

# THE AUSTRALIAN GOLF HANDICAP SYSTEM SURVEY OF ALL AUSTRALIAN CLUBS

July 2016





# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	3
BACKGROUND.....	3
SCOPE OF WORKS.....	3
RESPONDENT PROFILE & INTERPRETATION OF TABLES .....	3
SURVEY SECTIONS.....	4
ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS.....	5
HANDICAP LIMITS.....	5
SCORING OUTCOMES.....	6
GRADES & TEES USED.....	9
DAILY SCRATCH RATING.....	10
SYSTEM SENTIMENT .....	13
OVERALL SATISFACTION .....	14
ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS.....	15



## Background

A major reform of the GA Handicap System has taken place over the past five years. The complete new system came into full effect for all clubs in early 2014. With this revised system having now been in place and operating for approximately two years, Golf Australia (GA) wanted feedback from the industry as to their satisfaction with the system.

This feedback was sought via a national survey, with this report detailing the findings of this research. This report outlines the general profile of the views held by industry administrators and identifies the differences that exist across the different club types when assessed by various characteristics such as gender, member size, and geographic location. Where applicable, responses have been weighted to take account for the number of members at each responding club.

## Scope of Works

The national survey has been overseen by Golf Business Advisory Services (GBAS). A 24 question survey was sent to Golf Australia's national club database on the 25th of February 2016. To ensure maximum coverage across the golf club industry, the survey was also sent to the databases held by Golf Management Australia and the state golf associations. The survey is attached as Appendix One to this report.

## Respondent Profile and Interpretation of Tables

In the following document two tables are provided for each question. They both contain the results as evident by club size, geographic location and gender. The first table will reflect the results when assessed on a club basis, where all clubs are treated the same regardless of member size.

Given the large breadth of club sizes in Australia, the club mix does not equal the mix when measured by club numbers. Given the topic of this report and the fact that its outcomes will be directly applied to individuals rather than clubs, GBAS felt it important to also identify the resultant outcome when measured by members represented. The second table reflects the results when assessed on such a basis.

### Clubs

A total of 669 responses were received from 577 clubs. According to the 2014 Golf Participation Report there are a total of 1,591 clubs across Australia, reflecting a resultant 36% response rate.

The club response rate is summarised in the following table, outlining the overall rate, that of metropolitan and regional markets and clubs by size range.

Response by clubs					
Respondent Category	Survey response		National profile		Survey response differential
	Count	%	Count	%	
Overall	577		1,591		
Response %	36%				
Social	76	13%	230	14%	-1%
Less than 100	140	24%	624	39%	-15%
100 to 399	154	27%	392	25%	2%
400 to 799	118	20%	206	13%	8%
800+	89	15%	139	9%	7%
Metro	107	19%	206	13%	6%
Regional	394	68%	1,155	73%	-4%
Social	76	13%	230	14%	-1%

## Members

Based on data from Golf Australia's 2014 Golf Participation Report, the 577 clubs that responded to the survey account for a total of 271,727 members. Accordingly, as a proportion of total golf club members across Australia, the survey responses received represent 68% of the total Australian club member market.

The response rate by members represented is summarised in the following table, outlining the overall rate, that of metropolitan and regional markets and clubs by size range.

Respondent Category	Response by members				
	Survey response		National profile		Survey response
	Count	%	Count	%	
Overall	271,727		397,234		
Response %	68%				
Social	12,655	5%	15,225	4%	1%
Less than 100	9,236	3%	24,967	6%	-3%
100 to 399	39,140	14%	84,051	21%	-7%
400 to 799	84,825	31%	118,444	30%	1%
800+	125,871	46%	154,547	39%	7%
Metro	105,331	39%	150,266	38%	1%
Regional	153,741	57%	231,743	58%	-2%
Social	12,655	5%	15,225	4%	1%

## Survey Response – Specific Gender

Given the general topic of the survey, there was a chance that respondents could have differing views based on gender. If that was the case, clubs were asked to provide two separate survey responses – one on behalf of men and the other on behalf of women.

