodging they used while in the Galveston area. A large majority in both divisions stayed in a place they owned (Table 11). Less than 12 percent and 18 percent of the inshore and offshore fishermen, respectively, rented a place to stay. This reflects the small percentage of out-of-county fishermen, and the fact that virtually all participants lived within 100 miles of Galveston Island.

11

	In	shore	Offshore			
Number of Additional Persons	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)		
0	36	34.3	22	34.4		
1	21	20.0	12	18.8		
2	17	1 6.2	6	9.4		
3	17	16.2	8	12.5		
4	5	4.8	6	9.4		
5	5	4.8	3	4.7		
6	3	2.9	5	7.8		
7	Ō	0.0	1	1.6		
8	1	1.0	1	1.6		
No Response	2		0			
Totals	107	100.2	64	100.2		
z = -0.75 not significant at .05 level						

Table 10.	Frequency	Distributions	of	the	Number	of	Additional	Persons	Brought	to	the	Hall
	of Fame by	y Division										

Table 11. Frequency Distributions of the Type of Lodging Used By Hall of Fame Partici-
pants While in the Galveston Area by Division

	Ins	hore	Off	shore
Type of Lodging	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)
Owned	80	83.3	42	72.4
Rented	11	11.5	10	17.2
Stayed with				
Friends	5	5.2	6	10.3
No Response	11		6	
Totals	107	100.0	64	99.9
Chi-square = 2.77 not significant at .05	level			

A slight majority of the inshore division fishermen spent at least one night in the Galveston area (Table 12). Almost as many spent no nights in Galveston, and presumably returned to their nearby residence. The largest percentage of offshore anglers (39.2 percent) stayed one to three nights.

	It	nshore	Offshore			
Number of Nights	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)		
0	35	49.3	16	31.4		
1-3	12	16.9	20	39.2		
4-6	8	11.3	7	13.7		
7-9	10	14.1	3	5.9		
10+	6	8.4	5	9.8		
No Response	36	•••	13			
Totals	107	100.0	64	100.0		
z= -0.82 not significant at .0	5 level					

Table 12.	Frequency	Distributions	of	the	Number	of	Nights	Participants	Stayed	in	the
	Galveston .	Area by Divisi	on			•	-	-	-		

General Fishing Participation

Although participants in both divisions are active fishermen, they are significantly different in their reported levels of annual participation. Inshore participants are more active, fishing an average of 80 days in 1984 compared to 51 for offshore participants for the same period (Table 13).

A greater proportion of offshore respondents participate in gulf boat fishing than do inshore fishermen (Table 14). Respondents from both the inshore and offshore divisions participate in equal proportions in the shore, surf and pier modes of fishing.

The largest percentage of inshore division respondents usually use live bait when fishing (43.9 percent) as compared to those in the offshore division where the largest percentage use dead bait (34.9 percent) (Table 15).

Participants were asked to list their three favorite fish species in decreasing order. Because fishermen used common names to describe their species preferences, it is inappropriate to use scientific names in the following tables. When preferences for first, second and third choices are combined, speckled trout, red drum and flounder received over 70 percent of the votes from inshore respondents (Table 16). King mackerel, ling, and red snapper were considered the first, second or third most favorite fish species by almost 63 percent of the offshore respondents (Table 17). Since they are predominantly saltwater fishermen, it is not surprising that tournament anglers listed only one freshwater species, bass, as a favorite.

	Ir	ishore	Offshore			
Number of Days	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)		
0-25	12	12.2	10	17.7		
26-50	23	23.5	24	42.9		
51-75	24	24.5	14	25.0		
76-100	15	15.3	4	7.1		
101-125	8	8.2	2	3.6		
>125	16	16.3	2	3.6		
No Response	9		8			
Totals	107	100.0	 64	99.9		
Mean days fished	80		51			
t = 3.72 significant at .001 level						

Table 13. Frequency Distributions of Number of Days Fished During Previous Year

Table 14. Respondents Who Participated in Each Fishing Type During Previous Year by Division

Fishing Type	Inshore %	Offshore %
Saltwater Pier	45.5	33.3
Saltwater Shore, Surf or Wade	71.0	67.2
Saltwater Boat Total Saltwater Boat in Bays Saltwater Boat in Gulf [*]	94.0 92.2 64.4	98.3 93.2 96.7
Freshwater	54.4	51.7
*Chi-square = 25.93 significant at .05 level		

Absolute Frequency 22	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)
22	•••		
	20.6	6	9.6
47	43.9	6	9.6
10	9.3	22	34.9
15	14.0	2	3.2
			•
1	0.9	6	9.6
2	1.9	6	9.6
10	9.3	15	23.8
0		1	
107	99.9	64	100.1
	47 10 15 1 2 10 0 	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Table 15. Frequency Distributions of Type of Bait Usually Fished With by Division

Table 16. Fish Species Most Sought by Inshore Division Respondents

		Preference	To	otal	
Species Sought	1st	2nd	3rd	N	%
Speckled Trout	47	26	16	89	28.8
Red drum	20	32	18	70	22.6
Flounder	14	18	26	58	18.8
Stingray	5	5	6	16	5.2
Shark	4	4	6	14	4.5
King mackerel	1	6	7	14	4.5
Jack crevalle	4	3	0	7	2.3
Ling	3	2	2	7	2.3
Red Snapper	1	2	4	7	2.3
Gar	0	1	5	6	1.9
Other	2	1	2	5	1.6
Bass	2	0	1	3	1.0
Black Drum	0	1	2	3	1.0
Trout and Red drum	1	0	1	2	.6
Anything in Season	1	0	1	2	.6
Crappie	0	1	0	1	.3
Gafftop	0	1	0	1	.3
Pompano	0	0	1	1	.3
Billfish	0	0	1	1	.3
Tarpon	0	Ō	1	1	.3
Dolphin	0	0	1	1	.3
Total				309	99.8

		Proference		Т	otal
Species Sought	1st	2nd	3rd	N	%
King mackerel	16	15	12	43	23.8
Ling	8	21	12	41	22.6
Red Snapper	8	5	16	29	16.0
Shark	13	5	3	21	11.6
Speckled Trout	4	3	5	12	6.6
Flounder	6	1	2	9	5.0
Dolphin	Ō	3	5	8	4.4
Other	2	2	1	5	2.8
Billfish	1	Ō	1	2	1.1
lack Crevalle	Ō	1	1	2	1.1
Trout and Red drum	Õ	1	1	2	1.1
Anything in Season	1	0	0	1	.6
Bass	1	0	0	1	.6
Black Drum	1	0	0	1	.6
White Marlin	Ō	1	0	1	.6
Stingray	Ō	1	0	1	.6
Dorado	Ō	1	Ō	1	.6
Red drum	Ō	Ō	1	1	.6
Total				181	100.3

Table 17. Fish Species Most Sought by Offshore Division Respondents

About 79 percent of the inshore division and 53 percent of the offshore division respondents devote most of their fishing effort to catching one particular species of fish (Table 18). The fish most frequently sought by inshore respondents are speckled trout (34.3 percent) and red drum (13.3 percent). The greatest interest shown by offshore fishermen is for shark (17.7 percent) and king mackerel (11.3 percent).

A majority of tournament participants are boat owners. There were significant group differences between inshore and offshore division respondents regarding reported boat length (Table 19). The most commonly-owned boats as reported by inshore participants are between 13 and 20 feet in length (61.6 percent). Offshore competitors are most likely to own boats 17 to 30 feet in length (69.9 percent).

Inshore division respondents own an average of 11 rod and reel combinations, and offshore respondents an average of 16. The greatest number of combinations individually owned is 50, by one inshore fisherman and three offshore fishermen.

	Inst	ore	Off	shore
Species	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)
None	32	30.5	29	46.8
Speckled trout	36	34.3	2	3.2
Red drum	14	13.3	1	1.6
Stingray	5	4.8	0	0.0
Flounder	4	3.8	0	0.0
Other	4	3.8	0	0.0
Shark	3	2.9	11	17.7
Swordfish	2	1. 9	1	1.6
Jack Crevalle	2	1.9	1	1.6
Sailfish	1	1.0	0	0.0
Speck. trout and Red drum	1	1.0	0	0.0
Bass	1	1.0	0	0.0
King mackerel	0	0.0	7	11.3
Dolphin	0	0.0	1	1.6
Ling	0	0.0	5	8.1
Red Snapper	0	0.0	4	6.4
No Response	2		2	
Totals	107	100.2	64	99.9

Table 18. Distributions of Species Participants Specialized in Catching by Division

Table 19. Frequency Distributions of Lengths of Respondent-Owned Boats by Division

	In	shore	O	ffshore "
Length	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Freq.(PCT)
Did not Own Boat	18	17.3	11	17.5
1-12	2	1.9	0	0.0
13-16	32	30.8	2	3.2
17-20	32	30.8	18	28.6
21-24	18	17.3	15	23.8
25-30	2	1.9	11	17.5
31-40	0	0.0	6	9.5
No Response	3		1	
	107	100.0	64	100.1
t = -6.53 significant at .001 level				

There were significant group differences between inshore and offshore fishermen regarding the level of expenditures devoted to reels, bait and tackle (Table 20). Inshore division fishermen spent about \$555 on rods, reels, bait and tackle during the previous year. Offshore division respondents spent about \$940. There was no significant difference between groups in individual expenditures for fishing rods.

