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Abstract

This study was conducted as the product of ten years’ experience and learning in the area of tourism and disability since the researcher first knew the topic. There has been a growing interest in disability issues in tourism studies. Exclusion of disabled people from tourism has mostly been studied in terms of the issues for disabled tourists, whereas there have been few studies on disabled people’s involvement in the different stages of the design of tourism up to now. Moreover, although public participation approaches have been regarded as useful tools to involve local people in tourism, they have a weakness in embracing people who are excluded from society and whose needs are not obvious. This study was intended as an investigation of the involvement of disabled people in different areas of tourism. The concepts of design and inclusive design were introduced to tourism, and the idea of inclusive design of tourism was established as an effective approach to promote the inclusion of disabled people in the design of tourism.

The aim of this research was to answer the following two research questions: (1) Are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism? and (2) How can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome? Thus, the ultimate goal was to explore the way toward inclusive design of tourism. It took a methodological position of the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm informed by the critical perspective, and 35 semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted with the key tourism stakeholders in the area of tourism and disability in the South East England region.

The findings of the study show that both inclusionary and exclusionary practices exist in the design of tourism. The forms of and reasons for the involvement and non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism were examined. A variety of barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism were identified, and the ways to overcome the identified barriers were suggested in order to achieve and promote inclusive design of tourism. The main possible contribution to theory that emerged from this study was the introduction of the concepts of design and inclusive design to tourism, leading to the development of the idea of inclusive design of tourism, which can address the issue of exclusion of disabled people from different areas of tourism and promote inclusionary practices in tourism.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction – what has brought me here

A good place to start the thesis is to introduce what has brought the researcher to conduct this piece of research. Introducing the researcher’s personal background is useful in giving readers a better understanding of why and how this research was conducted. This approach can contribute to highlighting reflexivity issues in research, which will also be addressed from different perspectives in the discussion of research methodologies in Chapter 5.

As an undergraduate, I studied tourism at Rikkyo University in Japan with the aim of working in the hotel industry. However, the experience I had at the ‘Tourism for All’ conference in Bali in 2000, where I joined as an undergraduate volunteer, greatly changed my mind. As a mere undergraduate student, my world was quite limited and small. But at the conference in Bali, I met a lot of people working in the accessible tourism area with passion and dreams, and I felt that a huge new world had suddenly opened up in front of me. I found that people who work in this area are passionate but realistic, and that they are kind and accept people’s differences. I also learned from the conference how much of a positive impact tourism can have on disabled people. This experience in Bali led me to begin thinking that I also wanted to join them and do something for the development of accessible tourism. The reason why I started to think this was because I have learned and received a lot of things from the people working for accessible tourism, and therefore I wanted to give something back to them. Also, if my future work and contribution to the development of accessible tourism can make my friends who have disabilities or people in general happy, it would also make me happy. I fundamentally like to see people’s happy faces. In fact, when I looked back at my past working experiences, most of the jobs I had were in the service industry where I can actually see customers’ positive reactions as a result of good service.

After the conference, and in the same year, I became a member of Tourism for All Japan, and I also set up a walking group in the university where I managed monthly walking activities involving disabled people, and continued the activity for three years until
my graduation. Meanwhile, I travelled to many domestic destinations and abroad with friends with disabilities and witnessed what it is like to travel with disability. One of my friends, who is a wheelchair user, showed me what can be barriers for him when travelling and how to overcome them, and what kind of facilities and services can work for people with different needs. My photo albums at that time contained a lot of photos of toilets and ramps in tourism destinations. Another friend who is blind surprised me when he guided me in a place that was unfamiliar to him. We were walking around in a town in Tokyo, and I got lost and could not guide him in terms of which way to go. But he is so good at making a map in his head that after walking through the place, he was able to guide me even though it was the first time that he had been in the town. I was supposed to guide him because I had visited the area several times before, but I got lost, and he guided me in the town instead. I learned from my friends that they are just themselves and are not different from me. They just cannot do particular kinds of things, just like me. I was fortunate to gain this idea from my experience as a starting point of my challenge to contribute to the development of accessible tourism. I am not trying to contribute to accessible tourism development for 'poor' people, but for the people I know and other people in general. This experience was reflected in my undergraduate dissertation, which examined the enjoyment involved in travelling with disabled people.

At the point of my graduation, I still intended to work for the development of accessible tourism in Japan, but, when I looked at myself, I did not have anything in my hand to contribute to it. There were already people working on accessible tourism in different areas such as travel agents, hotels, transport, attractions, non-profit organisations (NPOs) and destinations. I was studying tourism in the university by chance, and found that the topic of tourism and disability had not been studied sufficiently in tourism as an academic subject. Thus, I decided to continue to study this subject in higher education in order to contribute to the development of accessible tourism in an academic sense.

I chose the University of Surrey to accomplish this aim because there were only two universities in Japan at that time that had postgraduate courses in tourism, and I could not find a supervisor for the topic in both of these universities. I chose Surrey just because it had a good foundation course, which no longer exists, including not only English but also different subjects in management. The foundation course leader was Dr Graham Miller. I cannot tell how surprised I was when I found, at the end of the course, that he had actually written an article on tourism and disability. He has been my supervisor since then, and I
would not have thought about doing a PhD if he had not been in Surrey. In the following year, I took an MSc in Tourism Development in Surrey. But I was pushed for time as I had to complete many assignments and exams, and I was only able to explore the topic of tourism and disability in the final-year dissertation. The topic of the dissertation was local disabled people’s involvement in tourism development in London. However, I could not say that I had become an expert in this area with only the single MSc dissertation. For this reason, I decided to take a PhD course.

During the PhD course, I attended a range of local, regional and national conferences, and meetings on accessible tourism and disability in general, to learn what is happening in accessible tourism in the UK and to develop networks with people working for accessible tourism. For example, it was meaningful to know the issues for local disabled people at the meetings of Guildford Access Group (local disability group), whereas it was equally interesting to see the issues in the UK's accessible tourism at the meeting of the Accessible Tourism Stakeholder Forum in the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). It was also extremely worthwhile to listen to disabled people’s voices and to learn the reality that they face in their daily lives at the disability conferences. In order to make my PhD research useful in practice, I have tried to talk directly to practitioners and disabled people, and I have developed the ideas and framework for the research through these experiences.

Having introduced the personal background of the researcher, the chapter now turns to the study itself. The first chapter of the thesis aims to clarify why this research was conducted and how it was designed. It does this by presenting the research background, problem statement, research questions and objectives, research context, key concepts of the research leading to the theoretical framework, and finally by outlining the structures of the thesis.

1.2. Research background

There has been a growing interest in disability issues in tourism studies in the last decade. While most of the existing studies focus on the barriers to travel and the tourism experiences of tourists with disabilities, this research highlights the involvement of disabled people with the design of tourism.
There are different perspectives from which to consider disabled people’s involvement in the design of tourism. Firstly, in addressing the concept of social exclusion, it can be said that tourism is not the only arena from which disabled people are excluded. Rather, disabled people are excluded from a range of dimensions of social life, and tourism is just a part of these dimensions. It should also be noted that there are many groups of people who are identified as socially excluded people such as single-mothers, ethnic minorities, gay, elderly and disabled people. Among them, this research particularly considers disabled people as one of the socially excluded groups of people. The exclusion of disabled people from tourism has been studied extensively from the viewpoint of disabled tourists and the issues surrounding inaccessible environments, whereas there has been little research on disabled people’s involvement in the design of tourism up to now. The focus on the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism can be explained from the second perspective.

Secondly, from the idea of community based tourism (CBT) development, the involvement of disadvantaged members of community, such as disabled people, is one of the challenges that have to be considered in the design of tourism. Community involvement in tourism has been regarded as essential in sustainable tourism development (Cooper and Wanhill, 1997); therefore, the idea of CBT can be regarded as one derived from the concept of sustainable tourism. Although the concept of CBT itself has been significant in emphasising the importance of the involvement of local people in tourism, it has a weakness in addressing the heterogeneous nature of community and power relations within the community, and in embracing people who are excluded from society and whose needs are often not obvious.

These weaknesses of CBT, together with the perspective of social exclusion addressed above, lead to the third perspective in which the involvement of disabled people in tourism development can be seen as a demand from the idea of inclusive development. Inclusive development has been defined by Bieler (2006:14):

‘The emerging concept of Inclusive Development, recognizes diversity as a fundamental aspect in the process of socioeconomic and human development, claims a contribution by each human being to the development process, and rather than implementing isolated policies and actions, promotes an integrated strategy benefiting persons and society as a whole’.

As Bieler (2006) introduces the concept of inclusive design in discussing inclusive development, it can be argued that the notion of inclusive development is based on the
concept of inclusive design. Inclusive design can be understood as both a process and a method. The main characteristic of inclusive design as a process is that it involves users in a design process in which continuous evaluation and improvements of a product, environment or service are made. On the other hand, inclusive design as a method can be seen as one of the business strategies that aim at making products, the environment or services accessible and useable for as many people as possible (Dong and Clarkson, 2006). The research takes the former idea of inclusive design to discuss the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, instead of the latter approach of making the environment and services accessible. Moreover, inclusive design is seen as an action to combat social exclusion (Shimamura-Willcock, 2006). Thus, there is an awareness of the issue of social exclusion behind the idea of inclusive design, and the aim of inclusive design is to combat social exclusion and to promote an inclusive society. The demand for inclusiveness is well described in the following statement that can be also applied to the design of tourism:

‘Inclusion – that is what development is all about – to bring into society people that have never been a part of it’ (Wolfensohn, no date: cited in Bieler, 2006:27).

This thesis examines the contribution of inclusive design to tourism and introduces the idea of inclusive design of tourism. The perspectives introduced here are some of the key concepts that will be addressed in detail in later chapters.

1.3. Problem statement

As introduced above, the thesis recognises two main research problems. Firstly, the discussion on social exclusion and disability shows that disabled people have been traditionally excluded from a range of dimensions of social life in which tourism is a part. While there have been studies on disabled people and barriers to travel, the exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism has not been well researched. The focus of the research is placed on the latter. The second is the limitations and weaknesses of CBT and other public participation approaches to include disabled people in the design of tourism.

Having reviewed the literature on disability, social exclusion, accessible tourism, community involvement in tourism and inclusive design, it appears that disabled people have been traditionally excluded from a range of dimensions of social life in general, and from the design of tourism in particular. Factors preventing disabled people from participating in the
design of tourism have not been revealed particularly well, and ways to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism need to be developed. These problems are the starting point of this study. In attempting to answer and provide insights into the problems, the following research questions were formulated.

1.4. Research questions and objectives

The aim of the research is to answer the following two main questions:
(1) Are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism?
(2) How can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome?

Answering the first question can suggest what the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism are, by identifying the reasons for the inclusion and exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism, which leads to the second question concerning how these barriers can be overcome. In attempting to answer these two research questions, six research objectives were formed.

This research attempts to achieve the following six objectives.

a) To examine if there is inclusion/exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism.
b) To develop the concept of inclusive design of tourism.
c) To explore how disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism.
d) To consider why disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism.
e) To explore the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism.
f) To discuss how the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism can be overcome.

These objectives are not distinct, but they are interrelated with each other, and they can be answered throughout the whole process and every step of the research, including secondary and primary research.

It might be worth explaining why the terms ‘exclusion’ and ‘inclusion’ are used in the research questions, instead of other terms such as ‘involvement’ and ‘non-involvement’. The
meaning of the verb ‘exclude’ is: 1) deny access to a place, group, or privilege, and 2) remove from consideration (Oxford Dictionary of English, 2003). On the other hand, as an opposite word of ‘non-involvement’, the verb ‘involve’ means: have or include (something) as a necessary or integral part or result, and cause to participate in an activity or situation (Oxford Dictionary of English, 2003). Therefore, while the word ‘non-involvement’ simply signifies not involving someone in an activity or situation, the word ‘exclusion’ implies that there are a group of people who are denied access to something that people who are not excluded take for granted. Thus, it might be clear that the use of the word ‘exclusion’ can address the issues of social exclusion and disability and be appropriate in the research questions in the context of this study.

On the other hand, for the interview questions, the words ‘involvement’ and ‘non-involvement’ were intentionally used, instead of ‘exclusion’ and ‘inclusion’, in giving consideration to the possibility that disabled people are excluded from the design of tourism intentionally as well as unintentionally by tourism businesses and organisations. This point is supported by the literature on social exclusion, which claims that exclusion can be an institutionalised mechanism to control people’s access to places, activities and resources (Madanipour, 1998). Therefore, there can be intentional or unintentional and obvious and unobvious forms of exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism. If the interviewees were asked ‘why have you excluded disabled people?’ they might think they are not intentionally trying to exclude disabled people, and therefore they do not give any answer, although they have not involved disabled people in the design of tourism. However, the fact that they have not involved disabled people can entail various reasons that form the exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism and have important implications to understand the issue, regardless of whether the interviewees intended to exclude disabled people or not. Thus, the words ‘involvement’ and ‘non-involvement’ were used in the interview questions.

Furthermore, it should be added that the use of the words ‘exclusion’ and ‘inclusion’ might reflect the belief or moral judgement that the researcher has. By using the words ‘exclusion’ and ‘inclusion’, the research tries to highlight the existence of the group of people who are excluded and issues of social exclusion, because the researcher believes that this problem should be addressed and disabled people should be involved in the design of tourism, and this belief has been developed through the researcher’s experience as introduced at the beginning of this chapter. Some might contend that it is not appropriate to have research questions that
reflect a researcher’s personal belief. However, it can be argued that it is inevitable that a researcher’s personal background or belief will influence in some way the development of research questions and the conduct of the research. This is related to the reflexivity issues that will be addressed in detail in the discussion in Chapter 5 on research methodologies.

1.5. Research context

The research context for this study is set at a regional level, and the South East England region was selected. The South East England region has six sub-regions: Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire; Hampshire; the Isle of Wight; Surrey and West Sussex; East Sussex; and Kent. The main tourism organisations related to the region are VisitBritain, VisitEngland, Tourism South East (TSE) and the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA). VisitBritain and VisitEngland are the tourist boards responsible for marketing Britain and England, including South East England. SEEDA is one of the regional development agencies in England, and it is in charge of economic development and the regeneration of the South East England region. TSE is a company limited by guarantee and funded by SEEDA and it acts as a regional agency for tourism. TSE works in partnership with the tourism industry and regional and local governments in developing tourism.

