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Abstract
Purpose – This paper is designed to examine how pleasure travelers manage their travel constraints.
Design/methodology/approach – The leisure activity participation constraint negotiation process framework is presented based on previous studies, and the pleasure travel constraint management process models are suggested based on the research survey and interviews.
Findings – The pleasure travel constraint management model was suggested as a result of the survey, and the leisure activity participation constraint management model based on the interviews. These models demonstrate how the process of motivation, constraint, influence factors, and desire flows to result in no participation, or participation of pleasure traveling or other leisure activities.
Originality/value – It is the first trial to construct the pleasure travel and leisure activity participation constraint management models.
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Introduction
Travel seems to have started from the existence of human beings if a definition of travel as “move or go from one place to another” (AskOxford.com, 2010a) is applied. It is assumed, “A million years ago the first human to walk over a hill – and come back – told stories about what he found there. Years went by and people learned to write and draw, and they drew trip reports on cave walls and sent letters to the spectator” (TravelHistory.org, 2007). People have been enjoying not only short distance travel to local or domestic locations, but also long distance travel to foreign destinations. For example, international tourist arrivals in 2007 were nearly 900 million (Audioconexus, 2008). The Republic of Korea recorded the international movement of 16,102,895 people (6,022,752 inbound and 10,080,143 outbound) in 2005 (Korea Tourism Organization, 2007). Great attention has been paid to the reasons for people’s movement to tourist attractions, especially as the travel industry has experienced a steady increase in tourists’ departures and arrivals since the 1990s: 3,818,740 Korean travelers moved out of Korea in 1995 and 5,522,313 in 2005; 2,476,828 foreign travelers entered into Korea in 1995 and 4,347,318 in 2005 (Korea Tourism Organization, 2007). In response to the increase of tourist movement, travel motivation studies have been conducted (e.g. Lundberg, 1971; Eagles, 1992; Kozak, 2002; Radder, 2005; Kimmm, 2009a). Common travel motives are relaxation, nature appreciation, cultural experience, socialization, and escape.

Leisure activity participation motivation research has been followed by constraint research (e.g. McGuire, 1982; Jackson, 1983; Gilbert and Hudson, 2000; Chick and Dong, 2003; Kimmm, 2009b). These constraints include time, money, partner, fear, skill, stress and so on. Regarding negotiation research, strategies to overcome leisure activity participation...
constraint have been examined (e.g. Kay and Jackson, 1991; Jackson and Rucks, 1995; Schneider and Stanis, 2007; White, 2008). Some examples of negotiation strategies are participation in alternative activities, time arrangement, money saving, and skill development.

The possible relationship among motives, constraints, and participation through constraint negotiation was raised by Crawford and Godbey (1987) who stated: “[studies of] one relationship among leisure preferences, barriers, and participation; that is, first a leisure preference exists, then a barrier intervenes and results in non-participation or, if no barrier intervenes, the individual will participate […] have neglected to examine leisure barriers in the diverse ways in which they may be associated with leisure preferences and leisure participation” (pp. 119-127).

There have been research efforts in the motivation, constraint, and constraint negotiation strategies of leisure activity participation. However, more studies have yet to be conducted in the area of travel constraint negotiation strategies, since constraint negotiation studies have been performed mainly in leisure activities such as physical recreation activities (Hubbard and Mannell, 2001; Loucks-Atkinson and Mannell, 2007). This paper is designed to examine how pleasure travelers negotiate their travel constraints.

**Literature review**

*Motivation, constraint, negotiation*

Motivation/motive, constraint, and negotiation studies of leisure activities (including recreation and traveling) are closely connected. Schneider and Stanis (2007) stated: “The negotiation conceptualization has advanced leisure constraint research, brought the idea of negotiation to the forefront of constraints research and recognized the importance of motivations in the negotiation process”. Son et al. (2008) argued: “negotiation strategies and motivation are crucial elements in shaping leisure participation” (p. 201); “the greater the motivation, the greater the effort to negotiate, the lesser the perception of constraints, and the higher the level of participation” (pp. 355-6).