. . .

	โกรไ	hore	Offs	hore
Category	Expense	Percent	Expense	Percent
Rođe	\$ 125.47	22.5	\$ 182.23	19.3
Reels*	129.85	23.3	253.37	26.8
Bait*	174.03	31.2	281.12	29.8
Tackle*	127.57	22.9	227.63	24.1
Total*	\$ 556.92	99.9	\$ 944.35	100.0
*t-test results signi	ficant at .05 level			

Table 20. Mean Annual Expenditure	s For	Fishing	Equipment	and	Bait	by	Division
-----------------------------------	-------	---------	-----------	-----	------	----	----------

Tournament Fishing Motives

Tournament participants were presented a series of 17 motive items and asked to rate each in importance as reasons for tournament fishing. These items, developed by Driver (1977), were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale, with a value of 1 indicating the item was "not at all important," 3 indicating the item was "moderately important," and 5 indicating the item was "extremely important" as a reason for participating in a saltwater tournament. The reliability and validity of results obtained using this approach have been well documented (Driver and Cooksey, 1978).

That participants in the two divisions are similar in their motives is strongly supported by the finding that not one statistically significant between-division difference was found on any of the 17 motivation measures. The motive considered most important by both divisions as a reason for participating in the Hall of Fame Tournament was for the challenge or sport (Tables 21, 22). The five motives considered most important by both divisions were in fact the same, although in slightly different order.

A Tournament Fishing Motives	Mean	Not at All Important 1	Slightly Important 2 Value:	Moderately Important 3 s given are percen	Very Important 4 tages	Extremely Important 5
For the challenge or sport	4.40	0.0	1.0	6.0	45.0	48.0
For relaxation	3.98	2.0	6.0	16.0	44.0	32.0
For the experience of the catch	3.89	2.0	6.9	18.8	44.6	27.7
To get away from the regular routine	3.81	2.0	9.1	20.2	43.4	25.3
To be outdoors	3.69	5.0	11.0	18.0	42.0	24.0
To develop my skills	3.66	5.0	7.0	28.0	37.0	23.0
To get away from the demands of people	3.57	8.1	9.1	21.2	41.4	20.2
To obtain a "trophy" fish	3.57	7.2	13.4	22.7	28.9	27.8
To be with my friends	3.56	4.0	10.1	28.3	41.4	16.2
To be close to the sea	3.41	11.0	10.0	28.0	29.0	22.0
To experience natural surroundings	3.41	10.0	9.0	28.0	36.0	17.0
To experience new & different things	3.16	14.0	14.0	30.0	26.0	16.0
For family recreation	2.97	21.2	11.1	27.3	30.3	10.1
To obtain fish for eating	2.94	19.0	13.0	34.0	23.0	11.0
For the prize money	2.92	19.8	16.8	27.7	22.8	12.9
To win a trophy 2	2.76	17.0	27.0	30.0	15.0	11.0
To test my equipment	2.67	20.8	21.8	34.7	14.9	7.9

Table 21. Importance of Tournament Fishing Mottoes to Inshore Division Respondents

	Mean	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Tournament Fishing Motives			Value	s given are percen	- tages	ſ
For the challenge or sport	4.48	0.0	1.0	8.5	30.5	59.3
For the experience of the catch	4.12	3.4	5.1	8.8	45.8	39.0
For relaxation	3.97	0.0	10.2	18.6	35.6	35.6
To get away from the regular routine	3.93	3.4	5.2	24.1	29.3	37.9
To be outdoors	3.84	0.0	8.6	25.9	37.9	27.6
To get away from the demands of people	3.83	3.4	10.2	25.4	22.0	39.0
To be with my friends	3.81	1.7	10.2	22.0	37.3	28.8
To develop my skills	3.76	5.1	3.4	23.7	45.8	22.0
To be close to the sea	3.70	3.4	10.2	27.1	32.2	27.1
To obtain a "trophy" fish	3.64	5.1	11.9	25.4	28.8	28.8
To experience natural surroundings	3.54	1.7	15.3	30.5	32.2	20.3
For the prize money	3.24	13.8	12.1	31.0	22.4	20.7
To experience new & different things	3.22	13.6	11.9	28.8	30.5	15.3
To obtain fish for eating	3.12	6.8	20.3	39.0	22.0	11.9
To win a trophy	2.97	16.9	22.0	27.1	15.3	18.6
To test my equipment	2.90	20.3	13.6	30.5	27.1	8.5
For family recreation	2.79	25.0	14.3	28.6	21.4	10.7

Table 22. Importance of Tournament Fishing Motives to Offshore Division Respondents

.

Consumptive Aspects

A series of nine statements were included in the survey to determine the attitudes of tournament fishermen towards the consumptive aspects of fishing. These items were developed and tested for reliability by Graefe (1980) as part of his investigation of the consumptive orientation of fishermen. Participants could respond to the statements on a scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). The statements covered several aspects of catching fish, and the importance of size and number of fish caught.

Respondents from the two divisions were significantly different in their response to two of the nine measures (Tables 23, 24). Both groups disagree with the statement "It doesn't matter to me what type of fish I catch," indicating that species of fish caught is important. Inshore fishermen, however, disagree more strongly. Respondents from the two divisions also differ on the statement "I'm just as happy if I don't keep the fish I catch." Responses show inshore division participants to be relatively neutral on whether they keep their catch. Offshore fishermen disagree with the statement, indicating a desire on their part to keep the catch.

Item	Mean	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2 Values gi	Neutral 3 ven are percentage	Agree	Strongly Agree 5
I usually eat the fish I catch	4.19	1.9	4.7	13.2	33.0	47.2
The bigger the fish I catch, the better	3.78	3.8	12.3	17.9	34.0	32.1
I would rather catch one or two big fish than ten smaller ones	3.78	3.8	15.1	14.2	33.0	34.0
The more fish I catch, the happier I am	3.67	5.7	11.3	19.8	36.8	26.4
A fishing trip can be successful even if no fish are caught	3.43	9.5	16.2	14.3	41.9	18.1
A successful fishing trip is one in which many fish are caught	3.40	3.8	17.9	29.2	33.0	16.0
I'm just as happy if I don't keep the fish I catch*	3.10	13.1	21.5	19.6	33.6	12.1
When I go fishing, I'm just as happy if I don't catch a fish	2.46	20.6	39.3	22.4	6.9 3	8.4
It doesn't matter to me what type of fish I catch*	2.27	34.0	34.9	8.5	15.1	7.5

Table 23. Frequency Distribution of Responses to Consumptive Aspects of Fishing by Inshore Division Respondents

*Significant difference between divisions at the .05 level.

Item	Mean	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2 Value	Neutral 3 s given are percent	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
I usually eat the fish I catch	4.33	0.0	6.6	6.6	34.4	52.5
I would rather catch one or two big fish than ten smaller ones	3.86	1.6	9.7	22.6	33.9	32.3
The bigger the fish I catch, the better	3.81	1.6	9.7	21.0	41.9	25.8
The more fish I catch, the happier I am	3.61	0.0	12.9	27.4	45.2	14.5
A successful fishing trip is one in which many fish are caught	3.53	3.2	14.5	24.2	41.9	16.1
A fishing trip can be successful even if no fish are caught	3.26	9.8	16.4	39.3	115	16.1
I'm just as happy if I don't keep the fish I catch*	2.74	11.3	37.1	22.6	24.2	4.8
It doesn't matter to me what type of fish I catch*	2.61	12.9	4 1.9	21.0	19.4	4.8
When I go fishing, I'm just as happy if I don't catch a fish	02 C	21.0	38.7	343	12.9	3.2

Table 24. Frequency Distribution of Responses to Consumptive Aspects of Fishing by Offshore Division Respondents

Tournament Expenditures

Survey participants were asked to estimate the total amount of money they spent during the tournament for such items as gas and oil, launch fees, fishing tackle, bait, ice, snack foods and beverages. Estimates of the total amount of money spent on Galveston Island for restaurant meals and for overnight accommodations, including expenses for family members and friends not fishing in the tournament, were also requested. Tournament fishermen were also asked to indicate whether each item was purchased at home or in the tournament area. This information is necessary for determining the economic impact of the tournament on Galveston County.

Inshore Division Fishing Expenses

Most of the respondents purchased or contributed to the purchase of six of the ten expense items (Table 25). Less than a majority had expenses for launch fees or a boat slip, restaurant meals, lodging or "other." The largest average individual tournament expense was for lodging (\$237). However, only six percent of the respondents had a lodging expense. That so few inshore fishermen paid for overnight accommodations or restaurant meals (35 percent) reflects the finding that 79 percent of the respondents were from Galveston County, and that they probably returned home after each day's fishing. Many others who did not reside in Galveston County lived close enough to commute. All or nearly all of the anglers purchased snack foods, gas for the auto, gas and oil for the boat, and ice.