As will be introduced in Chapter 4 on inclusive design of tourism, there are a wide range of stakeholders involved in the design of tourism, from small to big groups, and from public to private groups. It is important to cover key stakeholders widely for data collection in order to achieve the research objectives. The list of the key stakeholders in South East England in relation to the research questions will be introduced in Chapter 5.

1.6. Terminologies

This study embraces several key concepts. Berg (2004) defines ‘concepts’ as symbolic or abstract elements that represent objects or features of objects, processes or phenomenon. Although they seem apparent at the outset, they always need to be clearly defined (Berg, 2004). In particular, concepts in social science are given many definitions and are interpreted
differently for different purposes. Thus, in order to avoid definitional confusion, some key concepts in this study need to be clarified here.

1.6.1. Tourism

Tourism is often referred to as the world's biggest industry (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2006; Pearce, 1989; Hall, 2008). For many countries, tourism is the largest contributor to their international trade. The tourism industry also generates millions of direct and indirect jobs globally (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2006). The economic significance of tourism might be one of the main reasons why tourism has gained attention as a major area of academic, industry, government and public concern.

Tourism, however, should not be solely understood in terms of its economic impact, since it also entails considerable non-economic impacts such as social and environmental impacts. Some authors such as Lindberg, et al. (2001) and Goeldner and Ritchie (2006) describe the balance of the tourism impacts as gains and losses or cost and benefit. The benefits of tourism encompasses not only economic benefits but it also contributes to rest and relaxation, educational benefit, understanding other cultures, physical and mental well-being of the traveller, enhanced quality of life for both travellers and the host community, and breaking down of various barriers such as language, sociocultural, class, racial, political and religious barriers, whereas the cost of tourism includes the creation of social problems and conflicts in the host community (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2006). This dualistic categorisation seems contradictory, as it asserts that tourism can break socio-cultural barriers while creating social problems. However, this is the case of tourism that both positive and negative impacts might be brought to the same dimension. Therefore it is accepted that tourism is 'neither a blessing nor a blight, neither poison nor panacea' (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2006:32).

Goeldner and Ritchie (2006) argue that in defining tourism one must consider various stakeholders, not only those who participate in, but also those who are affected by the tourism industry, in order to gain a comprehensive definition that takes different perspectives into account. They identify four main perspectives, namely: that of the tourist, the businesses providing tourist goods and services, the government of the host community or area, and the host community. Therefore, tourism is defined as:
‘...the processes, activities, and outcomes arising from the relationships and the interactions among tourists, tourism suppliers, host governments, host communities, and surrounding environments that are involved in the attracting and hosting of visitors’ (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2006:5).

Despite the argument that there cannot be any perfect definition of tourism, Goeldner and Ritchie’s definition is adopted for this study as it encompasses a wide range of stakeholders and issues and addresses not only the perspective of guests but also that of the host. One thing that needs to be added to the definition is that there can be more stakeholders of tourism, not only the four stakeholders suggested. NPOs, charities, families of travellers and tourism academics are some of the examples to be included in the stakeholders of tourism. Therefore, subject to adding more stakeholders with a more holistic view, Goeldner and Ritchie’s holistic definition of tourism is relevant to the research questions of this study. In a practical sense, forms of tourism here include business, visiting friends or relatives, other personal business such as shopping and dining out, and pleasure (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2006).

1.6.2. Disability

Considering how disability has been defined is particularly important, as the definitions can directly or indirectly relate to and affect how disabled people have been regarded and treated in society. Disability in this study is not understood as the same concept as impairment, but rather as the notion that is conceptualised through the influences of many factors in society.

The issues of disability have historically been neglected in mainstream sociology (Oliver, 1986) and in many cases disability was understood almost exclusively in medical and psychological terms (Barnes, 2004; Barton, 1996). It has been believed that disability and a myriad of barriers in society are caused by people’s impairments and ‘abnormality’ (Oliver and Barnes, 1998:15). This idea is fundamental to the individual or medical model of disability. The fundamental idea of the individual model is that the barriers faced by disabled people are caused directly by people’s impairments or inabilities; therefore, the focus is exclusively on the individuals (Oliver, 1983 and 1996a and Barton, 1996). The individual model has been criticised in many ways that can be found in Chapter 2 on disability.

On the other hand, in the past decade, particularly in Britain, sociological study has contributed to knowledge and insights of disability which include the social model of
disability and consideration of social, economic and political environment surrounding the issues of disability. The social model of disability proposes the shift from regarding individual impairments as the exclusive reason of any limitations to arguing that it is social environments that bring limitations to certain groups of people (Oliver, 1983; Barnes et al., 2002). In other words, in this model it is society that is required to make adjustments and to establish enabling environments in order not to exclude people with impairments unnecessarily. The social model of disability sees disability as a socially constructed phenomenon (Oliver, 1986). By separating impairments from discrimination and social exclusion, the model makes it possible to establish that disability is a social issue rather than a personal problem (Hughes, 2002). One of the most important values of the social model of disability is, as Oliver (1983) and Thomas (2004) stress, that disabled people are no longer seen as having problems with them. It might not only reject the individual model of disability but also become an idea which emancipates disabled people from self-denial as deviance from society. While there are some critiques of the social model of disability, which are discussed in Chapter 2, the importance of the social model of disability needs to be acknowledged as the means of the emancipation of disabled people (Finkelstein, 2004), of objecting to the social roles given by non-disabled people, and to enable a significant drive for political and social changes (Christie, 1999).

The social model of disability suggests that studies on social oppression in any discourse take the same approach; understanding the society. Morris (1992:160) argues that feminists’ work illustrates that ‘feminism is not just about the study of women but also an entirely new way of looking at the world’. It might be evident that the same approach can be adopted in the context of disability. Disability study is not just about focusing exclusively on disabled people, but it is about suggesting new alternative ways to look at the society in which disability is conceptualised and created. Therefore, any social problems and oppression can be understood by looking at society rather than by looking at the oppressed group of people alone, and this idea is clearly based on the concept of the social model of disability and postmodernism accounts.

Finally, as any person may have a chance to have a disability, disability issues are not just about creating an accessible environment and society for disabled people, but also about making an inclusive environment for our future selves. Social oppression and exclusion experienced by disabled people are not an issue of a particular group of people, but a
challenge for the whole of humanity. In this respect, as Christie (1999) suggests, the idea of the social model can be effectively used by disability campaigners and organisations in promoting social inclusion by addressing common ground between disabled people and non-disabled people.

Although the importance of the concept of the social model of disability has been acknowledged widely, the individual model of disability still remains a dominant idea that informs professional as well as general views toward disability (Barton, 1996). The view of the personal tragedy theory, which sees disability as something that strikes individuals randomly, where people’s lives suffer and are ruined by the unfortunate event (Oliver, 1996b), is also very dominant and prevailing, as can be seen throughout media, language, research, policy and so forth (French and Swain, 2004). It can be argued that there are still barriers which exclude disabled people from social and day-to-day activities, such as education, employment, leisure activities and tourism.

There are different ways to refer to people who have disabilities. Darcy (2002) explains that the term ‘people with disabilities’ is generally accepted in discussing disability in most Western countries. It puts ‘people’ first and ‘disability’ second; therefore, the focus is on people rather than disability as central to understand the people. On the other hand, the term ‘disabled people’ emphasises the ‘disability’ that people have. Oliver (1990) explains that ‘disabled people’ signifies the political reality of oppression experienced by disabled people. Based on the social model of disability, the term ‘disabled people’ indicates that people are disabled by a disabling society, and therefore they are called ‘disabled people’. As one of the aims of this study is to identify the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism, it is important to investigate the factors that prevent the inclusion of disabled people in the design of tourism. Therefore, in this research context, the term ‘disabled people’ is more relevant.

1.6.3. The design of tourism

The third concept to be clarified is the design of tourism. The word ‘design’ is normally used as a noun or verb. Oxford Dictionary of English (2003) describes ‘design’ as a noun as ‘(1) a plan or drawing produced to show the look and function or workings of a building, garment, or other object before it is made’, or ‘(2) purpose or planning that exists behind an action, fact, or object’. On the other hand, ‘design’ as a verb refers to ‘decide upon the look and
functioning of (a building, garment, or other object), by making a detailed drawing of it’ and ‘do or plan (something) with a specific purpose in mind’. It might show that the concept of design can be understood as a plan showing the look, function and features of an artefact that is developed before it is actually made, and a process of developing the plan, entailing a series of decision-making and activities. It should be mentioned that the idea of design has been used in developing services as well, not only for tangible objects. In addition, design can be drawn and proceeded with even after the entity has been made; this is particularly the case for the re-development or improvement of products or services based on the examination and evaluation of the existing products or services.

Taking the idea of design as a process, Miller (2004) defines design as ‘the thought process comprising the creation of an entity’. Five key features of the notion of design are identified: Thought, Process, Comprising, Creation and Entity (Miller, 2004). Firstly ‘thought’ refers to the instinctive nature of design. It entails the ability to examine the problem and to develop possible solutions by looking at the potential connection between problem and possibility. Second, ‘process’ emphasises the view that design is an activity, a sequence of events and procedures leading to the creation of what is being designed. In this view, a clear distinction is made between design and product. It is explained that product is the output of design. Moreover, design needs to be regarded as a repeatable process that includes the construction of prototypical forms, the assessment of them and the reformulation of them. And they are part of the iterative design process toward the next and better solution. Third, ‘comprising’ indicates that design process comprises various thoughts and actions that are necessary to create what is being designed, including:

- the identification of a set of needs
- the initial conceptualisation of a way to meet those needs
- the further development of that initial concept
- the engineering and analysis required to make sure it works
- the prototyping of its preliminary form
- the construction of its final form
- the implementation of various quality control procedures
- selling its value to the consumer
- its delivery to the consumer
- providing for after-service
- and obtaining feedback regarding its utility and value (Miller, 2004).
Each of the steps above is understood as a part of the design process. Although the stages to be included in the design process vary depending on the type of entity being designed, they all contribute to the creation of form (Miller, 2004). The fourth is ‘creation’, which reminds us that all the comprehensive process of design is subject to the creation of an entity. It suggests that design is regarded as a prerequisite for the creation of an entity, in which the image of possibility is completed as the tangible or intangible realisation. In other words, without creating the designed entity, design remains as a mere drawing or plan and eventually becomes a useless sketch. The last element is ‘entity’, which denotes the diverse product of the design process. Miller (2004) suggests that an entity can be: physical (e.g. an object that occupies space), temporal (e.g. an event occurs at particular time), conceptual (e.g. an idea), or relational (e.g. a relationship between entities). In other words, it suggests that the entity can be anything, and, conversely speaking, anything can be produced by the design process. The significance of Miller’s definition is that it addresses a range of key issues, not only the functions of design but also a range of activities within the design process.

As examined above, design is an iterative process toward the creation of an entity, comprising a series of thoughts, decision-making and activities. In applying the concept of design to tourism, ‘the design of tourism’ can be understood as a continuous and iterative process toward the creation of tourism comprising a sequence of stages of tourism from planning to evaluation, involving a range of thought and action. The idea of the design of tourism is summarised in Figure 4.2 in Chapter 4 with the possible steps of the design of tourism, including: user research and marketing; planning products and services; developing and constructing; promotion; staff training; sales and service delivery; user and customer feedback; and evaluation. It shows tourism as a dynamic design process in which tourism is planned, developed, distributed and evaluated, and each of the steps is understood as a part of the design process. The design of tourism can be recognised as a circular and iterative process, as the evaluation of tourism products or services at the last stage can be utilised for planning new or better products or services, leading to the first stage of the process. The reason why the term ‘design of tourism’ is used in this study instead of ‘tourism development’ or ‘tourism planning’ will be discussed in Chapter 4.

1.6.4. Inclusive design of tourism – The theoretical framework
Bearing the concept of disability, social exclusion and the design of tourism in mind, this section addresses the idea of inclusive design of tourism, which is the theoretical framework of this research. The concept of inclusive design needs to be examined first. Broadly speaking, the notion of inclusive design embraces the issue of social exclusion and inclusion in the concept of design.

Coleman (2006:13) defined inclusive design in the following way: ‘inclusive design is not a new type of design, but an intentional project that sets out to include significant sectors of society that are all too frequently ignored or over looked’. It might be obvious that there is an issue regarding social exclusion behind the idea of inclusive design. Simamura-Willcocks (2006) points out that the ultimate goal of inclusive design is social inclusion, and inclusive design is a method and means to achieve social inclusion. Therefore, inclusive design can be understood as a means to promote social inclusion.

The concept of inclusive design originated in the UK (Coleman, 2006), while in some countries such as the USA and Japan, the term ‘universal design’ is more accepted. It has been particularly used in the manufacturing, architecture and product development areas. The main approach of inclusive design is user involvement in the design process. Potential users are involved in a whole design process from the initial stage to the evaluation stage (Dong and Clarkson, 2006). The focus of an inclusive design process is to listen to users’ opinions, perspectives and ideas, and the possible design is proposed based on communication with the users. Therefore, inclusive design is a process to develop products and services that can be inclusive and usable for potential users, particularly those who are often excluded from a range of dimensions of social life.

The idea of inclusive design can also be adapted to tourism. The central concept of this research is the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. However, it could be difficult for the existing public participation approaches to address the issue of social exclusion of disabled people due to the diverse nature of the community. The opinions and interests of the dominant groups of people can have more power than the interests of those who have less power and are excluded from society. By borrowing the idea of inclusive design, it can be said that, if we are designing tourism for inclusion or trying to use the design of tourism as a tool for social inclusion, then it is crucial to embrace people who are
marginalised from society. Therefore, the potential of inclusive design of tourism to involve disabled people in different areas of tourism needs to be examined.

1.7. The structure of the thesis

The first chapter of the thesis was devoted to showing readers the standpoint and theoretical framework of the study. The personal background of the researcher and problem statement was first introduced to show why this study was conducted. The presented research questions and objectives becomes the guidance to show the direction throughout the research process; therefore, they will be repeated several times in later chapters. Furthermore, how the key concepts of the research were defined was clarified in order to share common ground with readers.