Motive can be defined as “something that causes a person to act in a certain way, do a certain thing, etc.” (Dictionary.com, 2010a), and motivation as “the reason or reasons behind one’s actions or behaviour” (AskOxford.com, 2010b). Constraint can be defined as “limitation or restriction” (Dictionary.com, 2010b; AskOxford.com, 2010c). When these definitions are joined, leisure (free time) activity participation constraint can be interpreted as a barrier factor against leisure activity participation, or as a cause of frustration to participate in leisure activities such as traveling or golfing. In a broad sense, leisure activity participation constraints would include a limitation/restriction on motives, and other factors such as personal or social situations preventing one from participating in leisure activities. Examples of these situations can include lack of time, finances, partners, or recreational facilities. According to Crawford and Godbey (1987), “a barrier is any factor which intervenes between the preference for an activity and participation in it” (p. 120).

Negotiation can be defined as “the act of process of negotiating”, (Dictionary.com, 2010c) and negotiate as “manage” (Dictionary.com, 2010d). Thus, leisure activity constraint negotiation can be understood as leisure activity participation constraint management: negotiating or managing constraints. According to Schneider and Stanis (2007), “Negotiating leisure constraints means that people adjust their paths in response to an imposing and unchanging environment” (p. 412); “Leisure constraint negotiation is [also viewed as] the effort of individuals to use behavioral or cognitive strategies to facilitate leisure participation despite constraints” (p. 392).

The term “negotiation” has been popularly utilized in research discussing leisure constraints or strategies to overcome constraints (e.g. Scott, 1991; Little, 2002; Stalp, 2006; White, 2008; Samdahl, 2007). However, Schneider and Stanis (2007) stated: “negotiation and accommodation are distinct in that accommodation is an individual activity void of social recognition or reconstruction, whereas negotiation is not […] The majority of current leisure
research, if not all, focuses on accommodation rather than negotiation [...]. Further exploration and defining of constraint negation and accommodation are needed (p. 393).

Regarding the use of a term accommodation, Samdahl (2007) stated: “Our suggestion that leisure constraint negotiation should be called accommodation was somewhat derogatory and intended to emphasize the superficial nature of that approach. Schneider and Stanis (2007) prolific use of the term accommodation fails to capture this deeper purpose and does little to move towards the more dynamic forms of negotiation that my colleagues and I would like to see addressed in leisure literature” (p. 412). The usage of terms between negotiation and accommodation still needs to be settled. In this research, based on the dictionary definition, a term management is used also as a substitute for terms accommodation and negotiation.

Leisure activity participation constraint negotiation

People’s travel motivation is a factor leading to travels not being realized due to constraints. These constraints play a role sometimes or often as a serious barrier preventing one from traveling or participating in other leisure (free time) activities. “Staff of public leisure service agencies have long been concerned with barriers to participation in their attempts to improve service delivery” (Crawford and Godbey, 1987, p. 119). As a result, constraints also started to get attention and become a popular research subject. Research on leisure and recreation constraints has proliferated since the 1980s (e.g. McGuire, 1982, 1984; Jackson, 1983; Crawford et al., 1991; Hinch and Jackson, 2000; Kimm, 2009a, b). An increased number of research results on travel constraints has been observed since the 1990s (e.g. Korzay, 1986; Pearlman, 1990; Hudson, 2000; Nyaupane and Andercek, 2008).

Constraint negotiation research started to be progressed as “the view of constraints as ‘negotiable’ [...] emerged in the early 1990s” (Little, 2002, p. 158), thanks to “new conception [stating] that people do not necessarily react passively to constraints on their leisure, i.e., by not participating” (Jackson and Rucks, 1995, pp. 85-6). Scott (1991) stated: “Leisure constraints [...] must be successfully negotiated if leisure involvement is to occur [...] Although constraints may result in nonparticipation, for example, this may be only one of many outcomes that are possible. People, instead, modify their behavior to maintain a pattern of sustained involvement” (p. 323). Crawford et al. (1991) also stated: “Leisure participation is heavily dependent on a process of negotiation through an alignment of multiple factors, arranged sequentially” (p. 317). Jackson et al. (1993) argued: “people frequently respond to constraints actively, by negotiation, rather than passively, by nonparticipation. Furthermore, it may even be speculated that the confrontation and successful negotiation of leisure constraints can enhance participation as people rearrange their schedules, spending priorities, and other aspects of their lives to accomplish their leisure-related goals” (p. 5). The new concept of leisure constraint negotiation has been shared by other scholars and constraint negotiation studies have been steadily conducted in various aspects (e.g. Scott, 1991; Stalp, 2006; White, 2008).

