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Abstract
There have been constraint studies in the academic areas of leisure, recreation, and travel; and the hierarchical model of leisure constraints (Crawford et al 1991) has been tested frequently. However, the issues of invalidity of this model in hierarchical flow of constraints and in universal application have been raised. Therefore, the three-factor model of leisure activity participation and the pyramid model of leisure activity participation constraints were developed to supplement the almost 20-year old model. Through the classroom survey at universities in the Republic of Korea, it turns out that 1) the structural, intrapersonal, and interpersonal constraints play a constraint role in leisure activity participation separately or together, and 2) structural constraints are most seriously followed by intrapersonal and then interpersonal constraints.
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Introduction

People have been participating in pleasure travel and other pleasure activities with various motivations. However, diverse constraints have prevented people from travelling or pursuing other fun activities. These constraints have been examined by many scholars in various angles such as travel, recreation, or leisure constraints. Constraint studies on leisure, recreation, and travel have frequently tested the hierarchical model of leisure constraints (Crawford et al 1991). However, the invalidity of the hierarchical model and that of the cosmopolitan application were testified by the empirical tests (Gilbert & Hudson 2000, and Chick & Dong 2004), indicating the necessity for new models. Therefore, the three-factor model of leisure activity participation and pyramid model of leisure activity participation constraints were developed as possible options to complement the hierarchical model. In the three-factor model, structural, intrapersonal, and interpersonal constraints work independently or coincidently. In the pyramid model, constraints are explained based on the levels of seriousness. The square, diamond, and pyramid models of leisure activity constraints were diagramed and discussed for theoretical review on the leisure activity participation constraints and opportunities. The classroom survey at universities in the Republic of Korea was conducted to examine the newly developed models.

Literature Review

Leisure, Recreation, and Travel Constraints

The leisure constraint studies, playing a pioneer role for the related studies, started to be active since 1980s (e.g. by McGuire 1982; McGuire 1984; Smith 1987; Jackson 1988; Crawford et al 1991; Henderson & Bialeschki 1991; Shaw et al 1991; McCarville & Smale 1993; Raymore et al. 1993; Jackson 1994; Jackson & Henderson 1995; Samdahl & Jekubovich 1997; Stodolska 1998; Hawkins et al 1999; Hinch & Jackson 2000; Jackson 2000; Hubbard & Mannell 2001). These study results demonstrate that there have been endeavors to examine leisure constraints in diverse subjects including the disabled, women, or immigrants.

Leisure constraint studies have been extended to related academic disciplines such as recreation and tourism studies. As a result, recreation constraint research, often utilizing leisure constraint models, started to become active since 1980s (e.g. Jackson 1983; Buchanna & Allen 1985; Searle & Jackson 1985; McGuire et al 1986; Henderson et al 1988; Hultsman 1993; Jackson 1994; Williams & Lattey 1994; Caroll & Konstantinos 1997; Williams & Fidgeon 2000; Gilbert & Hudson 2000;

The commonly identified recreation and travel constraints are: 1) money (Williams & Fidgeon 2000; Hudson 2000; Gilbert & Hudson 2000; Pennington-Gray & Kerstetter 2002; Fleischer & Pizam 2002; Kim & Chalip 2004; Nyaupane et al 2004; Nyaupane & Andereck 2008), 2) time (Hudson 2000; Gilbert & Hudson 2000; Pennington-Gray & Kerstetter 2002; Fleischer & Pizam 2002; Nyaupane et al 2004; Nyaupane & Andereck 2008), 3) health (Fleischer & Pizam 2002; Nyaupane & Andereck 2008), 4) fear (Williams & Fidgeon 2000; Hudson 2000; Gilbert & Hudson 2000); 5) skill (Hudson 2000; Gilbert & Hudson 2000; Nyaupane et al 2004); and 6) partner (Hudson 2000; Gilbert & Hudson 2000; Nyaupane & Andereck 2008). These recognized constraints can be summarized by the three factors: structural, intrapersonal, and interpersonal constraints as explained by Crawford and Godbey as follows:

Examples of structural barriers include family life-cycle stage, family financial resources, season, climate, the scheduling of work time, availability of opportunity (and knowledge of such availability), and reference group attitudes concerning the appropriateness of certain activities. . . Examples of intrapersonal barriers include stress, depression, anxiety, religiosity, kin and non-kin reference group attitudes, prior socialization into specific leisure activities, perceived self-skill, and subjective evaluations of the appropriateness and availability of various leisure activities. . . Interpersonal barriers are the result of interpersonal interaction or the relationship between individuals’ characteristics (1987 pp 122-124)