The following three chapters address three main theoretical concepts: disability (Chapter 2), social exclusion (Chapter 3) and inclusive design of tourism (Chapter 4). Based on the theoretical framework, research methodologies and methods considered in Chapter 5, the selected methodologies and methods are justified. Chapters 6 and 7 present the findings of the primary research, with the analysis and discussion, and the final Chapter concludes the thesis. The structure of the thesis can be summarised in Figure 1.1 below.
Research questions (Chapter 1)
1) Are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism?
2) How can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome?

Literature review
- Disability (Chapter 2)
- Social exclusion (Chapter 3)
- Inclusive design of tourism (Chapter 4)

Research methodologies and methods (Chapter 5)
- Constructivism-interpretivism informed by critical perspective
- Semi-structured interviews

Findings and discussion
- Barriers to involving disabled people in the design of tourism (Chapter 6)
- Ways toward inclusive design of tourism (Chapter 7)

Conclusion (Chapter 8)
- Contribution to theory
- Contribution to knowledge
- Recommendations
- Limitations
- Future research

Figure 1.1: The structure of the thesis
CHAPTER 2
DISABILITY

2.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses how the concept of disability has been constructed in society. It first looks at sociological accounts on disability and reveals the significant factors behind the emergence of disability. Disability here is not understood as the same concept as impairment, but rather as the notion that is conceptualised through the influences of many factors in the society in which we live. Thus, the first part of this chapter deals with a question – ‘what makes people disabled?’ In answering this question, the social model of disability, which has been one of the most influential concepts in disability studies, will be examined. Finally, the current situation of tourism for disabled people and trends in accessible tourism will be addressed.

2.2. Sociological accounts on disability

It is crucial to examine how disability has been defined, since the definitions can directly and indirectly reflect how disabled people have been regarded and treated in society. In mainstream sociology, the issues of disability have historically been neglected (Oliver, 1986), and in many cases disability was understood almost exclusively in medical and psychological terms (Barnes, 2004; Barton, 1996). The reasons for this can be explained as: the general view of disability as a personal tragedy has been accepted in sociological discourse (Oliver, 1986), and since disability has been regarded as a medical issue and an individual problem, it is medicine and psychology's occupation to investigate disability as a research object (Oliver, 1996b). Furthermore, Corker and Shakespeare (2002) point out that the conceptual discussion in disability studies lacks a powerful theoretical base, which therefore leads to its elimination from mainstream sociology.

However, in the past decade, particularly in Britain, sociological study has contributed to knowledge and insights of disability, which include the social model of disability and
consideration of the social, economic and political environment surrounding the issues of
disability. Before examining the social model of disability, some of the general approaches
used to define disability will be compared.

2.2.1. Types of the definitions of disability – four categories

In considering how disability has been defined, Oliver (1983) suggests there are four main
approaches to define disability. Firstly, in terms of the general social attitudes and views of
disability, there are many factors that influence how general views toward disability are
shaped, such as the type of economy and the political and cultural background. For example,
as Oliver (1983) suggests, limited mobility is less likely to be an obstacle in an agricultural
society than in a hunting society: some societies might consider disabled people as those
chosen by God or the devil in the respect of religions; and in an individualistic social
structure where individual success is believed to be achieved through personal achievement,
disabled people stay low in the social hierarchy. These examples indicate that views on
disability are shaped by social, economic and cultural situations. This point will be discussed
further in later sections.

Secondly, Brechin and Liddiard (1981) suggest that, when disability is defined from a
professional viewpoint, a number of different definitions can be categorised into five groups:
(1) abnormality or loss, which refers to physical or psychological loss; (2) clinical condition,
denoting diseases or illnesses that impede individuals’ physical or psychological processes;
(3) functional limitations, which refers to the inability to perform basic tasks in day-to-day
and social life; (4) disability as deviance, which explains deviation both from physical and
health norms and from appropriate behavioural norms; and (5) disability as disadvantage,
meaning that disabled people often receive less resources compared to able-bodied
individuals in society. Each definition above has been developed for specific purposes or in
particular situations; therefore, it is not about which definition is right or wrong. Instead, it is
important to understand the context behind the definitions.

Thirdly, disability can be defined with functional categorisation. The functional definitions of
disability appeared in order to reflect the need for the distribution of services for disabled
people. For example, in order to obtain statistics for welfare distribution, research in 1971 for
the Minister of Health conducted functional assessment of disability based on the following
distinctions: impairment, disablement and handicap. As a result of the measurement of the extent of handicap, disabled people were categorised into: very severely handicapped, severely handicapped, appreciably handicapped and impaired. The functional definitions are specifically developed for registrational and welfare policy usages (Oliver, 1983).

The fourth approach is self-definitions. While the three approaches used above to define disability have been produced mostly by non-disabled people, or influenced by external factors, self-definitions of disability are made by disabled people themselves. Self-definitions are meaningful not only for disabled people but also for professionals, since self-definitions can make professionals realise what disabled people think about their own disability. One of the examples of the significance of self-definitions is that disabled people from various countries were required for the revision of the WHO’s International Classification of Impairment, Disability and Handicap (ICIDH), since it was based on the medical or individual definitions of disability. It is suggested that disabled people’s self-definitions had a significant influence on revising it and generating the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) in 2001.

The four approaches give a basic picture of the ways in which disability is defined in different contexts. It might be obvious that various approaches have been used to define disability. The definitions differ significantly depending on the usage, situation, and the purposes of the people who use the definitions. It is, therefore, important to understand the context in which the definitions were made and who defined them.

2.2.2. American sociological thinking and the individual (medical) model of disability

It was traditionally believed, and is even believed today, that disability and the myriad barriers in society disabled people face are caused by people’s impairments and ‘abnormality’ (Oliver and Barnes, 1998:15). This idea is fundamental to the individual or medical model of disability. In addition, there are theories and models of disability related to the individual model proposed by American sociologists.

Oliver (1996b) summarised American sociological works on disability in 1950s and 1960s as having similarities to the individual model of disability. According to him, the root of many American sociological studies on disability is Parsons’ (1951) model; sickness-related
behaviour. ‘Sickness’ here is defined as a deviation from the ‘normal’ state (Barnes, 2004). The model shows that once people get ill, ‘sick people’ should accept the ‘sick role’ in which any expectations and obligations people had before are mitigated. In this regard, Barnes (2004:28) states that, in this model, ‘illness, and by implication, impairment is more than a biological condition; it is a social status...’ The model presumes that the ‘sick role’ will be applied in the same way to everyone who gets ill irrespective of any factors and situations surrounding the people. Oliver (1996b) points out that this idea is based on the assumption that illness and impairment hinder physiological and psychological abilities, which can also be seen in what he calls the ‘personal tragedy theory of disability’.

Stemming further from Parson’s model, Safilios-Rothschild (1970, cited in Oliver, 1996b) suggests the ‘rehabilitation role’; a person with an impairment has to accept it and find a way to live with it through maximising existing abilities. Therefore, rehabilitation experts have an important role in this model, and people with impairments are dependent on the experts in order to return to ‘normal’. People with impairments are not relieved of social expectations and obligations; however, they are required to adapt themselves to society (Oliver, 1996b).

There are some similar characteristics between the ‘sick role’ and the ‘rehabilitation role’. First, people with impairments inevitably rely on medical and rehabilitation professionals. Secondly, they are regarded as staying in an unpleasant and unfortunate situation. Thirdly, they are required to get back to or adapt to ‘normal’.

The main criticisms toward these two theories made by Oliver (1996b) are: people’s behaviour is determined and evaluated only by professionals; external aspects such as economic, political and social factors are neglected; and subjective interpretations of impairment from the people’s perspective are denied. In this regard, Oliver (1996b:21) argues that the models are the product of non-disabled people’s ‘psychological imagination’ of what it is like to have impairments. Since such assumptions entail some forms of loss or a feeling of ‘personal tragedy’, Oliver (1996b:21) argues that the ‘...individualistic medical approach can best be understood as “personal tragedy theory”’ (Oliver, 1986). In the personal tragedy theory, disability strikes individuals randomly, and people’s lives suffer and are ruined by the unfortunate event. This view of the personal tragedy theory is very dominant and prevailing, as can be seen throughout the media, language, research, policy and so forth (French and Swain, 2004).
Oliver (1996b) points out that American sociology of disability, including the two models above, has been strongly influenced by interactionist theories. Interactionist theory, which sees disability as social deviance, was constructed in the context of industrial and post-industrial societies. The idea behind this theory is that people with impairments are free from social responsibilities and expectations, and it is essentially similar to the idea of the 'sick role'. Since ideas such as individual responsibility, competition and paid employment are considered as liberal ideals in industrial and post-industrial societies, people with impairments are recognised as being incapable to perform these principles, and, as a result, they are recognised as deviant (Oliver, 1996b). Developed further from interactionist theory, the stigma theory was proposed by Goffman (1963). The term 'stigma' was applied in order to understand people with impairments as a blemish on society and 'not quite human' (Oliver, 1996b:22). The intention of the stigma theory seems to be to distinguish people with impairments from 'normal' people and to insist that they are deviant from and inferior to the rest of the society.

In summarising the American sociological works on disability, some initial characteristics can be found. Firstly, there is a tendency to see illness or impairment as synonymous with disability, or illness and impairment as the root cause of the deviance from society, since it is believed that it is only impairment that affects the ability of people with impairments. Secondly, people with impairments are regarded as unfortunate people in non-disabled people's imagination. Oliver (1983, 1986 and 1996a) named this the 'personal tragedy theory of disability', which simply sees disability as a tragedy and an unfortunate chance event that happens to people randomly, rather than a phenomenon which can be explained in different ways. Contrarily, the absence of disability is regarded as a positive and universal human experience (Morris, 1992). Thirdly, there is a clear distinction between people with impairments and 'normal' people. It can be said that the American theories above are based on this dualism. It can be argued that this binary positioning of people is immensely simplistic, since even 'normal' people might be impaired to some extent in some circumstances. However, this dualism is made by non-disabled people who often become oppressors to disabled people. These features can also be seen in the individual model of disability.
Turning now to the individual model of disability, the fundamental idea of this model is that the barriers faced by disabled people are caused directly by people's impairments or inabilities; therefore, the focus is exclusively on the individual (Oliver, 1983 and 1996a; Barton, 1996). This idea is called the individual model or medical model. However, Oliver (1996a:31) says that he prefers to call it the 'individual model', since the element of 'medicalisation' is one of the notable components of the individual model. He also points out the connection between the individual model and personal tragedy theory by arguing that the individual model embraces the issues of personal tragedy theory.

The individual model has been criticised in many ways. First of all, it places the problems on the individuals and ignores other contexts such as family and social situations (Oliver, 1983 and 1990). As a consequence, secondly, adjustment to society is regarded as an individual matter (Oliver 1983), and disabled people are required to become appropriate to the world as it is. The role of medical and rehabilitation professionals becomes critical in this sense. If disabled people cannot find the way, they are shut in specialised institutions or isolated houses. Therefore, there are clear similarities between the models proposed in America and the individual model in terms of their focus on medical treatment and impairments within individuals. Thirdly, since the model focuses on individual loss and inabilities, it promotes negative views of disability and neglects other perspectives, particularly those of disabled people (Barton, 1996). These criticisms appeared during the disability movement in 1970s. The disability movement by disabled people has triggered the transition from the individual model to the social model of disability in the UK.

2.2.3. The social model of disability

The concept of the social model of disability emerged out of the Fundamental Principles document which was developed in a meeting of the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS) in 1976 (Oliver, 1996a). The significance of the Fundamental Principles document was that it made a clear distinction between impairment and disability, as in the statement which has been famously quoted in many places: '...it is society which disables physically impaired people. Disability is something imposed on top of our impairments, by the way we are unnecessarily isolated and excluded from full participation in society' (UPIAS, 1976:3-4). In this document, it was first argued that disability is a particular form of social oppression.
In 1980, Finkelstein, who was an active member in the UPIAS, introduced a materialist approach and indicated in his book that disability is a relationship that reflects interactions between individual impairments and social and economic structures (Oliver, 1996b; Finkelstein, 1980). The ideas that these two publications convey were taken by a British sociologist Mike Oliver and brought into the conceptualisation of the individual model of disability discussed earlier and the social model of disability (Oliver, 1983). As one of the reasons why the social model of disability emerged in Britain, Barnes (2004) explains that the fertile ground cultivated by many grass-roots organisations run by disabled people made it possible for disabled activists to redefine the concept of disability.

The social model of disability proposes the shift from regarding individual impairments as the exclusive reason for any limitations, to arguing that it is social environments that bring limitations to certain groups of people (Oliver, 1983; Barnes et al., 2002). Therefore, in this model, it is society that is required to make adjustments and to establish enabling environments in order not to exclude people with impairments unnecessarily. The social model of disability sees disability as a socially constructed phenomenon (Oliver, 1986). By separating impairments from discrimination and social exclusion, the model makes it possible to establish that disability is a social issue rather than a personal problem (Hughes, 2002). The role of professionals can also be shifted to one that removes the barriers from society and provides appropriate products and services for disabled people. One of the most important values of the social model of disability is, as Oliver (1983) and Thomas (2004) stress, that disabled people are no longer seen as having problems. Therefore, it can emancipate disabled people from self-denial as deviance from society.

2.2.4. Criticisms of the social model of disability

There are, however, some criticisms of the social model of disability. Firstly, there is an argument that the social model of disability tends to deny the experience of having impairment in order to object to the individual model of disability. Morris (1992:164) argues from a feminist perspective that ‘To experience disability is to experience the frailty of the human body. If we deny this we will find that our personal experience of disability will remain an isolated one...’ It can be imagined that this point was raised because women's voices and personal experiences are treated as particularly important to be considered in
feminist discourse, with the slogan ‘the personal is political’. Morris (1992) further suggests that the disability movement is required to adopt the feminist principle, which gives voice to the subjective experiences of the oppressed group of people. Furthermore, Thomas and Corker (2002) point out that the social model of disability does not consider the ways in which different impairments link to different forms of disablism, and they claim that the similarities and differences of disability experiences with a range of impairments need to be analysed. Against these criticisms, Oliver (1996a and 2004) maintains that the social model is about social oppression as the collective experience of disabled people, not about the personal experience of impairment. Yet the social model of disability was developed out of disabled people's experiences and pains (Oliver, 2004). In this regard, it can be argued that the social model of disability was created based on the personal experiences of disabled people; thus, the personal of disabled people becomes political, but the model transformed the experience into collective and socially constructed experiences in order to deal with external social barriers and oppression.