The common negotiation strategies are:
- no participation (Kay and Jackson, 1991; Jackson and Rucks, 1995);
- participating in alternative activities (Kay and Jackson, 1991; Samdahl and Jekubovich, 1993; Jackson and Rucks, 1995; Little, 2002);
- skill development (Scott, 1991; Little, 2002);
- time arrangement (Kay and Jackson, 1991; Samdahl and Jekubovich, 1993; Jackson and Rucks, 1995; Little, 2002); and
- money saving (Kay and Jackson, 1991; Jackson and Rucks, 1995; Little, 2002).

Regarding the relationship of leisure motivation, constraint, negotiation, and participation, Jackson et al. (1993) stated: “Both the initiation and outcome of the negotiation process are dependent on the relative strength of, and interactions between, constraints on participating in an activity and motivations for such participation” (p. 9). Regarding Jackson et al.’s motivation-balance-model, Son et al. (2008) observed: “motivation moderates the
relationship between constraints and participation. Higher motivation levels are expected to reduce the negative impact of constraints on participation [...] negotiation mediates the relationship between motivation and participation [...] motivation directly increases participation and higher motivation levels increase the use of negotiation strategies to produce a positive impact on participation (p. 201). However, Son et al. (2008) argued that “there is a dearth of research on the role of motivation in the constraint negotiation process [...] an empirical test of Jackson et al.’s balance proposition has not been done” (p. 201).

Hubbard and Mannell (2001, p. 148) developed the four models in which three constraint factors (intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural identified by Crawford et al., 1991), two motivation factors (enjoyment and health), and four negotiation techniques (time, skill, social, and finances) were utilized. Four models developed by Hubbard and Mannell (2001) were tested on randomly sampled, average 36.7 years old, employees’ participation in activities at employee recreation centers through structural equation modeling. Regarding the results of four model tests, Hubbard and Mannell (2001) stated: “only the constraint-effects-mitigation model received strong support [...] A slightly modified version of the constraint-effects-mitigation model with direct path from motivation to participation removed provided a good fit to the data received strong support” (p. 158), and finally suggested the modified constraint effects mitigation model. Regarding the relationship between constraints and negotiation, Hubbard and Mannell (2001) stated:

Respondents experiencing higher levels of constraint participated less. However, encounters with constraints also triggered a greater use of negotiation resources and strategies, and the greater the use of these resources, the higher was the level of participation [...] Encountering constraints appears to directly trigger negotiation efforts that can mitigate the negative effects of the constraints. However, the strength and effectiveness of negotiation efforts, once triggered, likely to depend on a variety of other factors (p. 158).

Son et al. (2008) also presented constraint negotiation dual channel model through structural equation modeling tests for which the questionnaire survey was participated by conveniently sampled, 50 years and older, 271 park visitors and volunteers of a Midwest metropolitan park agency. Regarding the study result, Son et al. (2008) stated:

Motivation did not moderate the relationships between constraints and leisure participation [...] Level of negotiation did not moderate the negative influence of constraints on physically active leisure [...] The constraint-negotiation dual channel model [...] indicates the independent and opposing effects of constraints and negotiation and the indirect effect of motivation on participation [...] constraint and negotiation work independently and with similar, but opposite influences on participation. Negotiation positively influenced participation whereas constraint negatively influenced participation [...] Constraint and negotiation were unrelated with both having independent and opposite effects on participation (pp. 209-213).