Type of Purchase	Percent of Fishermen Who Purchased Each Item	Total Amount Spent by Fishermen Who Purchased Item ¹
Gas for auto	93.8	\$ 35.79
Gas and oil for boat	88.0	50.59
Launch fees or boat slip	31.8	1 7.96
Fishing tackle and equipment	75.6	77.50
Bait	68.1	33.30
Ice	82.8	10.95
Snacks, beer, beverages	95.8	45.04
Other ²	32.3	114.90
Restaurant meals	35.0	63.44
Lodging	6.0	236.67

Table	e 25.	Total	Expenditures	of	Inshore	Division	Fishermen	by	Type	of	Purchase
-------	-------	-------	--------------	----	---------	----------	-----------	----	------	----	----------

¹ Includes respondents only.

² Other includes expenditures for repairs, receptions, gifts, entertainment and charter fees.

Expenditures by inshore division fishermen totaled \$32,109 (Table 26). This does not include the \$15 registration fee paid by each inshore participant. The fees would raise total expenditures by \$2,295, but were not considered in the economic analysis. The amount of money raised through registration fees, and how it was dispersed will be discussed later as revenues.

Purchases of items directly associated with fishing, such as boat fuel, launch or slip fees, fishing tackle and bait amounted to 50.6 percent of the total. Items associated with but not required for fishing include gas for the auto, ice, snacks and beverages and "other." Expenses for these items amounted to 37.4 percent of the total. Restaurant meals and lodging combined accounted for just 12.0 percent of all inshore division expenditures.

Type of Purchase	Total Amount Spent ¹	Percent of Total
Tackle	\$ 6.808	21.7
Gas and oil for boat	6.189	19.3
Snacks, beer, beverages	5.796	18.1
Gas for auto	3.835	11.9
Bait	2.734	8.5
Restaurant meals	2.444	7.6
Lodging	1.420	4.4
Ice	1,216	3.8
Other	1,149	3.6
Launch fees or boat slip	518	1.6
Total	\$32,109	100.0
Registration fees	\$ 2,295	
Grand Total	\$34,404	

Table 26. Total Direct Purchases by Inshore Division Participants

¹Includes respondents and non-respondents

Offshore Division Fishing Expenses

The majority of offshore division respondents also spent money on six of the ten expense items (Table 27). The six items are the same for both divisions.

Direct expenditures by offshore division respondents totaled \$43,951 (Table 28). Again, this does not include the offshore registration fee (\$40) which would raise the total by \$4,320.

Purchases of items required for fishing (gas and oil for boat, fishing tackle and equipment, **bait and launch** fees or boat slip) accounted for 66.6 percent of the total expenditures. Items **associated** with fishing but not required (snacks, beer, beverages, gas for auto, ice and other)

amounted to 24.4 percent of the fishermen's cost. Only \$3,934, or 9 percent, of the \$43,951 spent by offshore division participants was for restaurant meals or lodging. Again, this reflects the fact that a large majority of offshore division fishermen live nearby.

Location of Purchases

Determining the economic significance of direct expenditures requires a knowledge of where the various expense items were purchased. Therefore, participants were asked to indicate where the various items were purchased (Galveston County, elsewhere in Texas or in both places).

Type of	Percent of Fishermen Who Purchased	Total Amount Spent by Fishermen
Purchase	Each Item	Who Purchased Item ¹
Gas for auto	93.2	\$ 31.26
Gas and oil for boat	96.7	173.90
Launch fees or boat slip	34.6	60.17
Fishing tackle and equipment	87.7	85.44
Bait	93.4	51.67
Ice	90.0	20.02
Snacks, beer, beverages	98.3	71.19
Other ²	41.2	67 14
Restaurant meals	39.0	80.43
Lodging	13.8	128.75

Table 27. Total Expenditures of Offshore Division Fishermen by Type of Purchase

¹ Includes respondents only.

² Other includes expenditures for repairs, receptions, gifts, entertainment and charter fees.

Type of Purchase	Total Amount Spent ¹	Percent of Total
Gas and oil for boat	\$ 15.775	35.9
Fishing tackle and equipment	6,809	15.5
Snacks, beer, beverages	5.954	13.5
Bait	4.712	10.7
Gas for auto	2,514	5.7
Restaurant meals	2.065	4.7
Launch fees or boat slip	1.962	4.5
Lodging	1.869	4.3
Ice	1.821	4.1
Other	470	1.1
Total	\$ 43,951	100.0
Registration fees	\$ 4,320	
Grand Total	\$ 48,271	
¹ Includes respondents and non-respond	ents	

Table 28. Total Direct Purchases by Offshore Division Participants

сı t

Inshore Division Purchases

About \$25,000 of the \$32,000 in purchases by inshore division participants were made in Galveston County (Table 29). Two of the three largest expenditures were for fishing tackle and gas and oil for the boat. A majority of the fishermen spent money in Galveston County for six of the ten items. Few had expenses for restaurant meals or overnight lodging since they could easily return home each night.

	Percent	Total \$		
Type of purchase	In Galveston	At Home	Both	Galveston ²
Gas for auto	83.3	79.2	7.2	\$ 2.313
Gas and oil for boat	81.4	68.9	4.3	4.767
Launch fees or boat slip	27.1	20.5	8.2	407
Fishing tackle	65.7	59.5	3.3	5,119
Bait	64.5	45.0	4.3	2,411
Ice	78.6	65.0	4.3	1,022
Snacks, beer, beverages	91.8	78.6	8.3	4,791
Other	30.8	10.5	0.0	685
Restaurant meals	35.0			2,444
Lodging	6.0			1,420
Total				\$ 25,379
¹ Includes respondents only				
2				

Table 29.	Location of	of	Purchases	by	Inshore	Division	Fishermen
-----------	-------------	----	-----------	----	---------	----------	-----------

² Includes respondents and non-respondents

Offshore Division Purchases

...

T-LI. 40

More than \$38,000 of the nearly \$44,000 in purchases by offshore division fishermen were made in Galveston County (Table 30). A majority of the fishermen spent money on six of the ten items, the largest expense being gas and oil for the boat. Again, relatively few people had expenses for restaurant meals or lodging.

	Percer	Total \$		
Type of purchase	In Galveston	At Home	Both	spent in Galveston ²
Gas for auto	85.5	60.0	10.0	<u> </u>
Gas and oil for boat	90.6	09.U 50.1	10.2	\$ 1,84 1
Launch fees or hoat slip	25.4	59.1	5.0	14,406
Fishing tackle	00.4	5.6	0.0	1,239
Bait	80.4	60.0	3.5	5,464
Ico	89.3	50.0	3.3	4.446
fee Generalize har and	90.9	29.4	1.7	1,739
Shacks, beer, beverages	93.8	71.4	10.0	5 074
Other	37.5	9.1	0.0	0,074 ACC
Restaurant meals	39.0			400 0.0/E
Lodging	13.8			2,065
Total				1,869
Iotai				\$ 38,609
¹ Includes respondents only	ý			

1 adie 30.	Location	of	Purchases	by	Offshore	Division	Fishermen
------------	----------	----	-----------	----	----------	----------	-----------

² Includes respondents and non-respondents

Economic Impact Analysis

To determine the economic impact of tournament-related expenditures it is necessary to determine whether purchases were made by residents or non-residents (of Galveston County and the State of Texas). It is assumed that money spent by local residents to participate in the tournament does not have an economic impact on the area since the money most likely would have been spent there even if the tournament had not been held. Expenditures by nonresidents to the local area, however, are considered new monies which increase the area's economic base and produce economic impacts.

Purchases of goods and services by non-local tournament fishermen transfer money to local merchants, who in turn re-spend the money for goods and services needed to maintain their businesses. This re-spending is an indirect benefit to be included as part of the economic impact resulting from the tournament. Some of this money is re-spent outside the local area, and thus lost from the local economy. The rest is again re-spent locally. This spending and re-spending continues until all the money brought in by non-resident tournament fishermen has left the local economy. The length of time outside money remains in a regional economy, or how many times it is re-spent, is indicated by the economic multiplier. Larger multipliers indicate money remains in the local economy for a longer time period, resulting in a greater re-spending and economic impact (Davidson and Schaffer, 1980).

Economic impacts can be measured at the state level, or for a specific region or county. Tournament participants who live outside of Texas bring new money to the state, and thus have a statewide impact. Participants who reside outside of Galveston County would similarly have an economic impact on Galveston County. The magnitude of the economic impact for Texas or Galveston County is dependent on the number of out-of-state or out-ofcounty participants, respectively, the amount of money spent and the magnitude of the economic multipliers.