50% of the 669 survey responses received were on behalf of both men and women at the respective club. The remaining 50% of responses were gender specific responses, with 27% relating to male members and 23% relating to female members.

Of the 335 gender specific responses, 53% were from a club that supplied a response for one gender only while the remaining 47% were from clubs that supplied unique responses for both genders.

## Survey Sections

The survey analysis has been separated into five sections, namely:

1. Handicap Limits
2. Scoring Outcomes
3. Grading and Tees Used
4. Daily Scratch Rating (DSR)
5. Sentiment and Overall Satisfaction



# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## HANDICAP LIMITS

*Does your club believe the existing GA Handicap limit of 36 for men and 45 for women is about right or would you like to see it adjusted?*

The following tables demonstrate that there is a high level of agreement with the current handicap limit for male golfers of 36 and for female golfers of 45.

Where an "Other" response was provided, (3% for males and 4% for females), the most common suggestion provided was for a reduction in handicap limits, ranging from 27 to 32 for males and 36 to 42 for females.

Male Golfers	Response by clubs				Response by members represented			
Respondent Category	36 is about right	Increased to 45	Other (free text field)	Don't know / no opinion	36 is about right	Increased to 45	Other (free text field)	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	80%	3%	3%	14%	79%	3%	4%	14%
Social	68%	4%	5%	23%	78%	1%	3%	18%
Less than 100	86%	3%	3%	8%	89%	2%	2%	7%
100 to 399	81%	5%	3%	11%	82%	5%	3%	10%
400 to 799	81%	3%	1%	15%	81%	3%	1%	15%
800+	77%	3%	5%	15%	76%	2%	7%	15%
Responded for both	91%	4%	4%	1%	92%	4%	3%	1%
Male	90%	4%	4%	2%	92%	2%	4%	2%
Female	44%	1%	1%	54%	43%	0%	6%	51%
Metro	80%	3%	6%	12%	80%	2%	6%	12%
Regional	82%	3%	2%	12%	78%	3%	4%	15%
Social	68%	4%	5%	23%	78%	1%	3%	18%

Female Golfers	Response by clubs				Response by members represented			
Respondent Category	45 is about right	Increased to 54	Other (free text field)	Don't know / no opinion	45 is about right	Increased to 54	Other (free text field)	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	80%	4%	4%	12%	84%	3%	3%	9%
Social	70%	1%	4%	25%	77%	0%	3%	20%
Less than 100	86%	3%	5%	7%	89%	2%	4%	5%
100 to 399	74%	7%	4%	15%	72%	8%	4%	15%
400 to 799	82%	4%	3%	10%	82%	5%	3%	10%
800+	88%	2%	4%	6%	90%	2%	4%	5%
Responded for both	88%	6%	5%	2%	89%	6%	3%	1%
Male	55%	1%	3%	41%	65%	0%	4%	31%
Female	92%	3%	4%	1%	94%	2%	3%	1%
Metro	81%	7%	5%	7%	84%	5%	5%	6%
Regional	82%	4%	4%	11%	84%	3%	3%	10%
Social	70%	1%	4%	25%	77%	0%	3%	20%



# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## SCORING OUTCOMES - RESPONSE TO GOOD & POOR SCORES

*Generally, does your club believe that the GA Handicap System adequately responds to good scores in terms of reductions to a player's Handicap?*

72% of respondents generally consider reductions to a player's handicap from good scores to be adequate. Larger/ metropolitan clubs were less favourable to this question, with a greater proportion believing that handicaps are reduced too little in response to good scores.

