THREE-FACTOR MODEL OF EQUITY IN TRAVEL OPPORTUNITIES

There have not been enough discussions on the issues related to equal travel opportunities even though this study area is important. This paper, applying Adams’ theory of equity, examines the issues of equity/inequity mainly in golf travel opportunities; and three factors (quantity, quality, and psychology) to achieve equity in travel opportunities are suggested as the components of a Three-Factor Model of Equity.
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Introduction

Tension among members of a society can possibly be caused by various factors such as the absence of equity between different genders, races, or even by unfairly distributed travel opportunities. Antagonism between social members can cause negative impacts within its own community and possibly on other global communities. Therefore, equity issues in travel opportunities, including golf travel opportunities, are as critical as equity issues in other study disciplines. However, the issue of fair travel opportunity has not been discussed rigorously, and neither has been the issue of equal golf travel opportunity. There have been only a few research publications on the issues of equity in the tourism field. Examples include 1) Equity Effects in the Estimation of Leisure Benefits by Curry in 1982, and 2) Authenticity, Equity and Sustainability in Tourism by Cohen in 2002. The lack of research on the issues of equity in travel opportunities are possibly due to the fact that the academic history of tourism research is not long compared to other academic fields such as philosophy. For example, the Journal of Philosophy started in 1904. However, it was only in 1961 when the first volume of Journal of Travel Research was issued. The first volume of Annals of Tourism Research was issued in 1973.

Tourism policy, planning, and development seem to have been the fundamental research areas at the infant stage of tourism studies in the 1970s when the tourism industry started to receive attention as a productive generator of jobs and foreign currencies, and thus an area for systematic research. At the adolescent stage of tourism research in the 1980s and 1990s, it was thought that the research fields such as tourism marketing and service quality improvement were important to attract more numbers of tourists. Nowadays, many and different areas in tourism seem to be actively researched, along with publications in newly established journals such as Journal of Heritage Tourism (from 2006), Journal of Ecotourism (2002), and Tourism Geographies (1999). Tourism research has also included diverse issues
including environment, education, recreation, hospitality, events, and conventions. As the tourism industry and research have advanced to embrace the new era in which travel democracy can be claimed, exploring equity issues in travel opportunities seems to be critical to pave the way for the neoteric age of tourism.

This paper examines factors to achieve equity in travel opportunities. Adams’ theory and its application in golf travel opportunities in the Republic of Korea are reviewed. Finally, essential three factors are suggested and summarized in the Three-Factor Model of Equity in Travel Opportunities. Empirical testing of this model is recommended for future research.

Effects of Inequity

The issues of equity or inequity have been studied, discussed, or tested in various angles by many researchers such as Adams 1963; Adams & Jacobsen 1964; Weick 1966; Andrew 1967; Lawler & O’gara 1967; Berscheid, Boye, & Walster 1968; Lawler 1968; Leventhal, Allen, & Kemelgor 1969; Leventhal, Weiss, & Long 1969; Leventhal & Lane 1970; Leventhal & Anderson 1970; Walster & Berscheid 1973; Austin & Walster 1974; DiIulio 2004. The theory of equity by Adams (1963) has been widely utilized, for example, to examine relationships between time and inequity (Dalton 1983), to review relationships between organizational fairness and retail sales people’s job performance (Dubinsky 1989), to apply the theory in organizations (Huseman and Hatfield 1990), and to review performance management systems (Bradt 1996).

Why have the issues of social equity or inequity become such an interest by scholars or concerned others? It would be because of the negative effects inequitable situations could bring to communities or organizations, and their members. Human history demonstrates that people have been struggling, sometimes even to death, to achieve equal opportunities. Some examples are 1) from monarch to republic through the French revolution from 1789 to 1794
(Cody 2007), 2) from black slaves to African Americans in 1865 (Sylvester, n.d.), 3) from slavery of Jews to freedom of Israelites in 1948 (Lillian Goldman Law Library 2008), and 4) “from Apartheid to a democratic society in South Africa after the first democratic national election in 1994” (Yamauchi 2005 para1). Any society, or organizations would not be able to expect highest contributions or productivity from their members or employees who perceive their reward system to be inequitable.