Revenues

SETSFA raised a total of \$6,615 through registration fees; \$4,320 from offshore division participants and \$2,295 from inshore division participants. These fees were used to cover general expenses, cash prizes in eight of the 42 categories, and to provide financial support for marine-related research (Boedeker, 1986). As a non-profit organization, SETSFA realized no profit from the tournament. For registration fees (like any other expense to the participant) to contribute to the economic impact of the tournament, they had to be paid by non-resident participants and the fees had to remain in the local area for some time period.

Tournament expenditures for general expenses and the scholarships were local, with the money remaining in the Galveston area. Some of the prize money, however, left the агеа.

Of the \$6,615 paid in registration fees, only \$2,165 was from non-residents of Galveston County, \$1,760 and \$405 from the offshore and inshore divisions, respectively (Table 31).

Registration fees	Offshore Division	Inshore Division	Total
Resident	\$2,560	\$1,890	\$4,450
Non-Resident	1,760	405	2,165
Total Fees	\$4,320	\$2,295	\$6,615
SETSFA Prize Money Awarded to Non-Residents	\$ 9 00	0	\$ 900
Total Fees Remaining in Galveston County	\$ 860	405	\$1,265

Table 31. Distribution of Registration Fees Relative To Local Economic Impacts

However, not all of this revenue remained in Galveston. Non-residents won four of the categories, worth \$900. This \$900 left the county when the winning fishermen went home. Of the \$6,615 paid in entrance fees, only \$1,265 remained in Galveston County to generate economic impacts.

It is unclear what products or services the \$1,265 purchased. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the economic impact generated from the collection of registration fees with any certainty. However, the economic multipliers used in this study range from 1.5 to 2.72, depending on the product or service purchased. From this we can estimate the local impacts of registration fees to be from \$1,900 to \$3,450.

Statewide Economic Impacts

There were no out-of-state fishermen registered for the inshore division, and only one registered to participate in the offshore division. The amount of new money brought in by the single out-of-state participant is minimal at best, and for this study is considered insignificant. No statewide economic impact analysis was performed.

Economic Impact on Galveston County

Economic impacts on Galveston County result from the re-spending of money brought into the county by both out-of-state fishermen and fishermen from other Texas counties. Although statewide multipliers were most recently available for 1979, none were available to measure re-spending at the regional or county level. The following formula was used to calculate 1979 regional multipliers that were applied in the Galveston County area (Hawkins, 1985; Jones, 1985). Statewide multipliers were obtained from the Texas Department of Water Resources (1979, 1983).

Inshore Division Impact on Galveston County

Inshore division fishermen living outside of Galveston County spent an estimated \$7,800 in Galveston County during the tournament (Table 32). This is low relative to the total amount spent (\$25,379) because only 27 participants lived outside of Galveston County.

The economic impact due to expenditures by out-of-county inshore division fishermen is slightly more than \$16,000 (Table 32). This was determined by applying the appropriate multiplier to each item-specific expenditure, and summing. The greatest impacts resulted from expenditures for restaurant meals, lodging and snacks. These three items accounted for 56.2 percent of the total impact.

Type of purchase	Amount spent in Galveston County by out-of-county inshore fishermen	Multiplier	Total impact of purchases on Galveston County
Gas for auto Gas and oil for boat Launch fees or boat slip Fishing tackle Bait Ice Snacks, beer, beverages Other Restaurant meals Lodging	\$ 580 1,065 237 396 798 295 1,456 575 1,446 995	1.50 1.50 1.87 1.86 2.17 1.77 1.77 2.07 2.63 2.72	\$ 870 1,598 443 737 1,73 522 2,577 1,190 3,803 2,706 \$ 16.178
Total	\$ 7,843		ψ 10,170

Table 32. Economic Impact of Purchases by Inshore Division Fishermen on Galveston Co.

Offshore Division Economic Impacts on Galveston County

A total of \$14,449 was was spent in Galveston County by 44 out-of county offshore division fishermen. This resulted in an economic impact of about \$27,000 (Table 33). Expenses for boat gas and oil, fishing tackle, and bait resulted in the largest impacts. Money spent for these three items was responsible for 55 percent of the total.

Type of purchase	Amount spent in Galveston County by out-of-county offshore fishermen	Multiplier	Total impact of purchases on Galveston County
Gas for auto Gas and oil for boat Launch fees or boat slip Fishing tackle Bait Ice Snacks, beer, beverages Other Restaurant meals Lodging Total	\$ 630 5,144 894 1,978 855 682 1,399 56 1,150 962 \$ 13,750	1.50 1.50 1.87 1.86 2.17 1.77 1.77 2.07 2.63 2.72	\$ 945 7,716 1,672 3,679 3,372 1,207 2,476 116 3,025 2,617 \$ 26,825

Table 33. Economic Impact of Purchases by Offshore Division Fishermen on Galveston Co.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The Hall of Fame Tournament

In this study we measured and compared characteristics of inshore and offshore division participants on a variety of socio-demographic, fishing participation, motivation, and economic expenditure items. Although some significant differences exist, results indicate the two groups are quite similar.

The only observed demographic difference was in annual household income. The median annual household income of inshore division anglers is between \$30,000 and \$39,999 compared to between \$40,000 and \$49,999 for offshore division anglers.

The mean age was the same for each division, 34 years, as was the proportion of women in each division, about 8 percent. Geographically, a majority of the respondents from both divisions were from Galveston County, and all but three lived within 100 miles of where the tournament was held.

The two groups differed significantly on their annual fishing frequency. Although both groups are very active, inshore participants are more so, fishing on average 80 days each year compared to 51 days by offshore participants. They also differed on the species of fish they prefer to catch, the length of boat they are likely to own, type of bait used, and the amount of money they spend annually for fishing. Offshore respondents seek to catch king mackerel and ling, while inshore fishermen prefer to catch speckled trout and red drum. The boats most commonly owned by offshore anglers are longer, 17 to 30 feet in length compared with 13 to 20 feet by those fishing in the inshore division. Offshore fishermen most commonly use dead bait, and inshore fishermen, live bait. Finally, offshore division fishermen spend much more annually for fishing tackle and bait than do the inshore fishermen. These between-group differences are most likely due to inherent differences in the two types of fishing. Larger boats are required, and greater expenses are incurred for fishing offshore. Fish species sought and bait used are likewise related to the waters fished.

On measures of attitude and motivation, participants in the two divisions are remarkably similar. Of nine items used to evaluate the attitudes of tournament fishermen towards the consumptive aspects of fishing, participants from each division differed statistically on only two. In terms of motivations, or reasons for fishing, there were no statistical differences on any of the seventeen items.

An examination of tournament-related expenses, and how they were distributed among expenditure categories, again shows the two divisions to be similar. As a group the offshore division spent about \$44,000, as compared to \$32,000 by the inshore division. Most of the difference can be traced to expenditures for boat gas and oil, where offshore participants outspent inshore participants by about \$9,000. The larger boats used by offshore fishermen and the distance traveled to reach offshore result in greater fuel consumption and consequently higher costs.

The Hall of Fame was not successful in attracting new monies to the state of Texas. Only one out-of-state individual participated in the tournament. However, as noted earlier, attracting out-of-state fishermen was not a goal of this event. The tournament was more successful in attracting out-of-county dollars to Galveston County, resulting in a beneficial economic impact on the local economy. However, the amount of money brought in and the economic impact that resulted were not large. The reasons for this can be attributed to two factors. First, only 27 inshore and 44 offshore participants live outside of Galveston County, and only monies spent by non-local fishermen result in local economic impacts. The second factor is that although the tournament lasted nine days, the total money spent was not large in comparison to other Texas tournaments studied previously (Ditton and Arneson, 1986; Ditton and Loomis, 1985). Small expenditures result in small economic impacts.

There are four factors that contribute to a fishing tournament providing economic impacts to a community: 1) the number of fishermen who participate; 2) the origin of the participants; 3) how many non-participants they bring; and 4) length of stay.

The 1985 Hall of Fame registered 261 inshore and offshore fishermen, of which 252 fished. In comparison, the 1983 TIFT had 446 anglers participate, and the 1984 Deep Sea Roundup attracted 451 fishermen. Although not a small tournament, the Hall of Fame is not as large as many others in the state (Christian and Trimm, 1986).

The second factor in a successful tournament from an economic impact perspective is participants' origin. The amount of money brought into the area by non-residents determines the tournament's economic impact. Thus, the greater the number of out-of-state and out-ofcounty residents (and their expenditures), the greater the statewide and county economic impacts, respectively. Increased marketing efforts in nearby local counties could draw more fishermen. Also, in comparison to other saltwater tournament locations in Texas, Galveston is more readily accessible to out-of-state tournament fishermen by airline and interstate highway. The third factor affecting tournament success is the number of additional people accompanying participants to the tournament. Money spent locally by non-participants is just as beneficial as expenditures by competitors. If non-participants accompanied a competitor to the Galveston Island area and incurred expenses as a result, the impact could be attributed to the tournament. An effort is made in this study to estimate the added expenditures of non-participants for items such as restaurant meals and lodging, but other expenditures by non-participants were not estimated. Non-participants' expenditures during the 1985 Hall of Fame Tournament had some effect since approximately 66 percent of the participants brought at least one additional person. Hall of Fame Tournament officials should consider planning additional non-fishing activities for family members and friends while the tournament is in progress. Galveston has many existing attractions that could be promoted as well. The goal is to attract more non-participants who could become repeat visitors.