The second argument of those who criticise the social model is that it is not capable of encompassing the issue of multiple oppressions. There is some research on the combination of disability and other forms of social oppression such as racism (Stuart, 1992) and sexism (Morris, 1992), which is not incorporated into the social model of disability. In terms of the issue of multiple oppressions, it was criticised that the social model of disability ‘oversimplifies’ these issues (Oliver, 1996a). Whilst Oliver (1996a) agrees that the social model does not raise the issues associated with multiple oppression, he (1996a and 2004) suggests that this does not necessarily mean that the model is unable to deal with those issues, but rather, that it is important to use and apply the model to the multiple oppression issues.

The third criticism is related to the argument as to whether the social model of disability can be regarded as an appropriate social theory. In answering this criticism, Oliver (1996a and 2004) repeats in many places that the social model is not a theory of disability. He cautions the critics not to presume that the models can explain everything surrounding disability issues. Goodley (2004:118) explains the differences between models and theories explicitly: 'A model has no explanatory power, but instead directs us to theorise disability and concomitant phenomena...'. In other words, the role of models is to provide ways to understand the world (Oliver, 1996a) by demonstrating that an object can be looked at in different ways under
different conditions (Finkelstein, 2004). Therefore, the social model of disability can help provoke viewers to develop insights into disability issues from different angles.

In answering the above criticisms, Oliver (2004) summarised that many of the criticisms are related to the application of the model, rather than the social model of disability itself. It should be noted that these criticisms do not signify the weaknesses of the social model; instead, they are the indication of a vigorous discussion on disability issues, which should be welcomed in disability studies. It is, however, suggested that, while the social model of disability has been referred to by many people in a vague and confused way (Finkelstein, 2004) and criticised in various ways, there have been few attempts to implement it in making social and political change (Oliver, 2004). Therefore, Oliver (2004) asserts the importance of putting the idea of the social model of disability into action.

2.2.5. The emergence of disability – the role of power and culture in interpreting disability

The model has also been criticised by authors such as Shakespeare (1994) and Barnes (1996) on the basis that social model theorists have undervalued the role of power and culture, which have influenced the emergence of disability.

It is argued that the significance of power relationships between people who label and people who are labelled needs to be emphasised. ‘People who enjoy the fruits of the dominant culture always label others as lesser classes of themselves’ (Finkelstein, 2004:19). Finkelstein explains that the dominance of ‘able-bodied’ people has allowed for a distinction to be made between ‘able’ and ‘non-able’. As ‘able-bodied’ people are in the majority and dominant, they take it for granted that public services and products are developed for themselves. For example, a toilet for disabled people is called a ‘disabled toilet’, whereas a toilet for able-bodied people is not called an ‘enabled toilet’ (Finkelstein, 2004). Able-bodied people do not need to label themselves and their facilities, since they are dominant, in the majority and common. Although the idea of ‘ableness’ is an ideal and abstraction (Finkelstein, 2004), it has enough power to define disabled people as ‘others’ at the margin of society, and it has a great influence in shaping the views and attitudes toward disabled people. This point has a close relation to the concept of ‘otherness’, which will be discussed later.
Barnes (1996) argues that the oppression of disabled people can be explained by tracing back to the origins of western society, even prior to the emergence of capitalism. Back in ancient Greece, where the foundations of western civilisation were laid, he points out that the Greek economy was developed on the slavery system and a hierarchical society where physical and intellectual strength was crucial. As a result, people with impairments were excluded from society and children with impairments were murdered in infanticide. The Greek gods and goddesses represent bodily perfection, and impairment was seen as a punishment for sin. Therefore, there is a clear association between impairment, exclusion and impotency (Barnes, 1996). The Greek culture was followed by the Roman Empire and the British Isles, and it became a foundation of many western cultures.

Shakespeare (1994), being inspired by some of the feminist discourses, further contends that social model theorists have neglected crucial points in understanding the emergence of disability; namely, culture, representation and meaning. He first looks at the role of impairment imagery in order to understand the cultural representation of disability. By examining current media representation, he found that media such as TV programmes, drama and children’s books see disability as personal misfortune by exaggerating or romanticising disability. He explains this phenomenon by referring to Longmore (1987:66): ‘What we fear, we often stigmatise and shun and sometimes seek to destroy. Popular entertainments depicting disabled characters allude to these fears and prejudices or address them obliquely or fragmentarily, seeking to reassure us about ourselves’. This point can be supported by many examples of disabled characters in media presentations, such as ugly witches and villains with impairments. In the study of disability and representation, Hevey (1993) similarly explains that the representation of disabled people in art as socially dead people can mitigate the audiences’ anxieties related to a decline in their bodies or loss of their abled-bodies. Therefore, it can be said that impairment imagery in media has been distorted and exaggerated, and characters with impairments have been given a particular role to convey a message which comforts non-disabled people who have a fear of disability.

Based on the argument of cultural representation above, Shakespeare (1994) introduced the concepts of ‘objectification’: disabled people are passive and objects rather than subjects, as can be seen in the freak-show in 17th to 19th century Britain. In addition, the term ‘fetishism’ is also suggested by him to understand the process of objectification. Fetishism, a term used by Marx, is used to explain that social relationships are understood as things, and social
model theorist Michael Oliver employed the concept to explain that disability is a relationship between disabling society and people with impairments (Shakespeare, 1994). As examples of objectification, Shakespeare finds interesting similarities between disabled people in charity advertising and women in pornography. In both cases, the gaze is on the bodies that are passive and available: certain parts of the bodies are exaggerated (sexual aspects in pornography and defective aspects in charity advertising); and the images direct the viewer to an emotional response (desire in pornography and fear and pity in charity advertising). Along with ‘objectification’, the next concept, ‘otherness’, can help to understand the reasons why women and disabled people have similar features in the objectification process.

The concept of ‘otherness’ was introduced by De Beauvoir in 1976 in feminist discourse, as a helpful way to conceptualise women’s position within culture (Shakespeare, 1994). It was defined by Jordanova (1989:14, cited in Shakespeare, 1994) that: ‘The term helps us to think about the ways in which groups and individuals distance themselves from each other, often by unconscious means. Such separating devices are only needed, however, when the two parties are also deeply bound together, implicated in each other’s characteristics. Otherness conveys the kinships, the fascination and the repulsion between distinct yet related categories of person'.

This dualism saturates many cultures and ways of thinking, as can be seen in languages (Fulcher, 1996); however, it has been problematised by Foucault (1991, cited in Fulcher, 1996) because dualistic thinking can mislead analyses of social phenomena as one of the pair can only be understood by reference to the other. Although the dualistic idea such as ‘normal’ and ‘abnormal’ has been criticised in disability studies, it can be a useful example to examine how disability is constructed.

The concept of otherness involves power relations; namely, the other is treated as ‘more like an object, something to be managed and possessed, and as dangerous, wild, threatening’ (Jordanova, 1989:109, cited in Shakespeare, 1994). Therefore, it is rational for Shakespeare to suggest that the experience of disabled people can also be theorised with the concept of otherness. He argues that a general process of otherness is that the subordinated people become others, which can be seen as women, black people, and disabled people, for example.
The process of otherness and objectification of women can lead to the assumption that the masculine has been regarded as the absolute and ideal human type (Shakespeare, 1994), which is immensely resistant to change (Finkelstein, 2004). Religious factors might also influence this process. For example, the Christian religion is hostile to the body, which represents original sin and opposition to women (Shakespeare, 1994). Hence, Shakespeare refers to the statement: ‘One is not born a woman, one becomes one’. It can also probably be said that ‘one is not born a disabled person, one becomes one’. It is now clear that having an impairment is different from being disabled.

2.2.6. Postmodernism accounts

Finally, some criticisms arise regarding the fundamental idea behind the origination of the social model of disability. It has been pointed that the idea of the social model of disability is based profoundly on a materialist interpretation of the world (Thomas, 2004; Corker and Shakespeare, 2002; Tremain, 2002). Materialist thoughts, which focus mostly on material barriers existing in society, can be seen in the social model of disability (Thomas, 2004). Moreover, it is apparent that the social model of disability understands that capitalist social relations of production are the root cause of the social exclusion of people with impairments (Thomas, 2004; Finkelstein, 1980 and 2004; Oliver, 1990 and 1996b). In other words, economic factors, such as the mode and system of production, determine or affect the meaning of disability. For instance, it has been argued that the tragic view of disabled people is unique to capitalist societies (Oliver, 1996b), as can be seen in late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Britain when ‘non-owners of the means of production [sold] their labour-power, to be harnessed in the service of a fast moving and exhausting industrial labour process’ (Thomas, 2004: 22). People who could not follow this rule were devalued and excluded from society. The materialist viewpoint indicates that other modes of production in different times might create different views toward impairment; therefore, it can be stated that impairment and disability are not universal and consistent phenomena in society (Thomas and Corker, 2002).

This materialist standpoint, however, has recently been questioned, particularly through the postmodernism perspectives. Postmodernists contend that existing theories of disability are not appropriate anymore since they totalise and describe disability universally; they exclude significant and complex aspects of disabled people’s experiences and knowledge, and they
ignore the influence of cultural and historical aspects in shaping disability (Corker and Shakespeare, 2002).

Regarding materialism, Thomas (2004) points out the limitation of its view in the social model of disability. Since it sees social barriers surrounding disabled people almost exclusively as material barriers in society, it neglects the fact that disablism is also formulated internally and psychologically, through social interaction between disabled people with less power and non-disabled people with power; this takes place in, for example, family and community relationships.

The following points made from the postmodernist point of view are principally based on the works of Foucault (1973a, 1973b, 1977, 1978, 1980 and 1983 cited by Fulcher, 1996; Tremain, 2002; Thomas and Corker, 2002; Thomas, 2004). While Foucault's work has been dominant in feminist studies, in disability studies it has been disregarded by social modellists due to the general refusal and misunderstandings of postmodernism (Tremain, 2002), and this has led to the weakness of disability studies in terms of the absence of a strong theoretical foundation (Corker and Shakespeare, 2002). However, his work has important implications for disability studies. These implications include, for example: the birth of modern perceptions of disease and the body (1973a); the social production of madness (1973b); and technologies of normalisation (1980) (cited in Tremain, 2002), and postmodernists have applied these as valuable concepts to disability studies.

Firstly, the clear distinction between impairment and disability is considered to be problematic. In the social model of disability, impairment is intentionally divorced from disability. This is because focusing on impairment could provide credibility and precedence to medical occupations that discuss impairment as an individual bodily issue (Thomas, 2004), and the main attention of the model to society’s failure to provide an adequate environment and services to disabled people could be obscured.

It is argued, however, that it resembles biomedicine in terms of treating impairment as 'pre-social, inert, physical object, discrete, palpable and separate from the self' (Hughes and Paterson, 1997:329, cited in Thomas, 2004:24). Namely, the model sees impairment as a fixed and real human attribute, and this point has been regarded as a flaw of the model by postmodernists. Foucault’s work on modern power supports the point that the social model of
disability is defective due to the definitional separation and dualism of impairment and disability. Tremain (2002) explains that impairment- and its allegedly real existence- can be understood as an object and effect of modern power, which is historically contingent.

In order to understand the relationship between the interpretation of the body and modern power, Foucault takes a historical approach. The first historical condition that determines the modern perception of the body was the objectification of the body in medical examinations in the late 18th century, in which the body ‘could be used, abused, transformed and subjugated’ (Tremain, 2002:35). The body, the object of medical examination, becomes essentially passive and ready to be gazed upon. This objectification of body and modern power unites and becomes a new form of power – ‘biopower’ (Foucault, 1978 in Tremain, 2002), which will be discussed further subsequently. Foucault introduces ‘dividing practices’ to explain how the treatment of body relates to compartmentalisation; dividing, categorising and manipulating subjects, which indicates that science has a close interconnection with practices of social exclusion and segregation (Tremain, 2002). Through this process subjects are ‘objectivised’ scientifically as mad or sane, sick or healthy (Tremain, 2002:35). The second historical determinant was the emergence of technologies in 18th century that also led to the objectification of body, and Foucault calls one of these ‘disciplinary technology’, which is formulated to create a body that is ‘docile, that is, one which can be subjected, used, transformed and improved’ (Foucault 1977:136 cited in Tremain, 2002:36). The similarity of these two historical conditions is that both control the body as a passive subject. This perspective influences the modern perception of the body, the objectification of the body, and leads to the emergence of biopower.

Foucault explains that the main component of biopower is normalisation (Tremain, 2002). Technologies of normalisation-which can be seen in practices of genetic manipulation, chemical control, rehabilitation, and self-help groups, for example-are applicable in categorising and controlling ‘anomalies’ in the social body systematically. And the idea of normalisation gives a natural clarification for the existence of people with unusual bodies, and, being influenced by the power of the state, it becomes a mechanism for making the anomalies governable and excluding them from society (Tremain, 2002). Medical technologies, including normalising technologies, have advanced and have been deployed as a catalyst for ‘correcting nature’s mistakes’ (Tremain, 2002:37).
It has been pointed out that the idea of normalisation and the stance of ‘correcting nature’s mistakes’ relate to the way in which Western society views and understands nature. Tremain (2002) introduces Harding’s (1989) interesting accounts whereby the borders between culture and nature, drawn by modern Western society, are culturally bound. This dualism embraces binary oppositions; for example, mind-body and male-female, and, while the former is favoured, the latter is disregarded. The former allocates the form for the latter. In other words, the latter relies upon and requires the secure being of the former. This idea interrelates profoundly with the way of Western thinking that ‘the “world” (is) an object of knowledge in terms of the cultural expropriation of the “resources” of nature’ (Haraway, 1991 in Tremain, 2002: 39). The scientific revolution in the 19th century established the view that nature is passive and submissive, and therefore it can be arrogated and manipulated (Tremain, 2002). It might be argued that this idea is one that has influenced the modern Western manner of thinking, and which reflects its interconnection with the notion of biopower. The idea of differentiation between culture and nature has been seen as a problematic and unhelpful dualism in understanding the world (Tremain, 2002; Thomas and Corker, 2002).