Regarding the effects of inequity, Adams (1963) stated, “The presence of inequity in Person created tension in him. The tension is proportional to the magnitude of inequity present . . . the presence of inequity will motivate Person to achieve equity or reduce inequity” (p 427). The relationship between inequity and tension explained by Adams can be diagramed as follows:

![Figure 1 Relationship of Inequity and Tension](image)

Adams (1963) also stated the ways someone might follow to reduce inequity, in other words, to achieve equity, a person may:

- increase his inputs if they are low relative to Other’s inputs and to his own outcomes; decrease his inputs if they are high relative to Other’s inputs and to his own outcomes; increase his outcome if they are low relative to Other’s outcomes and to his own inputs; decrease his outcomes if they are high relative to Other’s outcomes and to his own inputs; “leave the field” when he experiences inequity of any type; psychologically distort his inputs and outcomes, increasing or decreasing them as required; increase, decrease, or distort the inputs and outcomes of others or force other to leave the field; change his referent other when inequity exists (pp 426-429).
Figure 2 Effects of Inequity demonstrates how one would do to reduce inequity in order to overcome tension based on Adams’ argument (1963) on inequity and tension.

As Figure 2 presents, Adams’ theory (1963) indicates that a person will try to reduce inequitable situations possibly by increasing or decreasing inputs, or increasing or decreasing outcomes. A person might choose to leave the area if adjustment does not work as expected. When Adam’s theory is applied to golf travel, it is expected that a person would try to achieve equal golf travel opportunities, for example, by demanding the increase in the number of golf courses or the decrease of green fees. However, if the request is not accepted, a person would give up golfing.

Adams’ theory (1963) indicates two major options a person may take. However, a person might take other options. Figure 3 demonstrates several options a person might take in
order to achieve equity. A person might 1) try to adjust inequitable situations by increasing inputs or outcomes, or by decreasing inputs or outcomes, 2) decide to leave the work or endure whatever situation he/she faces, and 3) try to adjust the situation in his/her favor by suggesting changes for the work evaluation system, or changes for the work conditions, etc.

In the case of golf travel, a person might 1) request golf course increase, or green fee decrease, 2) take a non-golf travel or an international golf travel, 3) not pay attention to the issues of golf travel, 4) make suggestions (e.g., the improvement of the social welfare system, the improvement of the economic situations, the increase of the salary, etc.).

As reviewed, Adams’ theory (1963) indicates that a person would take options such as adjusting or leaving when a person faces the inequitable situations. These two major options, depending on the personality, can be extended to four options such as adjusting,
leaving, enduring, or fighting. Adams’ theory (1963) demonstrates that people would march towards removing inequitable situations. Some historic facts (e.g. French revolution or communism revolution) testify that even violence or extreme actions could be used to get rid of dichotomy situations (e.g., the social system of master & slave, or the leisure system of the enjoying & the serving), especially when there is no way out for a better situation no matter how hard one works or tries.

One recent example of success in fighting to obtain equity can be the case of a new tax revolution in the Republic of Korea as described in the following diagram.
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Korean golf named Gyg Gu was played during the Choson Dynasty (1392~1863) of Korea
(National Institute of Korean History 2005). In 1988, professional golfer Ku obtained the LPGA championship (Blauvelt 2003). However, Koreans only started to pay keen attention to the sport of golf since after 1998, mainly due to the continuous international golf tour victories by Korean professional golfers (CNN 1998, Blauvelt 2003, Wikimedia 2010).