Crawford, Jackson, and Godbey also developed a hierarchical model of leisure constraints (1991 p 313) as follows:

```
Intrapersonal Constraints ----> Interpersonal Constraints ----> Structural Constraints
                 /                          \
             Leisure Preferences           Interpersonal Compatibility and Coordination
                                              --------> Participation (or Non-participation)
```
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Regarding the hierarchical model of leisure constraints (HMLC), Crawford et al stated (1991 p 313):

As far as leisure participation and non-participation are concerned, we propose that constraints are encountered hierarchically, first at the intrapersonal level . . . Leisure preferences are formed, it is suggested, when intrapersonal constraints of the kind enumerated earlier are absent or their effects have been confronted through some combination of privilege and exercise of the human will. Next, depending on the type of activity, the individual may encounter constraints at the interpersonal level; this could be less relevant in the case of solitary leisure activities. It is only when this type of constraint has been overcome (if appropriate to the activity) that structural constraints begin to be encountered. Participation will result in the absence of, or negotiation through, structural constraints. If structural constraints are sufficiently strong, however, the outcome will be non-participation.

The HMLC has been tested in leisure, recreation, and travel contexts by scholars such as Hudson (2000), Gilbert and Hudson (2000), Nyaupane, Morais and Graefe (2004), Chick and Dong (2004), and Nyaupane and Andereck (2008). The raised issues include 1) whether leisure constraints are hierarchical, and 2) whether the cross-cultural application of the HMLC is valid. The first issue was raised through the empirical test by Gilbert and Hudson (2000) who stated:

Primary research supported the hierarchical theory of constraints but only to a point. It was suggested by the data that people do have to overcome intrapersonal constraints in order to gain a leisure preference, and these are the first level of constraints that they will encounter. Those who have successfully negotiated intrapersonal constraints will move along the hierarchy to confront structural constraints. However, there was no evidence to support the Crawford et al (1991) model whereby interpersonal constraints are confronted before structural constraints. Further, in the case of skiing, interpersonal constraints often did not exist. These findings contradict those of Raymore et al (1993), who supported the hierarchical model in its original form (para 34).

The second issue, the application of the HMLC, was raised also through the empirical test by Chick and Dong (2004) who argued:

. . . tests of the Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constraints have largely been restricted to North America . . . Most studies of leisure are conducted in North America. Moreover, to our knowledge, there are no investigations of the validity of the leisure constraints model on the basis of cross-cultural comparative research (pp 338-339).
As noted and reviewed, the HMLC was tested frequently in countries with western culture, e.g. America (Nyaupane, Morais & Graefe 2004; Nyaupane & Andererek 2008), England (Hudson 2000; Gilbert & Hudson 2000). Even though Chick and Dong (2004) suggested the refined hierarchical model of leisure constraints based on the result of the cross-cultural application test of the HMLC through interviews with Chinese and Japanese participants, more testing in diverse research setting and newly developed models seem to be necessary.

Theoretical Framework

Three-Factor Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints

It seems to have been a good attempt to divide leisure constraints into three categories such as intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural (Crawford et al 1987 & 1991). However, as some empirical tests demonstrated the possible invalidity of the existence of hierarchy in leisure constraints (e.g. Gilbert & Hudson 2000), the existing model needs to be substituted by revised or new models. One example of a new model can be the Three Factor Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints (see diagram 1). In this model, constraints (structural, intrapersonal, and interpersonal) play a negative role by keeping one from participating in leisure activities (e.g. pleasure travelling or outdoor recreations) separately or concurrently according to one’s personal situations. For example, one cannot take an international golf travel due to 1) structural (money) constraint alone, 2) structural (time) and intrapersonal (no interest in golfing) constraints, or 3) structural (money), intrapersonal (no skill), and interpersonal (no partners) constraints. This model can also explain cases in which constraints do not work in a hierarchical process as Crawford et al argued (1991).

Diagram 1 Three-Factor Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints
Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints

The constraint studies show that structural constraints are frequently found both in travelling and recreations. For example, structural constraints (e.g. money, time, weather, information, availability of place or facilities, and place attributes) were identified in travel constraint studies such as travel to Arizona (Nyaupane & Anderreck 2008), travel to FIFA World Cup (Kim & Chalip 2004), nature-based travelling (Pennington-Gray & Kerstetter 2002), Israel senior travels (Fleischer & Pizam 2002). Structural constraints were found also in constraint studies of outdoor recreations such as rafting, canoeing, and horseback-riding (Nyaupane, Morais & Graefe 2004), and skiing (Williams & Fidgeon 2000; Hudson 2000; Gilbert & Hudson 2000). Money and time constraints turned out to be most serious in travelling (e.g. Arizona travel research by Nyaupane & Anderreck 2007, nature-based travelling research by Pennington-Gray & Kerstetter 2002), and also in skiing (e.g. Hudson 2000). Intrapersonal constraints (e.g. interest, skill, physically demanding, health, disability, safety, risk, and fear) were identified also in some constraint studies such as Arizona travel (Nyaupane & Anderreck 2008), nature-based travel (Pennington-Gray & Kerstetter 2002), and skiing (Hudson 2000; Williams & Fidgeon 2000). Regarding interpersonal constraints, Kim and Chalip (2004) stated “finding is consistent with Gilbert and Hudson (2000) who found that interpersonal constraints are not relevant considerations for sports tourists” (para 36).