As one of the examples of dualism and biopower, Foucault discusses the relationship between sex and gender. According to Foucault, sex is not a natural attribute or characteristic of an individual, but an effect of the operation of biopower. In general, it is believed that sex is the most intrinsic element existing in an individual; however, ‘sexual difference is never merely a function of material differences...’ (Tremain, 2002:40). This is because, ‘when one concedes that “sex”, or its “materiality”, is undeniable, one always concedes to some version of “sex”, that is, a certain formation of its “materiality”’ (Butler, 1993:2,10 in Tremain, 2002:40). Therefore, it is understood that sexual difference does not simply mean a mere physical difference, but the recognition of sex incorporates the association with gender thinking which is formulated by modern power. In other words, ‘there really is no ontological distinction between sex and gender’ (Tremain, 2002:41), and the same thing might be said with regard to the notion of impairment and disability. By understanding that impairment is constructed by modern power, it can be suggested that there is no ontological distinction between impairment and disability.

Another critical point raised by postmodernists is a different form of power that can be seen in the social model of disability. Tremain (2002) realises that, in the social model of disability, only people with impairments can be ‘disabled people’. It is explicitly stated that the
fundamental premise of the social model of disability is that impairment is not a condition of disability (Oliver, 1983). However, there is a concealed proposition in the model; impairment is actually an essential condition in which disability works and having an impairment is the requirement of being a disabled person (Tremain, 2002; Thomas, 2004) because it does not take other forms of discrimination such as sexism and racism into consideration as a form of disability (Tremain, 2002). Combining this hidden premise and Foucault’s accounts on power together, Tremain (2002:42) provides the reason for this definitional restriction: the subjects in the social model of disability – people with impairments – are constructed in order to make it appropriate and convenient for ‘certain requirements of contemporary political arrangements’. This might be one of the reasons why social modellists ‘desire to leave impairment out of account effectively’ (Thomas, 2004:24). Hence, it can be argued that the definition of disability in the social model of disability is influenced by power related to politics, and there can be seen the politics behind the social model of disability which is favourable for people with impairments.

In this sense, again, impairment can be understood as disability even in the social model of disability in terms of the similarity that both are constructed by external power – modern, political, or biopower – whatever the form of power is. People who have power owing to their status and the legitimacy of their knowledge can foist the label of ‘disabled’ on individuals (Thomas, 2004). As Thomas and Corker (2002) signal, these social and historical aspects of impairment have been discounted by social modellists. Thus, it might now be clear that there are no natural or inherent attributes that can make individuals disabled people, in contrast to the idea of the social model of disability, which defines impairment as a fixed natural attribute of an individual. Rather, by considering the mechanism of modern power, it is suggested that both impairment and disability are socially, culturally and historically constructed notions. Therefore, it can be suggested that impairment should not be disregarded in the social model of disability and disability studies.

This argument, however, does not involve denying the role of the social model of disability. The importance of the social model of disability, as the means of the emancipation of disabled people and of objecting to the social roles given by non-disabled people in an unequal society, should be acknowledged.
The effects and impact of the social model have been significant and can be found in a number of ways. Disabled people enthusiastically welcomed the enunciation of the social model. As it was developed through the disability movement by disabled people themselves, it is therefore closely related to their own experiences (Oliver, 1996b). The social model of disability has become a ‘touchstone’ (Thomas, 2004:21) and the fundamental basis of disabled people’s dialogues, disability studies and disability movement in the UK since its emergence in the 1970s. The concept of the model has also been applied in policy statements, disability awareness and equality training (Barnes, 2002). For instance, the initiation of the Disability Rights Commission by the British government (Barnes, 2004) was underpinned by the idea of the social model of disability. Clearly, the social model of disability has become ‘an invaluable tool that has strengthened our insight into the struggle for emancipation’ (Finkelstein, 2004:16) and a significant driver in political and social changes (Christie, 1999). Therefore, as Thomas (2004) advises, whilst the advent of the model should be celebrated as a start point for further discussion, the value the social model of disability has as a strong tool for political endeavour needs to be maximised.

2.3. Disabled people and tourism participation

As has been discussed throughout this chapter, the meaning of disability has been reframed as a form of social disadvantage and exclusions faced by disabled people in many aspects of life, and tourism is invariably one of the areas to be challenged. In relating disability issues to tourism, this section addresses existing research on disability issues in tourism studies and the current situation of tourism and disabled people.

The issues of tourism opportunities for disabled people have attracted research in recent years. When disabled people lived in specialised institutions, the issue of access to tourism and leisure was traditionally seen as an institutional and welfare term (Veal, 2002). However, the inclusion of disabled people in tourism is now regarded as increasingly important in terms of people’s rights, market potential, and legal requirements (Veal, 2002: ETB and TMI, 2003), and these issues will be considered in this section.

For the last two decades, there has been a growing interest in disability issues in tourism studies, and a considerable amount of research on this topic has been presented. Broadly
speaking, disability issues can be researched in tourism in two ways, based on Smith (1989)'s host and guest distinction. There can be a guest related approach, which examines tourism opportunities and the experiences of disabled people, while the host related approach considers the issues in the tourism industry and the design of tourism. However, the focus of the existing research is fairly limited as many of the studies focus on the guest side, and particularly the physical barriers encountered by tourists with disabilities (Shaw and Coles, 2004; Yau, et al., 2004). Moreover, the experiences of disabled tourists and the relationships between disabled tourists and the tourism industry have been neglected in tourism studies (Shaw and Coles, 2004). Although tourism researchers are aware that the physical access issue is only a part of the areas that tourism studies need to discuss (Shaw and Coles, 2004; Yau, et al., 2004), wider issues surrounding tourism and disabled people are still under exploration. Among the existing research on tourism and disability, some research categories can be identified:

Table 2.1: Research categories in tourism and disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research areas</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers for disabled tourists to tourism participation</td>
<td>Smith (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campbell (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yau et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bi et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burns and Graefe (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism experiences of disabled tourists</td>
<td>Shaw and Coles (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yau et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that make disabled people tourism active</td>
<td>Yau et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issue of disability access and heritage sites</td>
<td>Goodall (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of the DDA on the tourism industry</td>
<td>Campbell (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miller and Kirk (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaw and Coles (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability of the tourism industry to cater disabled tourists</td>
<td>Yuksel, et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of disability awareness training on service provision and staff attitudes toward disabled customers in the tourism industry</td>
<td>Daruwalla and Darcy (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment of disabled people in the tourism industry</td>
<td>Ingamells, et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gröschl (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market potential of the disabled tourists' segmentation</td>
<td>Campbell (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnett and Baker (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Card (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huh and Singh (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational needs of disabled tourists</td>
<td>Eichhorn, et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of tourism websites</td>
<td>Mills, et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible event planning</td>
<td>Darcy and Harris (2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It might be obvious that most of the studies in Table 2.1 are conducted mainly from the guest-perspective. Thus, a gap can be identified in the existing studies, and there is a need for further studies on tourism and disability from different perspectives. This point is that this study can make a contribution to knowledge, as it examines both host and guest perspectives by addressing the different stages of the design of tourism. In considering both host and guest perspectives, this section deals with the important issues and the current situation on tourism and disability, such as the right to travel, the market potential of disabled tourists, the barriers preventing disabled people from participating in tourism, and the gap between the tourism industry’s disability provision and the needs of disabled people.

2.3.1. Right to travel

One of the reasons for the growing interest in disability issues within both tourism studies and the tourism industry might be the introduction of anti-discrimination legislation and declarations ensuring the right to travel or access to tourism products for all people. It has been recognised that all people have rights to participate in every social activity, including leisure and tourism (Veal, 2002). Przeclawski (1997) argues that a specific category of tourists must not be discriminated against for any reason, and that disabled people should have the same right to travel and access to tourism destinations and attractions. The following discussion considers how the legislation and declarations advocate the right of disabled people to take tourism opportunities.

Firstly, in the UK context, the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) passed through the UK Parliament in 1995, with the aim of ending discrimination against disabled people. It has been suggested that the DDA is a product of the disability movement and disability activists’ numerous attempts and lobbying for more effectual legal protection (Barnes, 2002). The DDA defines disability as ‘a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities’ (DDA 1995). In this definition, disability covers people with heart disease, diabetes, severe disfigurement, depression, epilepsy, Down’s syndrome and many other types of impairment, and people with past disabilities are also covered by the DDA (EHRC, no date:a; Directgov, no date:a). Moreover, people with HIV, cancer and multiple sclerosis have been included after the amendment of the Act in 2005. It can be said that disfigurement itself is not the cause of disability, but discrimination arises from social attitudes toward the disfigurement. Therefore,
this definition implies that the DDA is based on the idea of the social model of disability and that it attempts to end discriminatory practices in society by moving away from the traditional medicalised definition of disability.

The main areas the DDA covers are: employment (Part 2); discrimination in other areas such as the provision of goods, facilities and services, disposal or management of premises or land (Part 3); education (Part 4); and public transport (Part 5). Since it was first introduced in 1995, the DDA has been revised and improved stage-by-stage, and it was integrated into the Equality Act with other anti-discrimination legislation in 2010. Meanwhile, the Disability Rights Commission (DRC) was established in 2000 and later merged into the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), in order to campaign and enforce the law and provide information and advice to employers, service providers and policy-makers (EHRC, 2008).

The key amendments of the Act, mainly focusing on the tourism related areas, are summarised chronologically as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2: Transition of the UK disability legislations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Source: EHRC, no date:a; EHRC, no date:b; Directgov, no date; GEO, no date; The National Archives, no date; Tourism for All, no date:a; Venhara, 2006; Roulstone and Warren, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1995 DDA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DDA came into force in 1995. It forbade discrimination in employment of disabled people and provision of goods, facilities and services to disabled people. Tourism businesses are included in ‘service providers’ which include businesses and organisations such as shops, restaurants, leisure centres and places of worship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1996 DDA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To treat disabled people less favourably than non-disabled people due to their disabilities has been set as an unlawful conduct. It has been prohibited that service providers refuse unreasonably to offer their services and products to disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999 DDA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Employers and service providers are requested to make reasonable adjustments for disabled people by:
  - changing a practice, policy or procedure which makes it impossible or unreasonably difficult for disabled people to make use of its services.
  - providing an auxiliary aid or service if it would enable (or make it easier for) disabled people to make use of its services.

In terms of physical barriers, employers and service providers are required to: remove the feature; alter it so that it no longer has that effect; provide a reasonable means of avoiding it; or provide a reasonable alternative method of making the service available. |
| **2004 DDA** |
| It has been unlawful for employers to discriminate against disabled people irrespective of the number of employees (previously 20 or more employees in 1996 DDA and 15 or more employees in 1998 DDA). The right to access to goods, services, facilities and premises has been extended. Service providers must consider removing physical barriers or providing a reasonable means to overcome the barriers. It was added that harassment and discrimination toward disabled people and failure to make reasonable adjustment cannot be justified. |
| **2005 DDA** |
| It has extended its scope to cover people who have HIV, cancer and multiple sclerosis. |
It has been unlawful for transport vehicles operators to discriminate against disabled people. It requires public sector to promote equal opportunity for disabled people and to build disability equality into everything they plan and do, based on the Disability Equality Duty. Thus, public bodies became responsible under the DDA to consider the needs of disabled people when they plan and develop their services. In terms of tourism, this amendment is significant in ensuring that public sector considers the needs of disabled people in tourism planning and development.

### 2010 The Equality Act

It integrates the DDA and other anti-discrimination legislations into one single Act to simplify the law and maximise the opportunity to tackle discrimination and inequality. Under the Act, service providers are not allowed to discriminate against people unlawfully when providing goods or services on the grounds of sex, race, disability or religion. The Disability Equality Duty in the DDA continues to apply to public authorities also under the Equality Act.

The implications of these Acts for the tourism industry can be found in many ways. It is clear that tourism businesses are part of the ‘service providers’, and Part 2 and 3 of the DDA are relevant to the tourism industry in terms of employment of disabled people and service provision for disabled customers. Under the Equality Act, tourism businesses such as travel agencies, tourist attractions and accommodations have to make reasonable adjustments if they have physical barriers that can lead to unreasonable difficulties for disabled people in using the services. Besides, tourism businesses have to be aware that failing to consider reasonable adjustments and any discriminatory practices can end in legal action, resulting in poor reputation, loss of motivation and, eventually, loss of business (Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005).

In terms of tourism planning and development, the 2005 DDA and the Equality Act suggest the need for public bodies to be responsible for considering the needs of disabled people and involving them in tourism planning and development.

Turning now to the international level, three declarations have been made by the United Nations (UN) that are related to disabled people’s right to tourism: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948); the Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons (1975); and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006). Furthermore, the Tourism Bill of Rights (1985) and the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (1999) were adopted at the General Assembly of the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). The articles in these declarations that relate to the issue of tourism and disability are listed in the Appendix 1. The aim and characteristics of the declarations are summarised in the Table 2.3 below:
Table 2.3: International declarations relating to the right to tourism
(Source: UNWTO, 1985; UNWTO, 2001; Christie, 1999; Veal, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim and characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</strong> UN (1948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It considers working hours and paid holidays. It is applied primarily to people in full-time paid employment; thus disabled people who are likely to be in unemployment and their leisure opportunities are not particularly considered in the Declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons</strong> UN (1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It specifically targets disabled people. Although it does not make any specific reference to the right to tourism, it implies that disabled people have right to participate in any social and economic activities that should include tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convention on the Right of Persons with Disabilities</strong> UN (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism is clearly included in the Declaration together with cultural, recreational, leisure and sporting activities, and states are encouraged to ensure access to tourism venues and services for disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism Bill of Rights</strong> UNWTO (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It proclaims everyone, including disabled people, have the right to participate in tourism, owing to the positive effects of tourism on the social, economic, cultural and educational sectors. It emphasises that tourism is a human right, based on the idea that tourism can play a role in improving people’s quality of life and promoting peace and international understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Code of Ethics for Tourism</strong> UNWTO (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It aims at promoting responsible, sustainable and accessible tourism for all people with the emphasis on the right to travel. The principle remains the same as the Tourism Bill of Rights; tourism opportunities should be equally enjoyed by everyone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summarising the official national and international commitments introduced above, it becomes evident that there has been a series of improvements in ensuring disabled people’s right to access tourism. However, it has been suggested that the declarations of rights and even legislation do not ensure appropriate disability provision, since key criteria, such as how much leisure time or paid holidays is acceptable, or what the reasonable limitation of working hours means, are not clearly clarified (Veal, 2002). Moreover, they do not address how the right to travel can be achieved and where the responsibility for achieving this lies. Therefore, these declarations are regarded as having merely specified ‘something that everyone ought to have’ (Cranston, 1973:6, referred by Veal, 2002:13).