Theoretical framework

There are commonalities, similarities, or/and differences among research results by Jackson et al. (1993), Hubbard and Mannell (2001), and Son et al. (2008). However, the constraint negotiation strategies from these studies can be summarized as no participation and participation. The second category can be subdivided into participation in a wished activity or in an alternative activity. Serious constraints or non-negotiable constraints would cause no participation, which can be understood as a behavioral decision through a pre-behavioral process of no desire. Negotiable constraints would result in participation in either wished or alternative activities. To pursue wished activities, various strategies (e.g. including reducing participation, reducing time for house chores or work, or saving money) turn out to be utilized. The differences of research outcome seem to be resulted from various factors, for example levels of constraints (whether constraints are negotiable or not), types of leisure activities, age, etc. However, the motivation, constraint, negotiation, and participation process can be summarized by the leisure activity participation constraint negotiation process diagram.

As shown in the leisure activity participation constraint negotiation process diagram (Figure 1), people are motivated to participate in leisure activities by push, pull, or/and
influence motive factors (Crompton, 1979; Kimmm, 2009a, b). However, people can face either serious or negotiable constraints. Serious constraints would cause no desire due to their seriousness for a person to overcome, and would result in no participation; whereas negotiable constraints would cause either strong or weak desire according to the level of constraint seriousness, and by the influence of diverse factors, e.g. family support or recreational facilities. The level of desire would make a person decide to participate in either wished or alternative activities through the negotiation process.

Research

The research is composed of a questionnaire survey and interviews based on a theoretical framework established on the results of previous studies of motivation, constraints, constraint negotiation.

Survey

The survey to pilot-test the application of the Leisure Activity Participation Constraint Negotiation Process Framework in pleasure traveling was conducted in June 2010. Short, one-page questionnaires were distributed to students in their twenties before the class started. These students were from three universities located in Seoul. The classes and universities were conveniently selected under the judgment that characteristics of Korean university students were similar. The open-ended questions included travel motivation, constraint, and constraint management strategies. Two hundred and twelve students (129 males and 83 females) participated.

Regarding travel motivation, influence motive (42 percent, 88 respondents, 49 males, 39 females) turns out to be the most popular factor, followed by push (27 percent, 58 respondents, 40 males, 18 females), pull (12 percent, 26 respondents, 18 males, eight females), push or influence (14 respondents, six males, eight females), push, pull, or influence (ten respondents, four males, six males), pull or influence (six respondents, three males, three females), and push or pull (one respondent, male). Ten participants (eight males, two females) did not answer.

The result of domestic travel constraints indicates that the most serious one (38 percent, 81 participants, 41 males, 40 females) was time, followed by money and time (35 percent, 74 participants, 52 males, 22 females), money (23 percent, 48 participants, 31 males, 17 females), transportation (three participants, two males, one female, 1), health (three participants, one male, two females) partner (two participants, one male, one female), and weather (one participant, no males, one female). In the case of international travel constraints, money (46 percent, 97 participants, 57 males, 40 females) along with time and money (46 percent, 97 participants, 66 males, 31 females) were the most serious, followed by time (15 participants, eight males, seven females), language (seven participants, three
males, four females), health (two participants, no males, two females), culture (one participant, one male, no females), visa (two participants, one male, one female), preparation (two participants, one male, one female), accommodation (one participant, no males, one female), permission (one participant, no males, one female), health (one participant, no males, one female), and food (one participant, no males, one female).

Various management strategies to overcome travel constraints turn out to be utilized. The strategies to overcome money constraint were:

- savings (37 percent, 78 participants, 54 males, 24 females);
- part time working during breaks (11 participants);
- taking finance supporting or cost-saving travels such as voluntary service travel or bike travel (eight participants); and
- spending less while traveling (three participants).

The time constraint was managed by the effort of making time for traveling by reducing study or other activity hours (18 participants), or utilizing summer or winter break periods (three participants). Other strategies were studying the travel destination’s language (eight participants) or culture (six participants), making travel plans in advance (five participants), or caring about health (one participant). The negative strategies were controlling desire (one participant), and delaying traveling (one participant).