The last factor is length of stay. The longer a tournament lasts, the longer participants are likely to stay in the local area. This should lead to greater expenditures and a larger economic impact. For the Hall of Fame Tournament, however, nine days of competition did not translate into greater expenditures or impacts. The most likely explanation for this is the local nature of the tournament. SETSFA advertised in the local area, and attracted fishermen from the local area. Most participants were able to fish during the day and then go home. For most, the expense of overnight lodging and restaurant meals was greatly reduced or eliminated. Another reason is that although the tournament lasted nine full days, the majority fished only three to five days. This indicates that many, who lived close to the tournament site, fished only during the weekends and not during the week. For over 60 percent of the participants, it was only a five day (or shorter) tournament. It is quite possible that the tournament could be shortened to a long weekend without experiencing a significant reduction in total expenditures or participation. Such a change might result in increased economic impact due to a greater involvement by non-local participants. Fishermen not willing or able to participate in a nine day event might be more easily attracted to one lasting a weekend instead.

Comparisons With Other Texas Tournaments

This is a third and final Sea Grant report focusing on saltwater fishing tournaments held along the Texas coast. Results from the three studies can be compared since they were prepared by the same research group using virtually identical research designs. The extent to which these three tournaments and their participants are similar or dissimilar can be evaluated for a number of tournament-related variables.

By comparing these three tournaments, it is clear that between-tournament diversity exists. The first tournament studied was the 1983 Texas International Fishing Tournament (TIFT) at South Padre Island. The second tournament was the 1984 Deep Sea Roundup (DSR) at Port Aransas, and the third is the 1985 Hall of Fame (HOF) at Galveston.

The Hall of Fame was the smallest of the three tournaments studied (Table 34). Both TIFT and the DSR had nearly 200 more participants than the HOF. TIFT and the DSR

Variables	TIFT	Deep Sea Roundup	Hall of Fame
Number of			<u> </u>
Participants	446	451	261
Percent Out-Of- County	59	68	27
Percent Out-Of- State	.02	.05	.04

Table 34.	Cross-Tournament	Comparison	on	Tournament	Characteristic
Table 34.	Cross-Tournament	Comparison	on	Tournament	Characterist

were also twice as successful as the Hall of Fame in attracting out-of-county participants; a necessary component for creating beneficial economic impacts for the local economy. The relatively high degree of participation by non-locals in both TIFT and DSR, and their low level of involvement in the HOF can be partially explained by each tournament's proximity to large population centers. For TIFT and DSR to attract a large number of competitors, they must draw from outside the local area, since both tournaments are held away from any

large cities. The HOF, on the other hand, has the Houston-Galveston metropolitan area from which to draw fishermen. There was no need to look beyond the local area to attract large numbers of participants. It is clear, however, that if economic impacts become a goal of the HOF tournament, the organizers need to attract many more participants from Harris

The three tournaments are similar in the low number of out-of-state participants they County. attract. Not one tournament had even one percent of its fishermen from out-of-state. This is why statewide economic impacts are low compared to local impacts.

Geography and transportation linkages no doubt play a major role in the reduced number of out-of-state fishermen in Texas saltwater tournaments. Of the three tournament locations studied, tournaments held in Galveston probably have the greatest chance of attracting out-of-state fishermen. Louisiana is nearby and air and highway transportation

linkages are well developed. Average daily expenditures by tournament participants also varied, and contributed to observed differences in economic impact. The average TIFT fisherman spent over six times, and the DSR five times, as much money each day during the tournament as the average HOF fisherman (Table 35). As a consequence, total expenditures for TIFT and DSR are much greater.

		DSR	HOF
Direct Expenditures	\$449,000	\$285,000	\$76,000
Expenditure/Day/ Participant	\$201	\$158	\$32
Economic Impact:	\$561,000	\$327,000	\$43,000
State	\$43,000	\$25,000	-0-

Table 35. Cross-Tournament Comparison on Expenditure/Economic Impact Characteristics

The combination of greater expenditures and involvement by out-of-county participants in TIFT and the DSR results in much larger economic impacts; 13 times larger for TIFT and more than seven times larger for the DSR than for the HOF.

Comparison of Tournament Participants with Saltwater Boat Fishermen

Although tournaments exhibit considerable diversity among themselves, their participants are boat fishermen. They can be compared to the statewide population of saltwater boat fishermen. The data set used to represent saltwater boat fishermen was collected as part of a previous Sea Grant project, and the associated methodology is well documented (Ditton and Fedler, 1983). The two groups of saltwater fishermen are compared on several standard demographic measures, and on a number of variables that measure commitment to the sport.

Saltwater boat fishermen as a group are older than tournament fishermen in Texas (Table 36). The population of boat fishermen and participants of the HOF tournament have similar household incomes. Although 34 percent of all saltwater fishermen in Texas are female (USFWS, 1982), they are greatly under-represented in the tournaments.

6	34	40	39
. \$30,1 39,999	000- \$39,999	\$50,000- \$59,999	\$50,000- \$59,999
5.9 "	92.3	76.3	92.7
	. \$30,0 39,999 5.9*	. \$30,000- 39,999 \$39,999 5.9 [*] 92.3	. \$30,000- \$50,000- 39,999 \$39,999 \$59,999 5.9 [*] 92.3 76.3

Table 36. Comparison of Tournament and Sport Fishermen on Selected Demographic Variables

A number of other variables are useful to gauge the extent of commitment to sportfishing. One such variable is annual days of fishing. Graefe (1980) has shown frequency of participation to be a good proxy for level of involvement with the sport. The higher the annual rate of fishing, the more strongly involved a fisherman is. The population of saltwater boat fishermen participated with much less frequency in fishing than their tournament counterparts (Table 37).

This finding may be attributed to differences in study methodology, however. Boat fishermen were surveyed at home with a mail questionnaire, and offered equal opportunity for both casual and avid fishermen to respond. The tournament studies were conducted onsite and thus tend to over-represent active fishermen.

Four other indications of involvement with fishing include the extent to which fishermen subscribe to sports magazines, belong to a fishing club, make some or all of their fishing gear, and seek to catch one particular species of fish. For the most part, greater percentages of tournament fishermen do these things than the population of saltwater boat fishermen.

It can be concluded, therefore, that saltwater tournament fishermen as a group are different from the population of saltwater sport fishermen in several identifiable ways. In general, tournament fishermen are younger, more affluent, and more active, involved fishermen. As such they can be considered a subgroup of the statewide population of saltwater boat fishermen.

Variables	Saltwater Boat Fishermen	Hall of Fame	Deep Sea Roundup	TIFT
Days fished annually	29	70	38	89
		Percent	Responding Yes	
Subscribe to sport magazine	55	71	71	85
Member of fishing club	7	29	9	34
Make own fishing gear	43	71	41	36
Focus on catching one species of fish	30	64	49	71

Table 37. Comparison of Tournament and Sport Fishermen on Measures of Commitment to Sportfishing

Negative Impacts of Tournaments

Most previous studies have described only the positive results associated with hosting a saltwater tournament. It has been suggested, however, that providing recreation or tourism opportunities, such as saltwater tournaments, is not without cost (Gunn, 1979; Turner and Ash, 1975). As the number of tournament events and fishermen attracted to the host community increases, so does the stress placed on the existing infrastructure. Water, waste and electrical power systems may need to be enlarged. Police, fire and medical services can become inadequate during peak use periods. New facilities and increased maintenance and repair of streets, roads and other public services are often required. Since a dollar figure could be attached to each condition, these are economic costs. Although the revenue generated by tournaments, or tourism in general, is seasonal, the maintenance or improvement of the infrastructure involves year-round expenses. Who will pay these costs is often unclear.

There is the potential for social and personal costs as well. A small coastal community's way of life may be significantly altered over time by repeated visits from large numbers of visitors from outside the community. Outside investors, businessmen and labor are also likely to be attracted. The social and economic patterns of leadership can be shifted from the traditional locals to newcomers (Pi-Sunyer, 1982).

Employment opportunities created through tournament-related activities are often temporary. The seasonal nature of tournaments can lead to periods of unemployment and underemployment. Of the tournaments held on the Texas coast in 1983, 73 percent were held between the summer season months of May and August (Christian and Trimm, 1986). Only two tournaments, or 4 percent of the total, were held between November and April. Moreover, temporary jobs are usually low paying, thus mitigating their value to the total economy or local tax base.