Moreover, Hall and Brown (2006) argue that the notion of tourism rights underlines global inequalities that tourism opportunities are the privileges of citizens from developed countries, and they can be pointless and irrelevant for many of the world’s population in less developed countries. Thus, the right to travel may not be universally feasible in practice, except in developed countries where people have resources to exercise the right (Veal, 2002). Unless attached responsibilities associated with the rights are clarified, equal tourism opportunities can hardly be realised (Hall and Brown, 2006).
2.3.2. Potential of disabled tourists' market

One of the factors that induce the growing interest in disability issues within tourism research and industry is the market potential of disabled tourists. This issue needs to be addressed here, since the potential of the disabled people's market is often used by tourism organisations to explain why it is important for the tourism industry to cater for disabled people and promote accessible tourism (Shaw and Coles, 2004). In terms of the size of the population of disabled people, there are different figures in different contexts.

For instance, if the number of people claiming Disability Living Allowance is considered, there are 2.7 million disabled people living in the UK (Visit Britain, 2006). On the other hand, the 2001 Population Census shows that there are 9 million people with disabilities or long-term illness in England and Wales; the census is based on self-reported information and comprises people without disabilities, but with limited long-term illness (Visit Britain, 2006). This number increased to 10 million disabled people, as shown in the report of disability prevalence estimates, in the year 2008/9 (ODI, no date). A smaller number has been estimated by the Department for Work and Pensions as 3.6 million disabled people between the ages of 19 and 59, if the working age is considered (Berthoud, 2006). On the other hand, the charity Tourism for All states that there are around 11 million disabled people in the UK (Tourism for All, no date:b). This might suggest that all these figures are estimated by the organisations for different purposes in different contexts. However, in any context, it is widely acknowledged by the organisations that the number of disabled people will only increase in the future, rather than decrease, due to the aging society in which many elderly people have similar needs to disabled people.

In terms of spending power, although disabled consumers are not seen as being wealthy, it is suggested that they have enough resources to travel several times a year (Burnett and Baker, 2001), and at least 2.5 million disabled people travel regularly (Tourism for All, no date:b). While Deloitte’s (2010) recent study estimates the total value of tourism to the UK economy in 2009 at £115.4 billion including direct and indirect impacts, and only the ‘direct’ effect of tourist spending is estimated at £90 billion, the annual spending power of disabled people in tourism is estimated by Tourism for All (no date:b) at over £50 billion in the UK alone. To arrive at this number, a broad definition of disabled people might have been employed by
Tourism for All, but, at the same time, these different estimates might indicate that high estimates are intentionally used by the charity. This point will be examined later in this section. The point here is that it is emphasised by the tourism organisations that the disabled people’s market is not a niche market anymore.

Burnett and Baker (2001) explain that, although disabled people represent the largest and fastest growing market segment, they are often ignored by tourism businesses. The potential of the market segment can be explained not only in terms of the increasing number of disabled people (Campbell, 2000: Card, 2003), but also in terms of the unique characteristics of disabled tourists.

Firstly, it has been reported that disabled people are more likely to travel with their friends and families than non-disabled people (Miller and Kirk, 2002: Phillips, 2002). This means that having accessible premises and services can potentially result in receiving disabled tourists as well as their friends and families (Yau, et al., 2004), and the financial benefit from them can be added to the premises (Miller and Kirk, 2002). While Daruwalla and Darcy (2005) argue that travelling with family, friends and business colleagues is something everyone does regardless of disability, they point out that the impact of inadequate access to premises and services experienced by disabled tourists can also affect the non-disabled tourists travelling with them. Therefore, disabled tourists’ negative experiences with inaccessible premises and services can be shared with their company, and the negative impact can be multiplied, and vice versa.

Secondly, it has been suggested that disabled tourists show a high degree of loyalty to destination institutions that consider and meet the needs of disabled people (Burnett and Baker, 2001: Turco, et al., 1998). Therefore, in meeting the needs of disabled people, tourism businesses and organisations can have an opportunity to get loyal repeat customers (Phillips, 2002). Moreover, the impact of word-of-mouth among the disabled people’s community has been pointed out by Burnett and Baker (2001) and Ray and Ryder (2003), in terms of the service and products that are accessible or inaccessible to disabled people. That is to say, if tourism businesses and organisations can offer a good experience to disabled people, they can encourage other customers from the community to use the services provided by the business.
Thirdly, the needs of disabled people can be shared by other groups of people, such as parents with pushchairs, elderly people, people with big luggage, or people with broken limbs. This means that accessible premises and services are beneficial not only for disabled tourists, but also for other groups of people who require similar services. Therefore, Daruwalla and Darcy (2005) argue that by ignoring the needs of disabled tourists, tourism businesses miss out not only on disabled people, but also a significant proportion of the population. Based on these characteristics of disabled tourists, the market potential of this segment has been emphasised, and tourism businesses have been warned that if they do not provide accessible services, they would fail to include a large number of customers (Burnett and Baker, 2001: Card, 2003).

The market potential of disabled tourists has been highlighted and promoted by tourism agencies such as the English Tourist Council (ETC), as can be seen in the ETC’s report ‘People with disabilities and holiday taking’ (2000). In response to the DDA, tourism development agencies and organisations, such as the ETC, have promoted and campaigned for accessible tourism; however, according to the analysis of Shaw and Coles (2004), their approaches are predominantly within the context of the economic potential of disabled tourists for the tourism industry. The ETC’s report estimates that there are 10 million disabled people in the UK, which is about 15% of the total population, and 2.7 million disabled people in England tend to take domestic holidays (Hall and Brown, 2006). It has been suggested that the ETC has selected information that gives relatively high estimates concerning the market potential of disabled tourists in order to emphasise the size of the market and the business opportunities available to the industry (Shaw and Coles, 2004). A number of reports and campaigns have similarly reinforced this perspective. This approach has been adopted not only by tourism development agencies, but also by disability organisations. In the disability rights movement in the UK, disability organisations have ‘tirelessly promoted the idea that discrimination against disabled people is “bad for business”’ (Vanhala, 2006:562), in terms of employment and the provision of goods and services for disabled people.

One of the reasons why the business opportunities and market potential of disabled tourists have been stressed in promoting accessible tourism is that tourism organisations that promote accessible tourism are aware that the tourism industry is reluctant to deal with disability issues (Burnett and Baker, 2001: Phillips, 2002: Shaw and Coles, 2004: Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005: Shaw, 2007). This is because the industry is unwilling to make changes in its products.
or services to meet the needs of disabled people (Shaw and Coles, 2004). Burnett and Baker (2001:4) explain this reluctance in the following way: ‘Building ramps, giving up prime parking spaces, constructing disability-friendly rooms, and installing expensive technology reflect some of the more common requirements that have soured the perceptions of many travel-related businesses toward the disabled.’ Namely, the industry perceives that the cost of creating accessible products and services outweighs the commercial benefits of having disabled customers (Phillips, 2002). Phillips (2002) adds the ‘fear factor’ in explaining the industry’s reluctance to deal with disability issues, whereby businesses are afraid of receiving too many disabled customers as a result of having accessible facilities and reducing existing core business. It might be obvious that this perception is based on an incorrect assumption that arises from lack of knowledge of disability.

However, the approach emphasising the market potential of disabled tourists in promoting accessible tourism is criticised by Shaw (2007), since it fails to highlight the fragmented nature of the market, where many disabled people have difficulty in taking holidays due to a range of barriers. The economic barrier to travel is particularly significant, as many disabled people are unemployed or have lower status jobs with lower salaries (Shaw, 2007). As a result, disabled people who enjoy tourism might just be a part of the group and might not reflect the strong market potential promoted by various tourism organisations (Shaw and Coles, 2004).

The market-driven approach in promoting accessible tourism has also been criticised on the grounds that it does not consider the social dimensions of access to tourism and the ethical issues involved in maximising public welfare (Hall and Brown, 2006: Shaw, 2007). It is argued that the focus should be placed more on corporate citizenship (Phillips, 2002: Shaw and Coles, 2004) and moral obligation (Card, 2003) in order to help to create a more inclusive society. However, Hall and Brown (2006) point out that it would be naïve to expect tourism businesses to take the ethical-driven approach to promote accessible tourism. This point can be supported by one of the ‘fundamental truths of tourism’ proposed by McKercher (1993). Namely, tourism is fundamentally a private sector dominated industry, and investment decisions are based predominantly on profit maximisation (McKercher, 1993 cited in Hall and Brown, 2006:15). This ‘fundamental truth’ suggests that the tourism industry acts with the aim of maximising financial benefits. Therefore, if they do not see the benefit of involving disabled people in their businesses, they would not consider meeting the
needs of disabled people. This can also explain why tourism organisations emphasise the market potential of disabled tourists in promoting accessible tourism.

2.3.3. The barriers for disabled people to participate in tourism

In spite of the promotion of disabled people's right to travel through enforcing the legislation and focusing on their market potential, disabled people still face numerous barriers in terms of tourism. The barriers and constraints for disabled people that prevent their participation in tourism have been revealed by a growing number of studies. It should be pointed out that most of these studies are related to the guest-side, namely, studies on the barriers for disabled tourists to travel, and their focus is not on the host-side. The barriers can be categorised into four groups presented in Table 2.4 by adapting Hall and Brown's (2006) categorisation, but also by incorporating other works on the barriers to tourism participation such as: Smith (1987); Murray and Sproats (1990); Haywood, et al. (1995); Turco, et al. (1998); Campbell (2000); Takeda and Card (2002); Darcy (2002); Yau, et al. (2004); Shaw and Coles (2004); and Goodall et al. (2004).

Table 2.4: Barriers to participation in tourism
Adapted from Hall and Brown (2006)

| Intrapersonal barriers | • Health-related problems  
|                        | • Lack of knowledge  
|                        | • Physical and psychological dependency  
| Interpersonal barriers | • Attitudinal barriers  
|                        | • Communication barriers  
| Environmental barriers | • Physical barriers  
|                        | • Ecological barriers  
|                        | • Transportation barriers  
| Structural barriers    | • Economic barriers (financial constraints)  
|                        | • Rules and regulations |

Firstly, intrapersonal barriers are the constraints associated with intrapersonal factors such as physical functioning and psychological state, including stress, anxiety, lack of knowledge and health-related problems (Hall and Brown, 2006). These factors are regarded as influential in deciding whether to participate in tourism. Lack of knowledge is one of the intrapersonal barriers that the majority of disabled people may experience due to lack of access to information of tourism opportunities and the resources available to them (Smith, 1987). Campbell (2000) and Goodhall et al. (2004) argue that disabled people are unable to plan
travel without accurate, reliable and comprehensive information of the availability and accessibility of tourism destinations and activities. The lack of accurate and reliable information has been an issue in accessible tourism. Turco, et al. (1998) and Darcy (2002) point out that not all information of accessibility provided to disabled people is accurate. Thus, Yau, et al. (2004) emphasise the need for constant verification of the accuracy of published information of accessibility. In contrast, Murray and Sproats (1990) point out the positive effect of having knowledge on tourism participation. They found that people who had previous experience in visiting parks were more interested in revisiting parks than people who had never visited. It suggests that the knowledge that parks are available and people can visit parks, acquired through previous experience, induces (more) interest in visiting parks. Therefore, lack of knowledge resulting from lack of information is clearly a barrier for disabled people in participating in tourism. Conversely speaking, it can be argued that knowledge and information of tourism opportunities and resources can encourage disabled people to participate in tourism.

Moreover, psychological factors can be a barrier to tourism participation. Smith (1987) argues that psychological dependency can restrict the leisure participation of disabled people, particularly when they have to travel away from home to unfamiliar places. Moreover, it has been pointed out that there are low aspirations and expectations among disabled people, as many disabled people accept the difficulties and impossibility of accessing and participating in tourism (Goodhall, et al., 2004). Haywood, et al. (1995) argue that the lack of knowledge and previous experience of tourism opportunities often leads to disabled people’s low assessment of their abilities and avoidance of tourism participation due to fear. In this regard, it is suggested that support and company by family or friends can give disabled people the confidence to become travel active (Yau, et al., 2004). Furthermore, Yau, et al. (2004) point out that there is a perceived loss of opportunity to travel among disabled people, as some disabled people think that they do not have a chance to engage in tourism opportunities. One of the respondents for their research stated: ‘if you are disabled, you are expected to be dependent. If you are dependent, you better not do too much, expect too much, or want too much. Just sit there’ (Yau, et al., 2004:953). This statement implies that the way in which disabled people are treated in society creates psychological barriers for them in participating in tourism.
In terms of a person's physical dependency, Darcy's research (2003) identifies the relationship between the degree of disability (level of necessary support) and the level of activity that disabled people can participate in; the higher the degree of disability the lower the participation rate. He also finds that intrapersonal factors such as impairment and level of travel independence have a significant influence in determining the level of participation in tourism activities. However, it was found in the same research that the majority of disabled people did not see their impairment as the reason for their non-participation in tourism (Darcy, 2003). In this regard, it becomes important to consider other non-intrapersonal barriers and constraints.

Secondly, interpersonal barriers refer to the barriers resulting out of social interaction or relationships between people. The interpersonal barriers for disabled people can occur in the interaction and relationship with service providers, strangers, travel companions, carers, local people in tourism destinations, and so forth (Hall and Brown, 2006). Attitudinal barriers can be regarded as the main interpersonal barrier for disabled people. In DRC's Disability Awareness Survey (2003), it was revealed that disabled people still face harassment in public on the grounds of their impairment. Similarly, it has been suggested that attitudinal barriers are still prevalent in the tourism industry (Takeda and Card, 2002). Campbell (2000) points out that although service providers are often willing to help disabled people, they tend to end up either being condescending or doing nothing at all, because they are not sure how to deal with disabled people and do not feel comfortable with them. This supports Darcy's (2007) claim that lack of awareness, understanding and knowledge of disability can lead to negative attitudes toward disabled people.