Despite travel constraints, the majority of participants (94%, 200 participants, 120 males, 80 females) had the desire to travel except 12 participants (nine males, three females). The majority of participants (62 percent, 132 participants, 60 males, 72 females) also had travel plans, while 38 percent (80 participants, 69 males, 11 females) of the participants did not have plans.

In summary, all survey respondents had travel experiences motivated by influence, push, or pull factors. The most popular factor was influence motivation followed by push and then pull. It is assumed that most participants’ travel experiences were not awful, since 94 percent indicated the desire to travel again even though all participants had constraints. However, constraints seem to play a negative role since 62 percent of the participants actually had a travel plan. For travel decision making, other influence factors along with travel experiences seem to play an influential role since 60 percent of the respondents utilized strategies to overcome constraints. As a result, it is also supposed that the constraint seriousness along with the role of influence factors determine the level of desire, either weak or strong. One with strong desire would choose to travel, while one with weak desire would decide to participate in alternative activities. Based on the survey findings, the leisure activity participation constraint negotiation process framework can be modified to the pleasure travel constraint management process model I as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2 Pleasure travel constraint management process I
As the model demonstrates, strong constraints would cause no participation. When constraints are negotiable, travel experiences would play a role in causing either weak or strong desire. Wonderful travel experiences would strengthen desire, while awful experiences would weaken desire. When compared with the leisure activity participation constraint negotiation process framework, the pleasure travel constraint management model I demonstrates that negotiable constraints with strong travel desire would result in traveling, whereas negotiable constraints with weak travel desire would lead to other activities.

**Interviews**

The interviews were conducted in July 2010 to examine the pleasure travel constraint management process model I. The semi-structured interview questions focusing on pleasure travel constraints and their management strategies were utilized. Judgment sampling was used in choosing interviewees. Low-income people were mainly selected, since these people were expected to have travel constraints. The participants were 20 females and 22 males aged between 19 and 84 years. Four participants were in their twenties, two were in their thirties, 11 in their forties, 13 in their fifties, ten in their sixties, one in their seventies, and one in their eighties. Eighty-one percent of the participants were in their forties, fifties or sixties. Four participants under 30 were all students, and the others were working, except two who were seniors over 70 years old. These participants had various jobs such as public servant, professional, golf teacher, guard, and owners or workers of self-employed small businesses (e.g. restaurant, and shops for accessories, bags, clothes, glasses, pharmacy, golf equipment, Korean cakes, shoe repair). The interviews lasted about 30-60 minutes, and were stopped whenever the interviewees wanted.

Except for two participants, the others had constraints such as time, money, health, partner, fear, weather, and lack of desire or interest. The majority (79 percent) of respondents had time and money constraints; 48 percent indicated time constraints while 26 percent indicated time and money constraints, and 5 percent indicated money constraints. Fear of long distance travel and health issues turned out to be the major constraint for seniors in their seventies and eighties, both time and money to people in their twenties and thirties, and time to people in their forties, fifties, and sixties.

It turns out that interviewees over 40 are not active in trying to overcome travel obstacles. All respondents in their forties, fifties, and sixties had domestic travel experiences in their twenties or thirties. However, only 15 out of 34 respondents in this age group had international travel experiences. Twenty-nine out of 34 indicated that their jobs did not allow them any time for traveling. Those interviewees who were too busy to plan any trip taking more than a day were usually the owners of or workers in self-employed small businesses. These people, working about 10 hours per day, are not financially affluent, earning less than 2,000,000 Korean won per month to support more than two family members, usually four family members including daughters or sons. As long-distance trips taking more than one day require time and money, these interviewees seem to be satisfied with other leisure activities such as playing sports, climbing mountains, watching movies, chatting, singing songs, dancing, searching the internet, watching TV, and listening to the radio. These people indicated that they planned to travel once they were retired. The interviewees without travel constraint were a public servant and a professional who had regular vocational periods per year, and received a salary, and thus could make travel plans.