There are other economic aspects of promoting tournaments that may not be desirable. The additional demand created by tournament fishermen for goods and services can cause an inflationary situation, where the cost of living is raised for year-round permanent residents. The local economy may be further disrupted by the uncertainty of how many tournaments will be held each year and, of these, how many will be held the following year. The host community can experience periods of rapid growth, slow growth or even decline. Instability in the number of saltwater tournaments held over time may lead to a cyclical pattern. This pattern parallels that of the product life cycle, and has been described by Richardson (1986) in a tourism framework. The product life cycle suggests that the evolution of a product (tournaments) advances through four major stages: introduction, growth, maturity and decline. If tournaments as attractions to the coast were to follow this pattern, then host communities must expect benefits, as well as costs, to flow in a cyclical pattern over time.

The impact of tournaments on the fishery resource can also be viewed as a cost. A number of Gulf coast fish species are considered stressed, to the point that restrictions are either being considered or are already in place. These include the king mackerel, red drum and speckled trout. The non-use or waste of such fish when caught is highly visible and has been referred to as an "appalling butchery" in other regions of the United States (Williams, 1984).

How the tournament experience might affect the participant is also of interest. The motivations for those participating in a tournament seem to be different from those who fish solely for sport. In their study of five tournaments, Graefe and Falk (1985) suggest that tournament fishermen generally attach more importance to motives related to the challenge and experience of the catch than do other types of fishermen. In an empirical test for differences in motivation between saltwater sport anglers and saltwater tournament fishermen, Loomis and Ditton (1987) show that tournament fishermen rated the importance of catch-related motives significantly higher than did other sport fishermen. Tournament fishermen were therefore labeled as more catch-oriented relative to sport fishermen.

The orientation of tournament fishermen towards catch has implications for their longterm participation patterns. Previous research suggests that the introduction of extrinsic rewards (such as prize money or trophies) into an otherwise intrinsically interesting activity like fishing may undermine or inhibit future participation (Deci, 1971, 1981; Kruglanski et al., 1975). Catch, being necessary to the winning of prize money and trophies, can be thought of as an extrinsic motive in the tournament experience. Therefore, the recent growth in popularity of tournaments and the trend towards prizes could result in a shift in goals and participation for some fishermen.

Tournaments can be praised for the benefits they produce, and criticized for the costs they create. It is not accurate to generalize about tournaments as being good or bad for a community. Just as the average "fisherman" does not exist (Shafer, 1969), neither does the average tournament. To speak of the average fisherman is to obscure individual or betweengroup diversity. Subsequent studies have been conducted that describe and test for betweengroup differences such as between bay and offshore fishermen (Graefe and Ditton, 1985). The situation is similar for tournaments. There is a need for descriptive profiles of various saltwater fishing tournaments and their participants. Tournaments can be expected to differ in terms of their geographical location, size, entry fee charged and species sought. As tournaments and their profiles vary, so might their participants vary across socio-demographic variables, motivations, participation rates and general involvement in fishing.

In recognition of the need to examine and understand diversity in saltwater fishing tournaments, we pursued a planned line of research. An inventory of Texas saltwater tournaments was conducted first to determine their geographical and temporal distribution. A series of separate surveys were then conducted to understand whether participants and their economic impacts are similar or dissimilar across different tournaments, and if so, in what ways.

This is different from the usual approach of selecting a single tournament for study, and using the results to generalize about all Texas saltwater tournaments and their participants. By studying several tournaments we have been able to demonstrate that betweentournament diversity exists, and that caution should be exercised when speaking of saltwater tournaments in general.

The impacts of tournaments can be classified into four categories: economic, social, cultural and environmental. To understand fully the impacts of hosting a saltwater fishing tournament, further studies that consider these diverse factors and how tournaments contribute to both positive and negative impacts need to be conducted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boedeker, Robin. 1986. Personal communication. Tournament Director, Hall of Fame Tournament, July.
- Christian, Richard T. and David Trim. 1986. An Inventory of Texas Saltwater Fishing Tournaments: Spatial, Temporal and Participation Patterns in 1983. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. Management Data Series Number 97.
- Davidson, L. S. and William A. Schaffer. 1980. A Discussion of Methods Employed in Analyzing the Impact of Short-Term Entertainment Events. Journal of Travel Research, Winter 1980, pp. 12-16.
- Deci, Edward L. 1971. Effects of Externally Mediated Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 18: 105-115.
- Deci, Edward L., G. Betley, J. Kahle, L. Abrams, and J. Porac. 1981. When Trying To Win: Competition and Intrinsic Motivation. **Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin**, 7: 79-83.
- Dillman, Don. 1978. Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. John Wiley and Sons. New York. 325p.
- Ditton, Robert B. and Lynn Arneson. 1986. 1984 Deep Sea Roundup Fishing Tournament: An Analysis of Participants' Characteristics, Attitudes and Expenditures. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program, TAMU-SG-86-203. 93p.
 - _____, and David K. Loomis. 1985. 1983 Texas International Fishing Tournament: An Analysis of Participants' Characteristics, Attitudes and Expenditures. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program, TAMU-SG-85-202. 63p.
 - ______. and Anthony J. Fedler. 1983. A Statewide Survey of Boatowners in Texas and Their Saltwater Fishing Activity. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program, TAMU-SG-83-205. 65p.
 - Alan Graefe, and Gary Lapotka. 1980. Economic Impacts of Recreational Boat Fishing in the Houston-Galveston Area of the Texas Coast. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program, TAMU-SG-80-206. 46 p.
 - ______. and Stephen M. Holland. 1984. Understanding Involved Fishermen: A Survey of Members of the Gulf Coast Conservation Association. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program, TAMU-SG-84-623. 70p.
- Driver, B. L. 1977. Item Pool for Scales Designed to Quantify the Psychological Outcomes Desired and Expected From Recreation Participation. Unpublished Report. Ft. Collins, Colorado: Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.
- Driver, B. L. and Cooksey, R. W. 1977. Preferred Psychological Outcomes of Recreational Fishing. Pages 27-40 in Catch and Release Fishing as a Management Tool: A National Sportfishing Symposium. Humboldt State University, Arcata, California.

- Driver, B. L. and Cooksey, R. W. 1978. Psychological Outcomes That are Desired and Expected From Recreational Fishing and Their Relevance to Sport Fisheries Management. Unpublished Manuscript, USDA Forest Service. Ft. Collins, Colorado.
- Ellerbrock, Michael J., J. Walter Milon, and Amy L. Sparks. 1983. Economic Impact and Participant Characteristics of Offshore Sportfishing Tournaments: Two Florida Case Studies. University of Florida Sea Grant College Program, Economic Information Report 176. 24 p.
- Ellerbrock, Michael J. and J. Walter Milon. 1984. A Methodology of Estimating the Economic Impact of Sportfishing Tournaments. Florida Sea Grant College Program, Report No. 59. 26 p.
- Falk, James M., Alan R. Graefe, and William P. Dubose III. 1981. 1981 Milford World Championship Weakfish Tournament: A Socio-Economic Analysis. University of Delaware Sea Grant Program, DEL-SG-25-81. 42 p.
- Graefe, Alan R. 1980. The Relationship Between Level of Participation and Selected Aspects of Specialization in Recreational Fishing. Doctoral dissertation. Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Graefe, Alan R. and Robert B. Ditton. 1985. Bay and Offshore Fishing: A Comparative Study of Fishing Patterns, Fishermen Characteristics and Expenditures. North American Journal of Fisheries Management. 6:192–199. 23 pp.
- Graefe, Alan R. and James M. Falk. 1985. Coastal Fishing Tournaments: A Review of Participant Characteristics, Motives, and Spending Patterns. Paper presented at the 1985 Outdoor Recreation Trends Symposium II, February 26, 1985, Myrtle Beach, S.C.

Gunn, Clare. 1979. Tourism Planning. Crane Russak, New York. 371 p.

- Hawkins, Charlie. 1985. Personal communication. The Gray Institute, Lamar University, January.
- Holland, Stephen M. 1985. Components of Leisure Satisfaction: Generic, Activity Inherent and Individual Idiosyncratic Factors. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. College Station, Texas; Department of Recreation and Parks, Texas A&M University.
- Jones, L. 1985. Personal communication. Department of Agricultural Economics, Texas A&M University, January.
- Loomis, David K. and Robert B. Ditton. 1987. An Analysis of Motive and Participation Differences Between Saltwater Sport and Tournament Fishermen. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, in press.
- Milon, J. Walter, Michael J. Ellerbrock, G. L. Brinkman, and C. M. Logan. 1982. Economic Impact and Participant Characteristics for the First Annual Greater Jacksonville Natural Light Kingfish Tournament. University of Florida Sea Grant College Program, Technical Report Number 21. 19p.
- O'Hara, William F. 1984. O'Hara's 1984 International Sport Fishing Tournament Directory. International Sport Fishing Publications. Captavia Island, Fla. 141 pp.
- Pi-Sunyer, Oriol. 1982. The Cultural Costs of Tourism. Cultural Survival Quarterly, 6(3):7.