According to the findings of these constraint studies, a main obstacle turns out to be structural constraints, especially time and money, followed by intrapersonal and then by interpersonal constraints. This result can be interpreted that structural constraints are most difficult to overcome since they are often related to income or work hours, which are not self-controllable in many cases. However, intrapersonal constraints are easier to overcome than structural constraints since these can be adjusted by personal efforts except for a few discouraging cases. An interpersonal constraint seems to become the least obstacle since various options exist to overcome these obstacles. For example, the main interpersonal constraint, partner finding can be overcome through various social clubs or on-spot socialization. Leisure activities requiring partners can also be substituted by other activities requiring no partner. Based on the review of the level of constraint seriousness in affecting participation decisions, the author suggests the Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints in which structural constraints play the most serious role in keeping one from participating in leisure activities. The structural constraints as a major barrier are followed by intrapersonal and then interpersonal constraints.
Diagram 2 Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints

Leisure Activity Constraints and Opportunities

Leisure activity constraints are closely related to leisure activity participation whether these constraints are real or perceived. It would be most ideal for leisure activity constraints to be minimized in order for any social members to enjoy fair leisure activity opportunities with mild constraints as shown in the Square Model of Leisure Activity Constraints and Opportunities:

Diagram 3 Square Model of Leisure Activity Constraints and Opportunities

However, it is assumed that the Square Model cannot be realized in all societies. There are communities whose situations can be explained by the Diamond Model of Leisure Activity Constraints and Opportunities. This model demonstrates three groups of people to explain the relationship between leisure activity constraints (e.g. time, money, and desire) and opportunities (e.g. travel or recreations). The first group of a few at the top indicates financially affluent people who have very mild leisure constraints and thus can enjoy enough leisure activity opportunities. The second group of many people implies the general public who has mild constraints and thus can enjoy fair opportunities. The third group of few indicates poor people who have serious constraints and thus can enjoy opportunities rarely. A society in which this model fits is considered to be second ideal because at least the majority of its members have fair opportunities to enjoy leisure activities.
Undesirably, there are also other communities whose situation cannot be explained by either the Square or Diamond Model, but by the Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Constraints and Opportunities. This model also indicates three groups of people: 1) The few financially affluent people with very mild leisure activity constraints, which could lead to enough leisure activity opportunities; 2) some people with mild constraints, who enjoy fair opportunities; and 3) many people with serious constraints, which only provide rare opportunities. The society in which this model fits is considered to be least ideal because the majority of the members face serious leisure activity participation constraints and thus cannot have enough or fair opportunities to enjoy leisure activities.

Diagram 5 Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Constraints & Opportunities
The most ideal and thus advanced model would be the Square Model followed by the Diamond, then by the Pyramid Model. The Pyramid Model can frequently be shown in a society in which a social welfare system is underdeveloped to guarantee fair wage, or official work hours. In the underdeveloped social welfare system, only a few people enjoy leisure activities, while many are prohibited by structural constraints like that of Roman Empire system of the oppressor and the oppressed, or the Victorian royal system of the master and servant as depicted by Moss and Delgado as follows:

... slaves ... never had a holiday, except for few days at the feast of Saturnalia in December ... Only their constant work made it possible for the free men of Rome to enjoy such wonderful leisure (Moss 1962 p 8)

... servants were available in almost unlimited numbers [for non-working class with endless free time]. The leisure activities of each day culminating in dinners and dances at night were considered by some people to be of crushing boredom and monotony (p.7) ... Leisure was not for the working classes [of Victorian era of Britain 1837-1901] - they did not know how to use it.” (Delgado 1971 p 82).

In this modern era, it would be difficult to find people who are forced to work endless hours without holidays as Roman slaves were. However, it would be possible to find people who work long hours to make ends meet, e.g. self-employed small business operators working about 12 hours per day. Enjoying leisure activities might be too luxurious for these people as it was for the working classes of Victorian era of Britain. These cases can possibly be found in societies with the underdeveloped welfare system in which the Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Constraints and Opportunities fit and thus issues of equal opportunity in leisure opportunities (e.g. travel or recreation) could be raised.