As Figure 4 illustrates, the Korean professional golfers’ championship wins in international golf tournaments have contributed to the increase of interests in golfing and the increase of amateur golfers. For example, golf participation increased 11.5% during 2001 and 2002 (Seo 2003). When playing golf becomes desired, there were people who could satisfy their newly ignited golfing desire. However, there were also people who could not play mainly due to financial constraints. According to Kimmm (2009), the most serious leisure activity participation constraint in the Republic of Korea is structural constraints (e.g. money), followed by intrapersonal (e.g. desire) and then interpersonal (e.g. partner) constraints. Games other than golfing or no games were the options for people with golfing desire but without supporting finances. Some people were eager to make the government take some action such as a new tax system to share the social burden of economic depression.

The late 1990s was the period when Koreans became excited by Korean professional golfers’ wins in international tournaments. However, the Korean economy was moving towards economic stagnation due to the dramatic plunge of the Korean won in the international exchange market in 1997 when thus Korea had to rely on the help of International Monetary Fund (Chossudovsky 1997). When the so-called IMF period started, the gap became greater between personal asset holders and no-asset holders, and between the employed and the unemployed. The rich and the employed seemed not to be affected so much and were able to enjoy leisure opportunities even in foreign destinations. According to the Korea Tourism Organization (2007), 603,079 people traveled to foreign destinations in 1998; 1,387,277 people in 1999; and 2,166,751 in 2000; whereas, there were people for whom three
meals were not guaranteed. Some family members made a fatal decision to kill themselves. According to Statistics Korea (n.d.), 6,068 people committed suicide in 1997; 8,622 in 1998; 7,056 in 1999; and 6,444 in 2000 (Statistics Korea, n.d.). Opportunities for jobs, foods, and fun activities seemed to be distributed in favor of the haves or the smarter for better paying positions. It seems that one’s less comparative ability, instead of a social system, was blamed for one’s financial crisis; and no social environment existed to actively support the have-nots or people in difficulty.

The late 1990s and the early 2000s in Korea were the period when the better-off could change their hobby to golfing and also could take international golf trips for better opportunities to play golf, while the less well-off were struggling to survive from the economic depression. Golfing was/is too expensive to enjoy for low income earners. For example, an 18-hole round of golf costs 170,000 Korean won during the week, and 205,000 won during the weekend for non-members (Seo Seoul Tour, n.d.). Membership requires about 4,250,000 to 1,450,000,000 Korean won (DAgolf 2009). According to Nam (2010), Daegu state subway cleaners were paid 1,171,000 won per month in 2009. While there was/is a group of people enjoying a round by paying one fifth of the cleaners’ monthly salary of 1,171,000 won, there was/is a group of people enduring offensive odors only to get the amount for 5-time golf rounding. This dichotomous situation possibly caused the criticism of international golf travel, and the outcry for the improvement of the economic situations. Finally, the Korean government in 2005 introduced the new tax system called Jongbuse by which the tax was imposed to the holders of assets (e.g., a house or an apartment) valuing a certain amount (National Tax Service 2008). This new tax system can be seen as a reflection of people’s outcries to share the burden caused by the infinite looking economic depression. However, the new tax system, a so-called bomb tax, was controversial since there were victims who led a normal life with average income but had to pay the skyrocketed tax due to
the bubble prices of apartments or houses caused partly by the failure of stable real estate price policy. For example, the yearly total tax amount one had to pay to the central and local governments was increased about 30 times since after Jongbuse was introduced (National Tax Service 2008; Ministry of Land, Transport, Maritime Affairs, n.d.). Retirees’ pension was not good enough to pay too much tax amount and thus without adjustment they had to move out of their place, which they might have bought about 20 years ago to live to death. The new tax system of Jongbuse, facing severe demonstrations for modification or abolition, finally became adjusted in 2008 in favor of the adjustment-needy including the elder, and one house or apartment owners. This recent social phenomenon in Korea demonstrates well how the social system is changed and re-changed by the social demand to achieve equitable treatment or situations.