- Pierce, Robert C. 1980. Dimensional Leisure: Satisfactions. Journal of Leisure Research, 12(1):5-19.
- Richardson, Sarah L. 1986. A Product Life Cycle Approach to Urban Waterfronts: The Revitalization of Galveston. Coastal Zone Management Journal, 14(1/2):21-46.
- Shafer, E. L., Jr. 1969. The Average Camper Who Doesn't Exist. USDA Forest Service Research Paper NE-142, Northeast Forest Experiment Station, Upper Darby, Pennsylvania.
- Smith, Joseph W. and Charles J. Moore. 1980. A Socio-Economic Survey of the Third Annual Arthur Smith King Mackerel Tournament. South Carolina Marine Resources Center, Technical Report Number 46. 11p.
- Texas Department of Water Resources. 1979. The Texas Input-Output Model, 1972. Planning and Development Division, Austin, Texas. 257 p.
- Texas Department of Water Resources. 1983. The Texas Input-Output Model, 1979. Planning and Development Division, Austin, Texas. 445 p.

Turner, Louis and John Ash. 1975. The Golden Hordes. Constable and Company. London.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1982. 1980 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife Associated Recreation. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Williams, Ted. 1984. Fishing To Win. Audubon, 186(3):82-95.

APPENDIX A

MAIL SURVEY INSTRUMENT

QUESTIONNAIRE

	IN THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, PLEASE TELL US ABOUT YOUR ACTIVITY, Expenditures, and opinions of the 1985 Hall of Fame Tournament.
	How many times, not including this year, have you fished the Hall of Fame Tournament before?
٤.	How many family members came with you to the tournament?
۱.	How many non-fishing friends came with you to the tournament?
	How many nights did you spend in the Galveston area for the purpose of
	fishing in the Hall of Fame Tournament?
; .	How did you find out about this tournament?
	1 FRIENDS
	2 RADIO
	3 MAGAZINE
	4 NEWSPAPER
	5 MAIL AD
	6 DTHER
6.	What type of lodging did you use while in the Galveston area?
	1 A PLACE THAT YOU OWNED
	2 A PLACE THAT YOU RENTED
	3 STAYED WITH FRIENDS
7.	Were lodging and other facilities and services adequate?
	1 YES
	2 NO
	IF NO, PLEASE EXPLAIN:
8	. What one thing did you most like about the tournament or how it was run

10. PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS ABOUT	tee			
FISHING IN THE 1985 HALL OF FAME TOURNAMENT.		SAG	State State	ALL LUDAR
The bigger the fish I catch the better the fighter true		` <i>o</i> .	Ň	*
The more fight catch the the better the itsning trip .		1	2	3
a more franciscutor, the nappier 1 am.		1	2	3
A successful fishing trip is one in which many fish are car	inh+		-	-
I usually gat the fish I esten	Burr .	•	- 4	3
		1	2	3
A fishing trip can be successful even if no fish are caught	• •	1	2	Э
It doesn't matter to me what huma at that a				

States -

5

5

5

5

5

5

5

5

5

S.A.C.

4

4

4

4

4

з 4 2 22 з 4 3 4 I would rather catch one or two big fish than ten smaller fish . 1 2 з 4

FOR EACH ITEM LISTED BELOW, PLEASE ESTIMATE THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF MONEY YOU SPENT OURING THE 1985 HALL OF FAME TOURNAMENT. (INCLUDE YOUR EXPENSES ONLY)

	Total Amount	Spent
	In Galveston	Other places in Texas
Gas or Diesel for Auto		
Gas and Oil for Boat		
Launch Fees or Boat Slip		
Fishing Tackle and Equipment		
Bait		
Ice	<u> </u>	
Snack Foods, Been, Other Beverages.		
Other (specify)		

- ii. Estimate the total amount which was spent in restaurants in the Galveston area (include expenses for family members, etc.).
- 12. Estimate the total amount which was spent for lodging in the Galveston area (include expenses for family members, etc.).

13. HOW WELL DO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS DESCRIBE YOUR FEELINGS AFTER FISHING IN THE HALL OF FAME TOURNAMENT. FOR EACH STATEMENT CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW STRONGLY YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE.					
	STRONGL DI SAGREL	DISAGRE	KEUTRAL	AGREE	STRONGL BGREE
More prize money needs to be offered	. 1	2	3	4	5
I did not catch the kinds of fish I had hoped to	. 1	2	3	4	5
There were not enough winners categories	.1	2	3	4	5
I enjoyed the challenge and sport	. 1	2	3	4	5
I was able to get away from my regular daily routine	. 1	2	Э	4	5
I cannot imagine a better fishing tournament	. 1	2	З	4	5
I enjoyed the natural surroundings of the area	. 1	2	3	4	5
I was able to escape from the demands of other people .	. 1	2	3	4	5
I was disappointed that I did not catch a trophy fish .	. 1	2	3	4	5
I learned how to become a better fisherman	. 1	2	3	4	5
The tournament was not as enjoyable as I had hoped	. 1	2	Э	4	5
I enjoyed being with the people I fished with	. 1	2	3	4	5
I thoroughly enjoyed the tournament	. 1	2	3	4	5
The tournament was well worth the money I spent	. 1	2	3	4	5
I generally felt relaxed	. 1	2	3	4	5
Not enough trophies were awarded	. 1	2	3	4	5
I was not able to test my equipment	.1	2	Э	4	5
I would have liked to have caught bigger fish	- 1	2	Э	4	5
I felt close to the sea again	. 1	2	Э	4	5
1 wish I had caught more fish	. 1	2	3	4	5
I was not able to do new and different things	, 1	2	3	4	5
My entire family had a good time during the tournament.	. t	2	3	4	5
It was good to be outdoors	. •	2	3	4	5
I was disappointed by some aspects of the tournament	. 1	2	3	4	5
I do not want to fish in any more tournaments like this	. 1	2	3	4	5

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR FISHING ACTIVITY IN GENERAL. (THIS SECTION IS NOT RESTRICTED TO TOURNAMENT FISHING.)

14. Please list, in order, the fish species you fish for most often during the year:

FAVORITE FISH ______ 2nd FAVORITE ______ 3rd FAVORITE ______

15. Please explain why you listed the first fish as your favorite:

46

16. Do you subscribe to any fishing or sporting magazines? 1 YES 2 NO 17. How often do you read fishing reports in the newspaper? 1 RARELY 2 OCCASIONALLY 3 REGULARLY 18. About how many of your close friends fish? NONE 1 2 SOME 3 MOST 19. How many of your vacation trips include fishing? 1 NONE 2 SOME 3 MOST 20. About how many of your co-workers fish? 1 NONE SOME 2 3 MOST 21. What types of groups do you fish with? (CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY) 1 BY YOURSELF FRIENDS 2 Э. FAMILY 4 FAMILY & FRIENDS TOGETHER

5 CLUB

22. Which type of group do you fish with most often? 23. Do you usually fish with the same group of people? 1 YES 2 NO 24. Which member of the fishing group usually initiates the idea to go fishing? 1 YOURSELF 2 ANOTHER MEMBER OF THE GROUP 3 BOTH YOU AND ANOTHER MEMBER OF THE FISHING GROUP 25. Do you put most of your effort into fishing for one particular kind of fish? 1 YES 2 NO IF YES, WHAT SPECIES____ 26. Do you make any of your own fishing gear? 1 YES 2 NO WHAT KIND?_____ 27. How many rod and ree? combinations do you own? 28. Who first took you fishing? 1 SELF 6 CLOSE RELATIVE 2 FATHER 7 GRANDPARENTS 3 MOTHER 8 FRIEND 4 SPOUSE 9 BUSINESS ASSOCIATE_____ 10 DTHER _____ 5 BROTHER 29. What kind of bait do you usually fish with: 1 ARTIFICIAL BAIT 2 LIVE BAIT 3 DEAD BAIT

30. How many fish do you usually catch compared to the average fisherman?

1 FEWER FISH

- 2 ABOUT THE SAME
- 3 MORE FISH
- 31. BELOW IS A LIST OF REASONS WHY PEOPLE FISH IN TOURNAMENTS. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT INDICATES HOW IMPORTANT EACH ITEM IS TO YOU AS A REASON FOR FISHING IN THE 1985 HALL OF FAME TOURNAMENT.

REASONS :	NDT AT AL	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	MODERATEL) IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANI	
To be outdoors	1	2	3	4	5
For family recreation	1	2	3	4	5
To experience new and different things.	1	2	3	4	5
For relaxation	1	2	3	4	5
To be close to the sea	1	2	3	4	5
To obtain fish for eating	1	2	3	4	5
For the experience of the cetch	1	2	3	4	2
To test my equipment	1	2	3	4	5
To be with friende		2	3	4	5
		4	3	4	5
To experience natural surroundings	1	2	3	4	5
To win a trophy	1	2	3	4	5
To develop my skills	1	2	Э	4	5
To get away from the regular routine	1	2	3	4	5
To obtain a "trophy" fish	1	2	3	4	5
For the challenge or sport	1	2	3	4	5
the cropping and more provident and the second s	1	4	3	4	5

32. How do you compare your fishing ability to that of other fishermen in general?

- 1 LESS SKILLED
- 2 EQUALLY SKILLED
- 3 MORE SKILLED

33. How much did you spend on the following types of fishing equipment during 1984?

REELS _____ BAIT _____

RODS

TACKLE (lures, hooks, lines, etc.)