Response by clubs					Response by members represented			
Respondent Category	Hcp reduced adequately	Hcp reduced too little	Hcp reduced too much	Don't know / no opinion	Hcp reduced adequately	Hcp reduced too little	Hcp reduced too much	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	72%	21%	4%	2%	68%	23%	6%	3%
Social	81%	15%	1%	2%	83%	8%	4%	5%
Less than 100	78%	15%	3%	3%	60%	12%	3%	25%
100 to 399	70%	22%	5%	2%	71%	21%	6%	2%
400 to 799	70%	25%	4%	1%	69%	25%	4%	1%
800+	63%	27%	7%	3%	66%	25%	6%	3%
Responded for both	70%	22%	5%	3%	65%	27%	4%	4%
Male	68%	27%	4%	1%	65%	27%	6%	2%
Female	82%	11%	5%	2%	78%	13%	7%	2%
Metro	62%	30%	6%	2%	62%	30%	5%	3%
Regional	73%	20%	5%	2%	71%	20%	6%	3%
Social	81%	15%	1%	2%	83%	8%	4%	5%
Metro, Male & 800+	50%	33%	11%	6%	50%	33%	11%	6%

*Generally, does your club believe that the GA Handicap System adequately responds to poor scores in terms of increases to a player's Handicap?*

73% of respondents generally consider increases to a player's handicap from poor scores to be adequate, with a generally consistent view held when assessed by members represented.

Response by clubs					Response by members represented			
Respondent Category	Hcp increased adequately	Hcp increased too much	Hcp increased too little	Don't know / no opinion	Hcp increased adequately	Hcp increased too much	Hcp increased too little	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	73%	16%	6%	5%	74%	14%	7%	6%
Social	80%	14%	2%	4%	84%	10%	0%	5%
Less than 100	75%	16%	6%	3%	55%	14%	4%	26%
100 to 399	69%	20%	5%	6%	68%	22%	4%	6%
400 to 799	70%	13%	11%	6%	71%	14%	10%	5%
800+	76%	13%	6%	5%	78%	11%	6%	5%
Responded for both	71%	16%	7%	6%	71%	13%	7%	9%
Male	72%	16%	9%	3%	69%	15%	11%	4%
Female	82%	14%	1%	3%	84%	12%	1%	3%
Metro	74%	14%	7%	6%	74%	11%	8%	7%
Regional	72%	17%	7%	4%	73%	16%	6%	5%
Social	80%	14%	2%	4%	84%	10%	0%	5%
Metro, Male & 800+	61%	11%	22%	6%	56%	12%	22%	10%



# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## SCORING OUTCOMES - WINTER & SUMMER SCORES

*Does your club believe Stableford scores in winter in your competitions are at about the right level?*

79% of respondents believe that Stableford scores in winter are at about the right level. A consistent view is held when assessed by members represented. Of those that do not believe that scores in winter are at about the right level, most believe that scores are too low.

Response by clubs					Response by members represented			
Respondent Category	About the right level	Scores are too low	Scores are too high	Don't know / no opinion	About the right level	Scores are too low	Scores are too high	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	79%	11%	5%	5%	78%	11%	6%	4%
Social	80%	6%	1%	13%	79%	5%	4%	12%
Less than 100	82%	9%	4%	6%	85%	8%	3%	4%
100 to 399	77%	16%	3%	3%	78%	16%	3%	3%
400 to 799	78%	12%	7%	3%	78%	13%	7%	2%
800+	77%	10%	8%	5%	78%	10%	8%	5%
Responded for both	81%	7%	4%	8%	81%	6%	6%	7%
Male	79%	11%	8%	2%	77%	8%	12%	3%
Female	73%	23%	1%	3%	74%	23%	1%	2%
Metro	79%	11%	7%	3%	80%	10%	8%	3%
Regional	78%	13%	5%	5%	77%	12%	6%	5%
Social	80%	6%	1%	13%	79%	5%	4%	12%
Metro, Male & 800+	74%	0%	26%	0%	75%	0%	25%	0%

*Does your club believe Stableford scores in summer in your competitions are at about the right level?*

64% of respondents believe that Stableford scores in summer are at about the right level; 15% lower than for winter scores.

A consistent view is held across different categories of respondents except for social and small (less than 100 members) clubs. Of those that do not believe that scores in summer are at about the right level, most believe that scores are too high.