**Equity**

The Compact Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford University Press 2009) defines *equity* as “the quality of being fair and impartial,” *fair* as “treating people equally,” *impartial* as “treating all rivals or disputants equally,” *equal* as “being the same in quantity, size, degree, value, or status; evenly or fairly balanced.” Equity, based on these definitions, appears to be related closely with quantity, providing the same number, e.g. providing social members with the same number of golf travel opportunities regardless of their interest. However, it seems to be reasonable to consider Rae and associates’ “person equality” based on “individuals’ needs. . . A threatened person may require more protection . . . to make that person equal to the nonthreatened person” (Frederickson 1990 p231), e.g. providing golf travel opportunities based on one’s needs or interests.

It also seems to be important to consider psychological factors as demonstrated by Adams (1963) who stated:
Inequity exists for Person whenever his perceived job inputs and/or outcomes stand psychologically in an obverse relation to what he perceived are the inputs and/or outcomes of other (p. 424).

The following summarizes the existence of equity based on explanations by Adams (1963):

Based on the Adam’s argument on inequity, it can be assumed that if a government provides the same number of golf travel opportunity to both a volunteer and a non-volunteer for social work, the volunteer might feel inequitable since he/she might think his/her input (social work) is not fairly reflected to output (golf travel opportunity). However, it is also possible for a non-volunteer to think that he/she deserves the same number of opportunities due to his/her social contributions as a public servant. How subjective feelings or decisions could be extremely subjective are well demonstrated by the Adam’s experiment in which:

Paris-born bank clerks worked side by side with other clerks who did identical work and earned identical wages, but were born in the Provinces. The Parisians were dissatisfied with their wages, for they considered that Parisian breeding was an input deserving monetary compensation (1963 p 423).

The psychological factor plays a critical role in personal judgment on whether situations are...
equitable or not and thus needs to be considered. However, it seems that distorted subjective psychology, e.g., the feeling of inequity felt by the Paris-born bank clerk (Adams 1964), does not deserve being reckoned. If the inequitable feelings by Paris-born bank clerks are reflected, it would only create objectively inequitable situations, so called wage discrimination based on the birthplace.

As reviewed, the factors required to realize an equitable situation can be summarized as 1) quantity factor to provide the same quantity, 2) quality factor to consider one’s personal needs, and 3) psychology factor to reckon one’s input. One ideal example of an equitable scenario can be a social welfare system in which three equity factors (quantity, quality, and psychology) are adjusted fairly. All social members are guaranteed for certain hours to relax after work (e.g. by keeping eight work hour rule), and these members are allowed to freely access public recreation facilities for certain hours, e.g. 2-3 hours per day, 3 times per week (quantity). All social members are also supported to enjoy their favorable leisure activities including costly sports such as skiing, golfing, or sailing (quality). Volunteers for social work (input) are provided more opportunities (output), e.g. more recreation facility use hours for volunteers than non-volunteers (psychology). Another example of an equitable situation can be a case of a pleasure travel opportunity. All social members are guaranteed to have a certain period of holiday (quantity) during which any type of travel one wishes can be enjoyed (quality). Volunteers for social work (input) are rewarded (output) by the state or central government through various ways, e.g. transportation discount coupons (psychology). In an equitable society, travel opportunities would be assured for any social members who wish to enjoy, as structural constraints such as time and money are removed by fair work hours and wages. On the contrary, in an inequitable society, these opportunities would be enjoyed by only a certain group of people (e.g., the rich), and thus failure to enjoy golf traveling is not a choice due to the lack of interest.
Equity indicates providing the same quantity (Compact Oxford English Dictionary 2008), considering personal needs (Rae & Associates), and reflecting one’s psychological factor (Adams 1963). Equity in golf travel opportunities indicates guaranteeing a certain holiday period along with holiday bonus so that anyone, not only the rich, could take a golf trip. Equity in travel opportunities (e.g. pleasure travel equity, recreational travel equity) can be accomplished through considering and adjusting three factors: quantity (number or period), quality (personal wish), and psychology (balance of input and output) as diagramed in Figure 6, which depicts the Three-Factor Model of Equity in Travel Opportunities (Kimmm, 2010).