34. Considering all the fishing you did during 1984, about how many days did you spend doing each of the following types of fishing?

_____Number of days saltwater pier fishing.

_____ Number of days saltwater shore, surf or wade fishing.

_____ Number of days boat fishing in bays.

_____ Number of days boat fishing in the Guif.

_____ Number of days freshwater fishing.

35. How many saltwater tournaments did you fish in last year? _____

36. How many saltwater tournaments do you expect to fish in this year?

37. How much time do you usually spend fishing compared to the average fisherman?

1 LESS TIME

2 ABOUT THE SAME

3 MORE TIME

38. PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS ABOUT SALTWATER Sport Fishing in general.

SPORT FISHING IN GENERAL.	STRONGLY USACAL	DI SAGREE	VEUTRAL	GREE	STRONGLY GREE
The more fish I catch, the happier I am	1	~	2	7	
A fighing this can be expended and in the second state		4	3		3
A rishing trip can be successful even it no rish are caught	1	2	3	4	5
when I go fishing, I'm just as happy if I don't catch a fish	1	2	3	4	5
I usually eat the fish I catch	1	2	3	4	5
A successful fishing trip is one in which many fish are caught .	1	2	3	4	5
I would rather catch one or two big fish than ten smaller fish .	1	2	3	4	5
It doesn't matter to me what type of fish I catch.	1	2	ā	à	5
The bigger the fish I catch, the better the fishing thin	4	-	-		ě
The time as bonned if a second brown the first the training the product of		4	3	4	3
I III JUST AS HAPPY IT I DON'T KEEP THE FISH I CATCH	1	2	3	4	5

39. How often do you participate in fishing tournaments?

THIS IS MY FIRST
 ONCE EVERY 2-3 YEARS
 ONCE A YEAR
 2-3 TIMES A YEAR
 4-5 TIMES A YEAR
 MORE THAN 5 TIMES A YEAR

40. Who introduced you to tournament fishing?

1	SELF	6	CLOSE RELATIVE
2	FATHER	7	GRANDPARENTS
Э	MOTHER	8	FRIEND
4	SPOUSE	9	BUSINESS ASSOCIATE
5	BROTHER	10	

41. Are you a member of a fishing club?

1 YES

2 NO

42. Have you ever: called your legislator on a fisheries matter? 1 YES 2 NO written your legislator on a fisheries matter? 1 YES 2 NO attended a hearing on a fisheries matter? 1 YES 2 NO

43. Do you own a boat?

1 YES

2 NO

IF YES, WHAT LENGTH IS IT? IF YOU OWN MORE THAN ONE BOAT, GIVE THE LENGTH OF THE LARGEST ONE.

44. What one thing would you most like to see done to improve saltwater fishing?

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WILL HELP US TO KNOW MORE ABOUT FISHERMEN. You will not be identified with your answers, so please be frank.

45. What is your occupation? _____

46. What is your age?

47. Are you:

1 MALE

2 FEMALE

48. What is the zip code of your permanent home residence? ______

49. What is your approximate annual household income before taxes?

UNDER \$10,000
 \$10,000 to \$19,999
 \$20,000 to \$29,999
 \$30,000 to \$39,999
 \$40,000 to \$49,999
 \$50,000 to \$59,999
 \$60,000 to \$69,999
 \$70,000 AND ABOVE

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE STATION, TEXA5 77843-2261 A/C 409-845-5411

Department of RECREATION AND PARKS

May 29, 1985



Dear Hall of Fame Tournament Fishermant

The Department of Recreation and Parks of Texas A&M University is conducting a study to provide information about tournament fishermen and the sconomic impact associated with fishermen who participate in saltwater fishing tournaments. This information will be useful to local communities and their businesses, and will help guide future planning and operation of tournaments.

When planning for the future, local tournament and business officials need to consider you, the tournament fisherman. Your responses to our questionnaire are as important to you as they are to us because you participate in and enjoy this specialized fishing activity. As you probably know, the accuracy of our study depends a great deal on the number of returned questionnaires we receive, so we would greatly appreciate it if you would complete the questionnaire and return it to us in the enclosed postage-paid envelope as promptly as possible.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on or associated with the questionnaire.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call. Our telephone number is (409) 845-5410.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely D. I 1/11/15

Robert B. Ditton Professor

Co-KSmin

David K. Loomis Research Associate

RBD/mvd Enclosure

> College of Agriculture Texas Agricultural Esperiment Station Texas Agricultural Extension Service Institute of Renewable Natural Resources

APPENDIX C

NON-RESPONSE SURVEY FORM

If person cannot/will not complete a mail survey:

I understand. In that case, could I ask you several very short and quick questions right now that would help us and only take two more minutes of your time?

IF NO...I am very sorry to have interrupted your evening. Thank-you. Goodbye.

IF YES...Thank-you. Here's the first question:

1. How many times have you fished in the Hall of Fame Tournament before?

2. How many family members or non-tournament fishing friends came with you?

3. How many nights did you spend in the Galveston area?

4. How much did you spend on the following items in Galveston?

Gas or Diesel for Auto_____

Bait____

Diesel/Gas and Oil for Boat _____ Launch Fees or Boat Slip_____

Fishing Tackle and Equipment

Ice _____

Snack Foods, Beer, and other Beverages

5. About how much was spent in restaurants in the Galveston area?

6. About how much was spent for lodging?

7. Do you own a boat? YES NO

8. About how many days did you saltwater fish in 1984?

9. How many days did you fish in the tournament? ______

10. And finally, may I ask your age? _____

THANK-YOU ON BEHALF OF THE TOURNAMENT SPONSORS AND MYSELF FOR TAKING THE TIME TO TALK WITH ME.

APPENDIX D

NON-RESPONDENT EXPENDITURES

Appendix D-1. Average Individual Expenditures by Type of Purchase and Total Amount Spent by Non-respondent Inshore Division Participants (N = 41)

Type of Purchase	Average Individual Expenditures During Tournament	Total Expenditures During Tournament ¹
Lodging	0.00	0
Restaurant meals	5.50	160
Gas for auto	14.10	578
Gas and oil for boat	51.00	2,091
Launch fees or boat slip	0.80	33
Fishing tackle and equipment	37.50	1,538
Bait	14.70	603
Ice	9.10	373
Snacks, beer, beverages	40.30	1,652
Other ²		
Total		\$7,028

¹ All expenditures made in Galveston County.

Type of Purchase	Average Individual Expenditures During Tournament	Total Expenditures During Tournament ¹
Lodging	19.50	839
Restaurant meals	5.00	215
Gas for auto	18.50	795
Gas and oil for boat	136.50	5,869
Launch fees or boat slip	3.70	159
Fishing tackle and equipment	59.00	2,537
Bait	41.10	1,767
Ice	17.20	740
Snacks, beer, beverages	40.80	1,754
Other ²		
Total		\$14,675
1	_	

Appendix D-2. Average Individual Expenditures by Type of Purchase and Total Amount Spent by Non-respondent Offshore Division Participants (N = 43)

¹ All expenditures made in Galveston County.

Average Individual Expenditures **Total Expenditures** During Tournament¹ During Tournament Type of Purchase 0 Lodging 0.00 Restaurant meals 22 5.50 Gas for auto 56 14.10 Gas and oil for boat 51.00 204 Launch fees or boat slip 0.80 3 Fishing tackle and equipment 150 37.50 Bait 14.70 59 Īœ 9.10 36 Snacks, beer, beverages 40.30 161 Other -- ---- --____ Total \$691

Appendix D-3. Average Individual Expenditures by Type of Purchase and Total Amount Spent by Non-Galveston County Non-respondent Inshore Division Participants (N = 4)

¹ All expenditures made in Galveston County.

Type of Purchase	Average Individual Expenditures During Tournament	Total Expenditures During Tournament ¹
Lodging	19.50	293
Restaurant meals	5.00	75
Gas for auto	18.50	278
Gas and oil for boat	136.50	2,048
Launch fees or boat slip	3.70	56
Fishing tackle and equipment	59.00	885
Bait	41.10	617
Ice	17.20	258
Snacks, beer, beverages	40.80	612
Other ²		
Total		\$5,122
_		

Appendix D-4. Average Individual Expenditures by Type of Purchase and Total Amount Spent by Non-Galveston County Non-respondent Offshore Division Participants (N = 15)

¹ All expenditures made in Galveston County.

The Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program publishes technical reports, proceedings and curricular supplements that contribute to its mandate of furthering research, education and public awareness of the oceans and the marine environment. All manuscripts are peer-reviewed by appropriate experts in their respective fields, and made available to the general public at cost. Inquiries regarding potential publications should be directed to the Sea Grant College Program Director or the Marine Information Service Editor.