According to the interview results, several groups can be categorized based on constraints and their negotiation strategies. These groups are:

- no constraint haves;
- constraint haves but active negotiators usually in their twenties; and
- constraint haves and negotiation losers, usually over 40 years old.

How these groups of people negotiate travel constraints can be demonstrated by the pleasure travel constraint management process II (Figure 3).
When compared with pleasure travel constraint management process model I, pleasure travel constraint management process model II presents:

- the existence of no constraint haves in addition to serious constraint haves and negotiable constraint haves; and
- negative and positive influence factors.

Negative factors such as unsatisfactory travel experiences causing a weak travel desire would make a person fail to participate in traveling, whereas positive factors such as pleasant travel memories causing a strong travel desire would make a person succeed in traveling.

Conclusions

As the pleasure travel constraint and leisure activity participation constraint management process models present, motivation is a causing factor for traveling, which can be realized when no constraints exist, and may not be realized due to constraints. There can be two types of constraints, i.e. serious and negotiable. Serious constraints would lead to no desire and thus finally no participation in traveling or other leisure (free time) activities, whereas negotiable constraints would lead to either traveling or other leisure activities according to the level of desire affected by positive or negative influencing factors (e.g. travel experiences). Therefore, these constraints would not necessarily keep people from leisure activity participation, as noted by scholars such as Kay and Jackson (1991), and Scott (1991). As Hubbard and Mannell (2001) noted, a higher level of constraints, if negotiable, would result in less participation. However, the highest level of serious constraints would result in no participation, since people with these constraints cannot find any resources to utilize to participate in traveling or other leisure activities. An example of serious constraint is well explained by an interviewee, who stated:

I do not feel like traveling at all because of my situation. I have been borrowing money from a bank for my golf practice center operation business. There aren’t many customers these days due to down economy, and thus I cannot earn enough to pay monthly interest payment to the bank. I have no time or desire for leisure activities.

The research result differences by Hubbard and Mannell (2001) and Son et al. (2008) can be explained by the pleasure travel constraint management process models. Hubbard and Mannell’s final modified constraint-effects-mitigation model presents that constraints negatively affect participation but affect it positively through negotiation processes. However, Son et al.’s constraint-negotiation dual channel model for physically active leisure in mid to late life demonstrates that “constraint and negotiation work independently [. . .]
Negotiation positively influences participation whereas constraint negatively influenced participation” (Son et al., 2008, p. 211). In both models, constraints play a negative role in participation. However, only in Hubbard and Mannell’s model do constraints also play a positive role in participation. This difference can be explained by the existence of different types of constraints. Serious constraints would play only a negative role and thus work independently from negotiation. However, negotiable constraints would play a positive role in participation through negotiation processes by making people discover negotiation strategies. The differences can also be explained by the age differences of the samples. This interview interviews in this research showed that people in their twenties were eager to deal with constraints; however, people over 40 years old were not. Therefore, it seems that Son et al.’s research participants aged 50 years old and older were not eager to overcome constraints as compared to participants with an average age of 36.7 years in Hubbard and Mannell’s survey. This difference could result in the different findings: constraints play only a negative role in Son et al.’s research, but both negative and positive roles in Hubbard and Mannell’s study.

Regarding the motivation factor, in both Hubbard and Mannell’s (2001) and Son et al.’s (2008) models, this factor plays a positive role in participation through negotiation process. However, in Jackson et al.’s (1993) motivation balance model, motivation plays a positive role in participation directly and also through negotiation and constraint. As the pleasure travel constraint and leisure activity participation constraint models demonstrate, this difference can be explained: motivation would play a positive role directly in participation when there are no constraints, and would also play a positive role through negotiation if constraints are negotiable and desire is strong with positive influence factors, while its positive role would be weakened even if constraints are negotiable because of weak desire by the influence of negative factors.

This research contribute to the existing studies by presenting pleasure travel constraint management processes and also by analyzing research result differences of Jackson et al. (1993), Hubbard and Mannell (2001) and Son et al. (2008). For future research, it is recommended that the pleasure travel constraint management process models are tested on various subjects with different characteristics.
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