Response by clubs					Response by members represented			
Respondent Category	About the right level	Scores are too low	Scores are too high	Don't know / no opinion	About the right level	Scores are too low	Scores are too high	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	64%	4%	22%	9%	66%	4%	26%	5%
Social	73%	1%	11%	15%	76%	0%	10%	13%
Less than 100	57%	4%	18%	21%	71%	3%	13%	13%
100 to 399	65%	6%	26%	4%	65%	5%	27%	3%
400 to 799	66%	4%	24%	6%	68%	4%	23%	5%
800+	63%	4%	30%	4%	64%	3%	29%	4%
Responded for both	63%	2%	23%	12%	64%	1%	28%	8%
Male	62%	2%	28%	8%	62%	1%	34%	3%
Female	71%	10%	14%	5%	73%	12%	13%	2%
Metro	68%	2%	25%	5%	66%	2%	28%	4%
Regional	62%	5%	24%	10%	65%	5%	25%	5%
Social	73%	1%	11%	15%	76%	0%	10%	13%
Metro, Male & 800+	64%	4%	22%	9%	52%	0%	48%	0%



# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## SCORING OUTCOMES - STABLEFORD SCORES

*What does your club believe the average winning score should be for a Stableford competition with approximately 30 and approximately 180 competitors?*

There was reasonable consistency across all categories to the question of what the winning Stableford score should be for competitions with 30 and 180 competitors, with the one notable variation being that the scoring expectation was slightly lower for women than men.

Winning score		
Respondent Category	30 players	180 players
Overall	38	41
Social	39	41
Less than 100	39	41
100 to 399	39	41
400 to 799	38	40
800+	38	40
Responded for both	39	41
Male	39	41
Female	37	39
Metro	38	40
Regional	39	41
Social	39	41



The distribution of responses is depicted in the chart below, which also reflects a lower scoring expectation for men compared to women.

30 players				180 players		
Stableford Score	Men	Women	Overall	Men	Women	Overall
36	10%	47%	18%	3%	20%	7%
37	11%	16%	11%	0%	2%	1%
38	25%	24%	28%	5%	19%	7%
39	21%	7%	16%	9%	9%	8%
40	21%	4%	19%	30%	24%	28%
41	3%	1%	3%	11%	9%	13%
42	7%	1%	5%	24%	14%	25%
43	1%	0%	1%	7%	0%	5%
44	1%	0%	1%	9%	3%	6%
45+	1%	0%	0%	3%	0%	2%



# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## GRADES & TEES USED

*Does your club separate club competitions into multiple handicap grades and award prizes for each grade?*

Clubs were reasonably evenly split with regard to the proportion of graded and ungraded competitions held. Club size has the most significant bearing on this question, with clubs having greater than 400 members being much more likely to run graded competitions than smaller clubs.

Respondent Category	Response by clubs				Response by members represented			
	Yes			No	Yes			No
	For all	For most	For some	All ungraded comps	For all	For most	For some	All ungraded comps
Overall	37%	16%	23%	23%	51%	22%	21%	6%
Social	32%	11%	20%	37%	37%	30%	12%	21%
Less than 100	11%	7%	22%	60%	33%	8%	18%	42%
100 to 399	34%	13%	36%	16%	38%	14%	36%	12%
400 to 799	61%	23%	13%	4%	61%	22%	13%	3%
800+	51%	27%	21%	1%	50%	25%	23%	2%
Responded for both	34%	15%	26%	26%	47%	22%	24%	8%
Male	37%	17%	23%	24%	52%	23%	20%	5%
Female	46%	18%	20%	17%	56%	23%	16%	5%
Metro	46%	26%	26%	3%	44%	24%	31%	1%
Regional	36%	14%	24%	27%	56%	21%	15%	8%
Social	32%	11%	20%	37%	37%	30%	12%	21%

*Does your club regularly follow the practice of conducting a competition which involves different groups of competitors playing from different tees but all contesting the same set of prizes?*

Most clubs (58%) responded that they do not regularly conduct competitions which involve different groups of competitors playing from different tees but all contesting the same set of prizes. Some variation is evident across different respondent profiles.