![Figure 6 Three-Factor Model of Equity in Travel Opportunities](image)

**Measurement of Equity**

To evaluate the situation whether it is equitable or inequitable, three factors (quantity, quality, and psychology) together need to be considered, because one or two of these factors seem to be good enough only for a partial evaluation of the situation. For example, quantity (e.g. numbers, scores, and percentage) was utilized in judging 1) “academic leadership in tourism research” (Zhao and Ritchie 2007), 2) a PhD applicants’ ability (Harvard University 2008), 3) “structural inequality” (Tapscott 1993). As Zhao and Ritchie argued (2007), the number of journal article publications could indicate leadership since the continuing research results must be essential for the academic fields to be developed. However, there could be one research result more valuable than five statistical research findings. GMAT or GRE scores demonstrate some abilities, e.g. time management, fast reading and understanding.
However, these scores might not necessarily evaluate one’s creativity, analytic ability, research skills, or sound personal philosophy leading to valuable research for social wellbeing. As Tapscott (1993 para4) stated, “in South Africa . . . the small white settler population . . . together with a tiny black elite . . . comprised just 5% of the population but in 1989 were estimated to control 71% of the GDP. The bottom 55% of the population, in contrast, controlled just 3% of the GDP”, percentage analysis helps to get general understanding on the GDP distribution. However, x% from poor 55% of the population could be more satisfied than y% from rich 5%, because economic situation might not have full relationships with one’s happiness. Therefore, it appears that quantity factor itself fails to explain the whole facts, e.g. leadership, one’s research ability, inequality.

Quality factors considering one’s personal needs should also be considered. One example to measure a quality factor can be by checking a “feeling of belonging,” a feeling as “part of the group” (Schoenaker 1985 p182) because these feelings can be established by satisfying one’s needs. Finally, one’s psychological factor should also be reckoned since quantity and quality factors could fail in successfully making one fully feel being treated equally. For example, a hard working professional, as one of frequent golf opportunity enjoyers (quantity), could regard him/her as a part of a society (quality). However, this professional might feel unsatisfied by observing someone who does not work but is able to afford golfing opportunities thanks to inherited assets. This observer might feel that his/her contribution to the society should be rewarded more and thus he/she deserves to have more opportunities than idlers. This case demonstrates that two quantity and quality factors are not full enough, requiring the psychological factor for one to feel equitable. Therefore, to make the hard working professional’s psychological feelings satisfied, the lucky with the accumulated assets from the ancestor can be urged to utilize some of his/her assets for the
society, e.g. welfare system for the disabled or orphans. In conclusion, establishing equitable situations and thus making social members feel equitable seems to be possible by considering and adjusting three factors: quantity, quality and psychology.

**Conclusions**

The issues of fair travel opportunities have not been discussed actively in tourism studies and there have been no discussions on equal golf travel opportunity. This research lack could be considered natural due to the short history of the academic discussions on the issues related to golf travel. However, in this mature stage of tourism studies examining various issues, it seems to be high time to eagerly embrace the issues of equal (golf) travel opportunities. Therefore, it is considered meaningful for this research to examine the effects of inequity and the issues of equity in golf travel opportunity by utilizing Adams’ theory of equity/inequity (1963). It is deemed also valuable to introduce the Three-Factor Model of Equity in Travel Opportunities and to identify three factors (quantity, quality, and psychology) in this Model as essential components to achieve equity in activities such as pleasure or golf traveling. This research makes a contribution to tourism and leisure studies by applying the theory of equity, especially in the case of golf travel opportunities. For future research, it is highly recommended to evaluate the Three-Factor Model of Equity in various research settings as empirical testing has yet to be conducted for this Model.
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