Hall and Brown (2006) argue that there is a close relationship between the way disability is conceptualised in society and negative attitudes toward disabled people. As examined early in this chapter, the notion of disability is constructed from various influences such as power, culture and the concepts of objectification and otherness. These factors, which are profoundly rooted in society, form people's attitude toward disabled people. Thus, negative attitudes toward disabled people are unintentional in many cases (Peat, 1997 cited in Hall and Brown, 2006:35). Importantly, the prevailing negative attitude can affect the self-concept of disabled people in a negative way in which disabled people may internalise the negative attitude and beliefs (Hall and Brown, 2006), which consequently induces intrapersonal barriers to tourism participation.
Removing these attitudinal barriers is seen as an urgent issue in the tourism industry because negative staff attitudes can directly affect disabled people’s travel experience and satisfaction (Bedini, 2000 cited in Card, 2003). In order to overcome the attitudinal barriers and lack of disability awareness, it is widely suggested that disability awareness training for the tourism industry is essential (Takeda and Card, 2002: Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005: Hall and Brown, 2006). In terms of the types of disability awareness training, Daruwalla and Darcy’s (2005) research found that the use of contact with disabled people in disability awareness training was more effective in changing people’s attitude than training that had only information provision. They found that training with direct contact with disabled people had a significant effect in changing attitudes, and the change in attitude tended to be longer lasting. The important implications of their research are: firstly, it is possible to change people’s attitude toward disabled people through disability awareness training; and secondly, intervention type of training programmes using role-play and contact with disabled people would be more effective in changing people’s attitude to disabled people (Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005). Similarly, Krahe and Altwasser’s (2006) research revealed that a combination of cognitive and behavioural interventions can reduce negative attitudes toward disabled people: ‘this (changing negative attitudes toward disabled people) can be achieved by an intervention that combines cognitive information with personal contacts with disabled people and first-hand role-taking experience of the impairment caused by different forms of physical disability’ (Krahe and Altwasser, 2006:67-68). Thus, training that involves contact with disabled people is useful in raising awareness and consequently overcoming attitudinal barriers. However, the question is where the interaction with disabled people can occur. Apart from family members or friends, it might not be easy to find opportunities to interact with disabled people. As Campbell (2000) points out, it is not always possible for non-disabled people to meet disabled people at their workplace, as disabled people have historically been discriminated against in the recruitment process. Therefore, it can be argued that attempts to make special opportunities for interaction with disabled people are required.

Thirdly, environmental barriers are associated with physical accessibility. Physical accessibility is often regarded as the most common understanding of accessibility (Haywood, et al., 1995). Physical barriers not only deny disabled people’s mobility and physical access to the environment, but also prevent them from using the existing resources (Smith, 1987). Environmental barriers in tourism are discussed in several ways. Firstly, it is suggested that
many tourism components and environments are still not physically accessible to disabled people. For instance, Tourism for All (no date:b) shows that only 2% of tourist accommodation in the UK has been assessed as accessible to date. Goodhall, et al. (2004) also point out the difficulty in making changes to heritage environments to improve accessibility. Secondly, the meaning of ‘accessibility’ is not uniformly shared among various disabled people, as the word ‘accessible’ can mean different things to different disabled people (Murray and Sproats, 1990). In other words, physical accessibility for one group of disabled people might not be accessible for another group of disabled people. Thus, providing detailed information on the physical environment might be more useful than describing the environment as ‘accessible’. Thirdly, there is an argument that physical and environmental barriers reflect people’s lack of disability awareness (Takeda and Card, 2002). Murray and Sproats (1990) and Goodhall, et al. (2004) point out that service providers are not aware of the needs of disabled people and do not have knowledge of what can easily be done to improve accessibility. Furthermore, service providers perceive that the costs of making changes to improve accessibility for disabled people are high (Goodhall, et al., 2004). Therefore, the lack of awareness among tourism businesses and organisations can lead to keeping or not changing physical barriers in tourism. Lastly, while some tourism businesses are worried about how much benefit they could get as a result of spending money for improving accessibility, Murray and Sproats (1990:13) argue that: ‘The disabled community wants to travel but first the barriers must be removed. Provision of accessible facilities and venues will soon create its own demand. ...They lose sight of the fact that disabled people do not use the facility because they cannot get into it. Disabled people will use recreational facilities if they know them to be accessible’. Card (2003) similarly states that if disabled people do not have access to facilities or services, they simply will not use them. In other words, it can be said that, if accessible facilities, services and environments are offered, disabled people will come to use them.

The final category of the barriers to tourism participation is structural barriers. Structural barriers arise in relation to the social structure or the factors influenced by the social structure, such as financial barriers, lack of time and regulations. These barriers are regarded as having a close relationship with the social structure of society. Among these, financial barriers are particularly influential in disabled people’s participation in tourism. As the next chapter on social exclusion will discuss the relationship between disabled people and financial constraints in detail, only tourism related financial barriers for disabled people are addressed.
Many disabled people do not have much disposable income, and this has notable implications for their holiday making (Haywood, et al., 1995; Shaw and Coles, 2004). Additionally, disabled people generally do not have much flexibility and choice to take economical holidays, such as backpacker styles of holiday, since many of the low priced holiday offers are not accessible to them (Murray and Sproats, 1990). Furthermore, many disabled people need to be accompanied by an attendant, and this entails additional costs (Murray and Sproats, 1990; Darcy, 2002). Bearing these financial barriers in mind, Shaw (2007) contends that the tourism organisations’ approach to emphasise the market potential of disabled tourists in promoting accessible tourism fails to acknowledge the financial barriers disabled people face. As the financial barriers reflect the social structure, this problem will not easily be overcome. This issue will be discussed in the next chapter.

It might be clear that the barriers to tourism participation addressed above are dynamic in nature, and they are interrelated with each other. Importantly, the barriers not only prevent disabled people from participating in tourism, but also have negative effects on psychological factors, such as enjoyment and satisfaction during and after tourism participation (Smith, 1987). Therefore, it is crucial to remove the barriers in order to encourage disabled people to participate in tourism, and the effort to remove the barriers should be made by all tourism stakeholders. Yau, et al. (2004:948) state: ‘Unless appropriate enabling environments are facilitated and the individual is empowered to take advantage of these environments, people may still not have access to tourism’. The barriers discussed in this section are predominantly related to disabled tourists, namely the guest-perspective, however, this study attempts to explore the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism in a more comprehensive way, and the findings of the study show the barriers from different tourism stakeholders’ perspectives (Chapter 6). The next section deals with how the tourism industry has tried to cater for disabled people.

2.3.4. The gap between the tourism industry’s disability provision and the needs of disabled people

It has been suggested that there is a gap between the needs of disabled people and the views of the tourism industry toward disability issues (Shaw and Coles, 2004). Miller and Kirk (2002) summarise the overall picture of disability provision in the tourism industry as one of non-understanding or misunderstanding of how to meet the needs of potential disabled
customers. As a result, the current standards of service provision for disabled people are not satisfactory. Moreover, the quality and standard of disability provision varies from company to company (Campbell, 2000), and there is a tendency whereby the public sector has a greater level of disability awareness and makes more actions on disability provision than the private sector (Shaw, 2007). Therefore, there is a gap within the tourism stakeholders in terms of views, awareness, and provision of disability.

According to Shaw (2007), referring to the survey by the Department for Education and Employment in 1998, the main reason for not taking action on disability provision in most businesses was that they believed that their services were fully accessible to disabled people. However, the same survey revealed that about 70% of businesses did not provide staff training on disability. This indicates that the businesses' confidence in their disability provision might not be based on awareness and understanding of disability. It was also found that the main barriers to make adjustments for disabled people perceived by businesses were: lack of knowledge and awareness of legal requirements; difficulties in making adjustments in physical environment due to design issues; and finally cost constraints. None of the respondents in the survey considered lack of awareness and staff training as a barrier to improve accessibility for disabled people (Shaw, 2007). These perceived barriers among businesses in improving accessibility for disabled people again might not reflect awareness and understanding of disability issues, if they do not have any disability awareness training. Similarly, Campbell (2000) argues that tourism businesses often do not realise that they offer poor service standards to disabled people. Therefore, it is crucial that the tourism industry becomes more aware of the needs of disabled people.

However, it has been argued that it is not easy to take all the needs of disabled people into consideration. This difficulty is due to the complex nature of the issues surrounding disability. Tourism organisations tend to view disabled people as a homogeneous group or market when promoting accessible tourism. However, the needs of disabled people are more complex than currently debated, due to different types and levels of disabilities and associated physical, attitudinal and economic constraints (Haywood, et al., 1995: Campbell, 2000: Shaw and Coles, 2004: Hall and Brown, 2006). Campbell (2000) adds that many disabled people are not visibly disabled. While the needs of people in wheelchairs might be easily recognised, the needs of people with hearing impairments or learning difficulties are less distinct. Furthermore, in relation to the intrapersonal barriers for disabled people to participate in
tourism, since the needs of disabled people have been neglected for a long time, it is unlikely that disabled people’s confidence in using the services and products offered by tourism businesses will change overnight (Campbell, 2000). This leads to a difficulty for businesses in gaining short-term financial rewards as a result of improved accessibility. For this reason, it might be inevitable that it takes time to gain disabled people’s confidence in terms of what tourism businesses offer. However, as Campbell (2000) stresses, in the longer term, improved disability provision will enable businesses to attract a wider cross-section of the population; not only disabled people but also other groups of people who have similar needs.

2.4. Chapter conclusion and summary

In concluding the discussion on disability, it should be emphasised that, while postmodernism considers the influence of power and cultural and historical factors to be beneficial for the theoretical and conceptual development of disability studies, the social model of disability is still influential in changing disabled people’s lives in terms of active disability movement and empowerment. Therefore, it is crucial to appraise both approaches for further discussion on disability and for accomplishing the ultimate common goal: to contribute to emancipating disabled people and to develop inclusive societies (Corker and Shakespeare, 2002).

Based on the discussion of the social model of disability, it might be suggested that it is not sensible to use the model only in the disability discourse. It can be applied when explaining any other form of social exclusion as well as social problems. This is because the model considers the main factors in society that influence any interpretation of social problems, such as economic, cultural and historical factors. Furthermore, the concepts of power and otherness, for instance, can equally be found in the discussion of disablism, feminism and racism.

‘Black people’s experience of racism cannot be compartmentalised and studied separately from the underlying social structure; women's experience of sexism cannot be separated from the society in which it takes place; and neither can disabled people's experience of disablism and inequality be divorced from the society in which we all live.’ (Morris, 1992:166)

From this statement, it is clear that studies on social oppression in any discourse take the same approach: understanding the society. Morris (1992:160) further argues that feminist
work illustrates that ‘feminism is not just about the study of women but also an entirely new way of looking at the world’. It might be evident that the same thing can be said in the context of disability. Disability study is not just about focusing exclusively on disabled people, but it is also about suggesting new alternative ways to look at the society in which disability is conceptualised and created. Therefore, all social problems and oppression could be understood by looking at society rather than looking at the oppressed group of people alone, and this idea is clearly based on the concept of the social model of disability and postmodernist accounts.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that, while understanding different forms of social oppression has similarities in terms of focusing on factors outside of the oppressed people, there are important differences between disablism, racism and feminism. The fact is that there is a possibility for a non-disabled person to become a disabled person, which might rarely happen to people concerned with sexism and racism within a particular society (it possibly happens in sexism). In other words, people have a higher possibility to experience the transformation from the dominant group of people to the socially oppressed group of people, particularly in this aging society where many old people have some form of disability. In this regard, along with the economic and cultural factors affecting the interpretation of disability, the ideas of ‘tragedy’ and ‘fear of becoming disabled’ need to be highlighted and studied. Finally, as people may have a chance to have disabilities, the disability issues are not just about creating an accessible environment and an accessible society for disabled people, but also about making an inclusive environment for your future selves. Social oppression and exclusion experienced by disabled people are not an issue of a single particular group of people, but a challenge for the whole of humanity. In this respect, as Christie (1999) suggests, the idea of the social model can be effectively used by disability campaigners and organisations in promoting social inclusion by addressing the common ground between disabled people and non-disabled people.

Although the importance of the concept of the social model of disability has been widely acknowledged, the individual model of disability still remains a dominant idea that forms professional as well as general views toward disability (Barton, 1996). This is because of the ‘psychological imagination’ (Oliver, 1983:18) in which people imagine what it would be like to have disabilities and assume that it must be tragic. Another reason is that leaving problems within individuals with impairments is politically convenient, since society does not need to
be challenged (Oliver, 1983). Changing such thinking is difficult because, as Hevey (1993) points out in terms of the representation of disability, the traditional interpretation of disability has become ‘natural’ within society. Therefore, there are still barriers that exclude disabled people from social and day-to-day activities, such as education, employment, leisure activities and tourism, which were also discussed in this chapter. In order to understand the mechanisms of the exclusion of disabled people, the issues of social exclusion become important and need to be addressed. The next chapter will deal with the issues of social exclusion.
CHAPTER 3
SOCIAL EXCLUSION

3.1. Introduction

The previous chapter examined the ways in which disability is conceptualised. As was discussed throughout the last chapter, the meaning of disability has been reframed as a form of social disadvantage and exclusion experienced by disabled people in all areas of life. And tourism, of course, is one of the areas in which disabled people are excluded.

The main aim of this chapter is to examine the issues of social exclusion and disabled people, and social exclusion and tourism. It does this by considering the issues and mechanisms of social exclusion and the exclusion of disabled people from tourism opportunities. These are important issues in understanding how and why disabled people are excluded from the design of tourism, which is the theme of the next chapter. In understanding the mechanism of exclusion of disabled people from tourism, the concept and issues of social exclusion can give background for, and implications to comprehend, the main theme of this chapter.

3.2. Understanding social exclusion

The issues of social exclusion have clearly been one of the central themes for governments in many countries to tackle, and the subject has gained much interest from academics and has been discussed in a number of ways in different discourses.