Respondent Category	Response by clubs			Response by members represented		
	Yes		No	Yes		No
	Often	Not often		Often	Not often	
Overall	24%	18%	58%	25%	22%	53%
Social	16%	6%	78%	17%	31%	52%
Less than 100	25%	13%	62%	21%	10%	70%
100 to 399	24%	21%	55%	24%	22%	55%
400 to 799	25%	22%	53%	26%	22%	52%
800+	27%	23%	50%	27%	22%	52%
Responded for both	30%	16%	54%	25%	21%	54%
Male	17%	20%	63%	25%	25%	50%
Female	20%	20%	61%	26%	21%	54%
Metro	26%	26%	49%	27%	27%	46%
Regional	25%	18%	57%	25%	17%	58%
Social	16%	6%	78%	17%	31%	52%

# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## DAILY SCRATCH RATING (DSR)

*Would your club like to have the option of requiring GOLF Link to automatically calculate one DSR for players with single-figure handicaps and a separate DSR for players with handicaps of 10 and above?*

Only 22% of respondents would like to have the option of requiring GOLF Link to automatically calculate one DSR for players with single-figure handicaps and a separate DSR for players with handicaps of 10 and above. Larger clubs are more likely than smaller clubs to utilize this option.

Response by clubs				Response by members represented		
Respondent Category	Yes - my club would use this option	No - my club wouldn't use this option	Don't know / no opinion	Yes - my club would use this option	No - my club wouldn't use this option	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	22%	50%	28%	28%	42%	31%
Social	10%	57%	33%	10%	42%	48%
Less than 100	16%	59%	25%	14%	45%	41%
100 to 399	22%	53%	26%	22%	50%	27%
400 to 799	28%	43%	28%	29%	43%	28%
800+	31%	36%	33%	31%	38%	31%
Responded for both	24%	50%	26%	30%	41%	29%
Male	29%	43%	28%	39%	29%	32%
Female	9%	58%	33%	12%	55%	34%
Metro	28%	36%	36%	28%	34%	38%
Regional	23%	52%	25%	29%	47%	24%
Social	10%	57%	33%	10%	42%	48%
Metro, Male & 800+	64%	36%	0%	63%	37%	0%

*Does your club believe the process for determining Daily Handicaps should be changed so that a score of 36 points will always be the measure of whether a player has played to their handicap?*

Respondents were split on whether 36 should be the measure of whether a player has played to their handicap, with 45% of respondents being favourable compared to 40% being unfavourable. There is little variation evident in the results to this question across different respondent types.

Response by clubs				Response by members represented		
Respondent Category	Yes	No	Don't know / no opinion	Yes	No	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	45%	40%	15%	45%	43%	12%
Social	43%	38%	19%	57%	36%	7%
Less than 100	45%	36%	20%	33%	31%	36%
100 to 399	46%	39%	16%	48%	37%	15%
400 to 799	46%	43%	11%	45%	44%	11%
800+	46%	42%	12%	43%	46%	11%
Responded for both	44%	42%	15%	44%	45%	11%
Male	52%	35%	12%	45%	42%	12%
Female	40%	40%	20%	46%	40%	15%
Metro	48%	38%	15%	46%	40%	14%
Regional	45%	40%	15%	43%	46%	12%
Social	43%	38%	19%	57%	36%	7%



# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## DAILY SCRATCH RATING (DSR)

*Does your club believe it would be best if GA were to reverse the Daily Handicap calculation that is used for Plus markers so that their Daily Handicaps were moved closer to 0 on a difficult course?*

Respondents were slightly favourable to GA reversing the Daily Handicap calculation that is used for plus markers so that their Daily Handicaps were moved closer to 0 on a difficult course, with 30% of respondents being favourable compared to 20% being unfavourable. Those respondents representing larger clubs (800 or more members) were more favourable to this question than respondents generally.

A large number of respondents (50%) have no view/opinion on this question.