Research

Purpose

The research was conducted 1) to test the newly developed leisure activity participation constraint models: Three Factor Model and Pyramid Model, and 2) to diagnose the leisure activity constraint and opportunity situation in Korea through the review on three leisure constraint and opportunity models: square, diamond, and pyramid models.
Method

The classroom survey was conducted before the class started at five universities of the Republic of Korea in 2008. The questionnaires with open ended questions were distributed to 463 full-time students who were asked to write their constraints on domestic travel, international travel, and favorable recreation. The questionnaire also included the profile questions such as age, and gender. Convenient sampling technique was utilized in choosing universities and classes since the constraint situations of full-time university students are considered to be quite similar.

Results

The results from university students aged between 20 and 25, presents that identified constraints for 1) domestic travel are money, time, distance, transportation, weather, information, accommodation, underdevelopment, desire, health, fear, partner; 2) international travel are money, time, distance, transportation, weather, information, accommodation, safety, seasonality, entry restriction, visa, desire, language, preparation complexity; and 3) recreation are money, time, distance, transportation, weather, information, safety, seasonality, equipment, place, desire, fear, skill, physical ability, partner. Common structural constraints are money, time, distance, transportation, weather, information; while a common intrapersonal constraint is desire. Interpersonal constraint ‘partner’ is not identified as a constraint for international travel. Major structural constraints turn out to be money and time for three types of leisure activities: domestic travel, international travel, and recreation.

The diagram 6 travel and recreation constraint frequencies drawn from the survey result demonstrate that 1) structural, intrapersonal, and interpersonal constraints play a constraint role independently or dependently on each other as suggested by the Three-Factor Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints (diagram 1); and 2) structural constraints are most outstanding followed by intrapersonal, and then by interpersonal constraints as demonstrated in the Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints (diagram 2).
## Diagram 6 Travel and Recreation Constraint Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Domestic Travel</th>
<th>International Travel</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural (S)</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal (Intra)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal (Inter)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; Intra</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; Inter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra &amp; Inter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; Inter &amp; Intra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Constraints</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Conclusions and Discussions

The survey result demonstrates that Korean university students' constraints on leisure activity participation are serious since 94% respondents felt constraints on domestic travel, 97% on international travel, and 92% on recreation. According to this result, Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Constraints and Opportunities seem to be most fit to explain the leisure activity participation opportunities for Korean university students who turn out to be in an unfavourable situation mainly due to structural constraints, especially money and time constraints. It seems that further research is required to investigate the issues related to students' leisure activity participation, and strategies need to be established to reduce the level of constraints experienced by the majority of the students, who participated in the survey.

The survey result also verifies newly built models (Three-Factor Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints and Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints) to complement the Hierarchical Model of Leisure Constraints (Crawford et al 1987 & 1991). It is considered a good attempt 1) to develop substitute models based on previous research findings (e.g. constraints on senior travel, travel to Arizona or to Korea, skiing, rafting, canoeing, horseback-riding), and 2) to test these established models. However, more empirical tests are recommended in consideration of different types of subject groups (e.g. non-students), diverse kinds of travels (e.g. short-period travels vs. long-period travels), or various recreations (e.g. high-cost recreation such as skiing vs. low-cost recreation such as badminton). As different research studies could draw different results, generalization without
enough empirical tests by considering various angles, would be improper. For example, structural constraints were found in outdoor recreations such as skiing (Williams & Fidgeon 2000; Hudson 2000; Gilbert & Hudson 2000), rafting, canoeing, and horseback-riding (Nyaupane, Morais & Graefe 2004). However, structural constraints such as money might not be serious in outdoor recreations such as badminton. Structural constraint could be found more in long-distance or long-period travels than short-distance or short-period travels (e.g. a Korean tourist to Africa vs. to Vietnam), and also more in recreations requiring high cost than one requiring low cost (e.g. skiing or golfing vs. badminton or table-tennis). A person would experience structural constraints more in a long-distance travel than a short-distance travel to a recreation area (e.g. ski resort vs. badminton area at a nearby park). Busy professionals might face more time constraints than ordinary workers. Low income earners could face more financial constraints than high income earners. Intrapersonal constraints can be found more in beginning level skiers than advanced skiers. Interpersonal constraints can be found more in recreational travel requiring partners than sightseeing travel which can be taken by individuals (golf travel vs. Seoul sightseeing travel), and also more in recreations requiring partners than recreations which can be practiced by individuals (e.g. tennis vs. skiing). As there could be so many diverse cases, Three-Factor Model or Pyramid Model of Leisure Activity Participation Constraints might not be applied to all different cases. However, these models must be a valuable trial in opening a way to examine leisure activity constraints according to the role of each factor and the level of seriousness.
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