Response by clubs				Response by members represented		
Respondent Category	Yes	No	Don't know / no opinion	Yes	No	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	30%	20%	50%	41%	21%	38%
Social	19%	15%	67%	44%	6%	49%
Less than 100	20%	19%	61%	39%	16%	45%
100 to 399	29%	19%	53%	31%	17%	52%
400 to 799	35%	24%	41%	35%	25%	39%
800+	47%	21%	31%	47%	21%	31%
Responded for both	34%	22%	44%	46%	21%	33%
Male	33%	22%	45%	47%	26%	27%
Female	18%	13%	68%	25%	17%	59%
Metro	39%	25%	36%	42%	23%	35%
Regional	29%	20%	51%	40%	21%	39%
Social	19%	15%	67%	44%	6%	49%
Metro, Male & 800+	63%	16%	21%	62%	19%	18%

*DSRs are currently permitted to range between 4 above the Scratch Rating and 3 below the Scratch Rating. Does your club believe these limits are correct?*

Respondents were favourable (61%) towards the current range for limiting the DSR with relation to the Scratch Rating. The overall spread of DSR limit preferences, including those that agree with the current limits, are depicted below.

Response by clubs				Response by members represented		
Respondent Category	Yes	No	Don't know / no opinion	Yes	No	Don't know / no opinion
Overall	61%	18%	21%	60%	23%	17%
Social	59%	10%	31%	51%	9%	40%
Less than 100	62%	14%	25%	72%	10%	18%
100 to 399	60%	20%	19%	60%	21%	19%
400 to 799	64%	18%	18%	63%	18%	18%
800+	62%	26%	13%	59%	29%	12%
Responded for both	67%	16%	17%	65%	20%	15%
Male	63%	20%	17%	67%	22%	12%
Female	47%	21%	32%	45%	30%	25%
Metro	63%	22%	15%	64%	24%	12%
Regional	61%	18%	20%	59%	23%	18%
Social	59%	10%	31%	51%	9%	40%

# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## DAILY SCRATCH RATING (DSR)

The overall spread of DSR limit preferences, including those that agree with the current limits, are depicted below.

Response Options	DSR Upper Limit	Response Options	DSR Lower Limit
1 above scratch	3%	1 below scratch	7%
2 above scratch	8%	2 below scratch	7%
3 above scratch	3%	3 below scratch	61%
4 above scratch	61%	4 below scratch	1%
5 above scratch	2%	5 below scratch	1%
>5 above scratch	2%	> 5 below scratch	2%
Don't know	21%	Don't know	21%





# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## SYSTEM SENTIMENT

*Based on your observations over the past two years and the feedback of your members, what is the most common sentiment at my club regarding the new GA Handicap System?*

66% of respondents believe that the GA Handicap System is fair to all players. Small and/or social clubs have a more favourable view about the fairness of the system compared to larger clubs.

Those who believe the system is fair to all players rate the GA Handicap System at 7.7 out of 10 while those that believe the system disadvantages at least some players rate the system at 5.8 out of 10. Of those who believe that it disadvantages some players, the players believed most disadvantaged are those with a handicap of less than 10.

Response by clubs				Disadvantages some players		
Respondent Category	Fair to all players	Disadvantages some players	Don't know / no opinion	Hcp. less than 10	Hcp. 10 to 20	Hcp. 20+
Overall	66%	30%	4%	24%	9%	5%
Social	75%	21%	4%	14%	7%	2%
Less than 100	74%	22%	4%	15%	9%	6%
100 to 399	62%	35%	3%	28%	11%	8%
400 to 799	64%	29%	7%	25%	7%	3%
800+	56%	41%	3%	38%	7%	4%
Responded for both	67%	28%	5%	23%	9%	4%
Male	57%	41%	2%	34%	9%	4%
Female	73%	23%	4%	16%	8%	8%
Metro	62%	33%	5%	30%	5%	3%
Regional	65%	31%	4%	25%	10%	6%
Social	75%	21%	4%	14%	7%	2%
Overall rating	7.7	5.8	-	5.9	4.9	4.6

(Note: Survey respondents were able to identify more than one disadvantaged handicap bracket. The average overall score provided is for those who checked that box, noting they could have also checked other handicap bracket boxes.)



# ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY RESULTS

## OVERALL SATISFACTION

*Considering your responses to this survey, and your observations over the past two years and feedback from members, on a scale of 1 to 10, where 10 is completely satisfactory and 1 is completely unsatisfactory, how satisfactory is the current GA Handicap System?*

Overall satisfaction with the GA Handicap System across all respondents is 7.1, which drops to 6.8 for a weighted average based on the number of members at each club.

Respondent Category	Response by clubs	Response by members represented
Overall	7.1	6.8
Social	8.0	7.9
Non-social clubs	7.0	6.8
Less than 100	7.3	7.4
100 to 399	7.1	7.0
400 to 799	6.7	6.7
800+	6.7	6.7
Responded for both	7.1	6.8
Male	7.0	6.7
Female	7.1	7.0
Metro	6.9	6.9
Regional	7.0	6.7
Social	8.0	7.9



The distribution of scores provided is outlined below both on clubs and members represented.

Respondent Category	Response by clubs				Response by members represented			
	1-3	4-6	7-8	9-10	1-3	4-6	7-8	9-10
Overall	6%	21%	56%	17%	7%	24%	58%	11%
Social	1%	9%	56%	34%	0%	11%	65%	23%
Less than 100	5%	18%	57%	20%	4%	13%	65%	18%
100 to 399	7%	20%	54%	19%	8%	20%	54%	18%
400 to 799	6%	29%	57%	8%	6%	28%	58%	8%
800+	8%	25%	58%	9%	7%	26%	59%	8%
Responded for both	5%	22%	54%	18%	7%	27%	54%	13%
Male	6%	23%	55%	17%	6%	28%	58%	8%
Female	7%	15%	62%	16%	7%	17%	67%	9%
Metro	6%	23%	59%	11%	6%	23%	61%	9%
Regional	7%	22%	55%	16%	7%	27%	56%	11%
Social	1%	9%	56%	34%	0%	11%	65%	23%



# SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

The key findings from the national survey are outlined below:

- There is a high level of agreement with the current handicap limit for male golfers of 36 and for female golfers of 45.
- 72% of respondents (68% by members represented) generally consider reductions to a player's handicap from good scores to be adequate.
- 73% of respondents (74% by members represented) generally consider increases to a player's handicap from poor scores to be adequate.
- 79% of respondents (78% by members represented) believe that Stableford scores in winter are at about the right level.
- 64% of respondents (68% by members represented) believe that Stableford scores in summer are at about the right level.
- There is reasonable consistency as to what the winning Stableford score should be for competitions with 30 and 180 competitors, being 39 and 41 respectively. There is a slightly lower scoring expectation for competitions for women than for men in competitions with 30 and 180 competitors, being 37 and 39 compared to 39 and 41 respectively.
- Only 22% of respondents (28% by members represented) would like to have the option of requiring GOLF Link to automatically calculate one DSR for players with single-figure handicaps and a separate DSR for players with handicaps of 10 and above.
- Respondents were split on whether 36 should be the measure of whether a player has played to their handicap, with 45% of respondents (45% by members represented) being favourable compared to 40% (43% by members represented) being unfavourable.
- Respondents were slightly favourable to GA reversing the Daily Handicap calculation that is used for plus markers so that their Daily Handicaps were moved closer to 0 on a difficult course, with 30% of respondents being favourable (41% by members represented) compared to 20% being unfavourable (21% by members represented).
- Respondents were favourable (61% by clubs, 60% by members represented) towards the current range for limiting the DSR with relation to the Scratch Rating.







Level 3, 95 Coventry St  
South Melbourne  
VIC 3205 Australia  
T: 03 9626 5050  
E: [info@golf.org.au](mailto:info@golf.org.au)  
[www.golf.org.au](http://www.golf.org.au)