3.2.1. Terminological diversity

There is a considerable diversity in terminology in most of the discussion of social exclusion. While (social) insertion, integration, inclusion, solidarity and cohesion are words commonly used in a positive way to express the phenomenon, (social) exclusion, isolation, marginalisation, segregation, fracture and socially exposed are commonly used on the negative side (Allen et al., 1998).
The term social exclusion in European dialogue originates from the French Socialist government's political programme during the 1980s (Allen et al., 1998). In this specific context, there are two important implications to be considered. Firstly, the term social exclusion emerged within a conceptualisation of national sovereignty based on the notion of 'the one and indivisible Republic'; therefore, the social, political and moral insertion of subjects in the unified French social order is required in combating social exclusion (Allen et al., 1998: 13). Thus, in a practical political dialogue, it was argued that failure to combat social exclusion would induce social fracture, which would endanger the basis of the Republic (Allen et al., 1998). Secondly, the implementation of a guaranteed minimum income by the French governments in 1980s indicates that achieving insertion of subjects into the French social order cannot inevitably rely on employment as a fundamental kind of socialisation (Allen et al., 1998).

In America, on the other hand, the idea of social exclusion is expressed with words such as 'ghettoization', 'marginalization' and 'underclass'. For several generations, the underclass has usually been understood as being composed of ethnic minorities, and people in the underclass are isolated from the mainstream of society and regarded as a threat to the society (Burchardt, et al., 2002). The situation and condition of the underclass tends to be considered as a self-induced consequence, and therefore, the individuals themselves have a responsibility for remaining as part of the underclass (Townsend, 1997; Byrne, 1999; Burchardt, et al., 2002).

Therefore, there are clear differences in the contexts behind the terms expressing social exclusion. While the French case shows a strong focus on the value of solidarity, the argument of underclass is based on American individualism (Townsend, 1997). This difference shows that the terms expressing social exclusion and notions behind them are varied depending on cultural and national contexts.

Furthermore, the terms used to express social exclusion differ significantly depending on academic background. While sociologists focus on behavioural differences between groups or social classes, economists emphasise the market sector, and particularly the labour market, in terms of poverty, and social policy analysts concentrate on government policies and the impacts they bring about (Burchardt, et al., 2002). Among the studies on social exclusion, it
is widely accepted that the term ‘social exclusion’ is intrinsically dynamic. In this regard, Burchardt et al. (2002) point out that although the focus of each discourse is convincing, they can offer only a part of the whole picture of social exclusion. Therefore, they propose an integrated approach to understand social exclusion, which will be discussed in the later part of this section.

3.2.2. Social exclusion as a multi-dimensional process

Irrespective of the terms used, it is commonly understood that discussion of social exclusion essentially deals with the changes in a society that affect some of the people in the society (Byrne, 1999); therefore, social exclusion can be understood as a multi-dimensional process within a society in which the changes take place, instead of a way to categorise people within the society (Madanipour et al., 1998; Hills, 2002). Madanipour et al. (1998:22) explicitly define social exclusion as ‘a multi-dimensional process, in which various forms of exclusion are combined: participation in decision making and political processes, access to employment and material resources, and integration into common cultural processes’. While some of the research on social exclusion exclusively focuses on the issues of low income and poverty as factors of social exclusion, this approach considers social exclusion as a multi-dimensional issue and encompasses a range of factors that influence the social exclusion of individuals. Taking this approach is advantageous to understand social exclusion comprehensively. Therefore, this chapter takes a position that sees social exclusion as a multi-dimensional process in discussing the main theme: the exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism.

In order to identify and understand the dimensions that determine social exclusion, Madanipour (1998:77-78) suggests examining three main broad spheres of the social world, or the economic, political and cultural arenas in which social exclusion takes place.

In the economic arena, firstly, access to resources is the main form of inclusion. This is generally secured by employment. Therefore, a lack of access to employment, which induces deprivation of opportunity for production and consumption, is the most evident form of social exclusion. As can be seen from many discussions on social exclusion (Walker and Walker, 1997; McKnight, 2002; Bradshaw and Finch, 2003; and Barry, 2002, for example) that treat
unemployment and poverty as the central issues, exclusion from the economic arena is regarded as a critical and acute form of exclusion.

In the political arena, involvement in power and participation in decision-making are the major form of inclusion, which is normally ensured through voting. Thus, a lack of political representation is a major form of social exclusion, which can be seen in the under-representation of women in governments and the elimination of immigrants from political decision-making, for example.

Lastly, in the cultural arena, sharing a series of meanings and symbols is the major manifestation of inclusion, of which the most significant forms are language, religion and nationality. Therefore, becoming marginalised from these symbols, meanings and rituals is the most apparent form of social exclusion. The forms of cultural exclusion are various due to the diversity of languages, race, religion and lifestyles.

Different social groups experience these forms of social exclusion in the three arenas at different degrees (Madanipour, 1998). For instance, individuals who are included in some of the arenas can be, at the same time, excluded from other arenas. Nevertheless, it was suggested that the severest form of social exclusion is the combination of the economic, political and cultural exclusion that closely interact each other and create a more acute form of social exclusion (Madanipour, 1998).

Thus, this approach suggests that social exclusion needs to be understood in terms of the various dimensions of a society such as political, economic and cultural dimensions. In other words, it can be said that social exclusion is determined by lack of access or opportunities to participate in these dimensions of a society. The reasons for the lack of access can be diverse, particularly in the context of disability and tourism. The reasons could not be low income or unemployment alone, but could include many other factors such as discrimination, people's attitudes toward disabled people and physical barriers. In this sense, the multi-dimensional approach to social exclusion is of value, since it allows analysis of social exclusion to be done from wider aspects.

3.2.3. Integrated approach to understanding social exclusion
In addition to the three dimensions' approach, Burchardt et al. (2002) introduce an integrated framework for understanding social exclusion. It explains that there are six levels in which social exclusion happens: the individual, family, community, local, national and global levels. Their onion diagram below in Figure 3.1. has the individual at the centre, spanning out to family, community, local, national and ultimately global layers, and any level is influenced by other contexts.
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**Figure 3.1: An integrated approach to understand social exclusion**
Adopted from Burchardt, et al. (2002:7)

This diagram shows that there cannot be just a single cause of any outcome in the context of social exclusion, due to the complexity of influences on individuals. This approach is crucial, as it allows dynamic analysis by being capable of embracing different aspects of social exclusion at different levels, unlike some of the studies on social exclusion treating individuals or family influences as essentially distinct factors.

### 3.2.4. Relationality

At this point, Allen et al. (1998)'s argument that the idea of 'relationality' is the key to the notion of social exclusion might become reasonable. The idea of relationality regards social exclusion as a process that originates from structural changes in a society that affect people in the society and the relationships between them. Giving a particular reference to the urban space, they further state that these relational changes question the capacity of urban governance, which represents the institutionalised patterns of relations among groups of
people that determine decision-making on managing people in the urban area. Consequently, social cues are reflected in space; therefore, social barriers become spatial barriers (Allen et al., 1998).

Furthermore, the important point of the relational view of social exclusion is that the structural process influences the whole society in a manner that generates barriers precluding particular groups of people from building social relationships with other groups (Allen et al., 1998). In this regard, they state that social exclusion is not something done by some people to others; rather, it is about social boundaries that are constructed through structural changes in a society, and experienced by some people as barriers to participation in a range of dimensions of social life.

3.2.5. Social exclusion as a relative concept

The significance of the impact of the barriers on people in society can also be seen in the definition of social exclusion by Byrne (1999:1, original emphasis); social exclusion ‘happens in time, in a time of history, and ‘determines’ the lives of individuals and collectivities who are excluded and of those individuals and collectivities who are not’.

This definition implies, firstly, that while exclusion is something done by some people to other people, social exclusion brings consequences to both people who are excluded and those who are not. Unlike Allen et al. (1998), Byrne maintains that some people exclude other people. Similarly, Burchardt (2004) affirms that some people exercise power and agency to exclude others, in order to protect own interests. Thus, non-excluded people might influence a process of exclusion of a certain group of people at different levels, as explained by the onion diagram. Secondly, it indicates that social exclusion is a relative concept that happens differently in different times and societies, as is seen in the terminological diversity of social exclusion. Thirdly, in terms of using the word ‘determine’ with regard to the lives of people, this might allude to the fact that the consequences of social exclusion are difficult for people who are excluded to avoid, and it is not something people choose to experience.

In this respect, Barry (2002) indicates the importance of distinguishing between voluntary and non-voluntary exclusion. In order to judge them, he argues that the quality of the choices on offer is the key to be examined. In other words, although self-exclusion might be called
social exclusion in some cases, whether people have a choice and access to other options or not is a crucial point in order to understand people who are excluded against their will. This idea leads to the approach that sees social exclusion as lack of access to rights and opportunities.

3.2.6. Social exclusion as lack of access to rights and opportunities

Social exclusion can be also regarded as a lack of access to and non-participation in key activities of the society in which people live (Burchardt et al., 2002: Barry, 2002). This definition also sees social exclusion as a relative concept, and the ‘key’ activities differ from society to society. Burchardt et al. (2002:31) identifies four key dimensions in the 1990s in Britain:

- Consumption: the capacity to purchase goods and services
- Production: participation in economically or socially valuable activities
- Political engagement: involvement in local or national decision-making
- Social interaction: integration with family, friends, and community

It might be clear that these dimensions overlap with Madanipour’s idea about social exclusion as a multi-dimensional process, introduced before, which can be found in three spheres of the world; the political, economic and cultural arenas.

In this approach, participation is the central concept of social exclusion. Individuals are socially excluded if they lack participation in any of the dimensions above. Therefore, belonging to an ethnic minority or staying in a disadvantaged area are not preconditions of being socially excluded if the individuals are able to participate in the four dimensions of the activities of the society (Burchardt et al., 2002).

Along with participation in the key activities of a society, access to basic rights can be added to the dimensions. According to Burchardt, et al. (2002), a sequence of research by the United Nations Development Programme identified the importance of civil and social rights in the context of social exclusion. Here, social exclusion is conceptualised as lack of access to basic rights, and it is often regarded as having a connection to the concept of citizenship.
Indeed, the concept of citizenship has been regarded as the key to understand social exclusion. This will be discussed in the subsequent section.

This lack of access leads to the notion of social justice as equal opportunity; namely, social exclusion causes a contravention of the demands of social justice as equal opportunity (Barry, 2002). Barry identified two ways in which social exclusion is incompatible with equal opportunities.

Firstly, social exclusion engenders unequal educational and occupational opportunities, and these two opportunities are mutually related. According to Barry (2002), a lack of job opportunities tends to reduce scholastic motivation, resulting in poor educational outcomes that consequently lead to limited job opportunities in the next generation. Moreover, it is suggested that while people at the bottom lack a network through which to gain ordinary jobs, those at the top are privileged in accessing a network offering information of the most advantageous and profitable jobs (Barry, 2002). This is far from equal opportunity, as ‘some have too few opportunities, others too many’ (Barry, 2002: 21). As the possession of and access to knowledge and information structures the power relations of individuals in a contemporary society (Thomas and Coker, 2002), whether individuals have networks, and what types of information the networks provide to the individuals, can determine what people can get in the society. In this context, education becomes the principal means to get an access to better networks. Therefore, inequality among individuals becomes more profound through the interaction between lack of access to educational and occupational opportunities.

Secondly, social exclusion embraces a dismissal of equal opportunity to participate in politics. It is suggested by Barry (2002) that the opportunity to participate in political activities, including not only voting but also participating in political parties and lobbying, is one of the rights that citizens have, and the inability to participate in these political activities is a facet of social exclusion.

On the other hand, Barry (2002) also points out that even if all people have equal power in politics, there will still be winners and losers. This is due to the nature of democracy in which political parties have to divide constituents into unequally sized parts and distinguish the majority part, whose concerns are regarded as the most important for the society in order to obtain support from the majority and maintain their political power. One of the important
implications of this is that politicians may demonise and dehumanise minorities for the sake of their benefit and political careers if there is a lack of empathy between the majority and minority groups (Barry, 2002). If the majority voters do not consider the minority, the concerns of excluded people will be neglected by democratic politics. Therefore, it is clear that the issue of politics and power is a significant factor affecting social justice in terms of equal opportunities.

Apart from the educational and occupational opportunities, there might be some rights that are believed to be unconditional to everyone, such as the right to a fair trial and the right to vote. However, even these rights can be threatened by the exercised inequality. For instance, the access to a fair trial is limited to people who are not able to pay for legal representation with the absence of legal funding support system (Barry, 2002). Similarly, disabled people's opportunity to vote can be endangered by the inaccessible format of information or the physical environment at the polling stations. Barry (2002) summarises that inequality and social exclusion are closely related in any society in which services and products supplied even publicly can be bought privately, and in which the market plays the predominant role in the allocation of goods and services.

3.2.7. Significance of economic factors in social exclusion

This chapter now moves on to one of the dimensions of social activities, the economic sphere, by considering the issues related to social exclusion, such as unemployment, low income and poverty. There has been a substantial amount of research on social exclusion and poverty. In some of the research on social exclusion, the focus is exclusively on the issue of poverty and economic factors. McKnight (2002) points to the significance of being in unemployment in working age because it determines the possibility of individuals becoming socially excluded. Byrne (1999) hints that unemployment and insecurity of employment is an inherent characteristic of a flexible labour market. This unemployment or low pay has been one of the major causes of the increasing number of people living in poverty (Pile and O'Donnell, 1997). Moreover, it is suggested that poverty could be both a cause and consequence of social exclusion (Walker and Walker, 1997). Therefore, although low income and unemployment clearly associate with social exclusion, they need to be considered as a part of the indications of social exclusion.
It is necessary to consider why economic factors are regarded as so important in the discussion of social exclusion. Byrne (1999) gives important accounts to answer this question. He examines the significance of processes of production and consumption under capitalism and argues that social exclusion is an inherent characteristic of polarised post-industrial capitalism. He points out that production continues to be of primary value under capitalism, which emphasises people’s role as producers; therefore, those excluded from employment become peripheral to the consumption process. Consequently, income becomes the prerequisite condition for social participation through consumption, and, at the same time, it reflects people’s power in their economic roles (Byrne, 1999). Furthermore, Byrne (1999) asserts that social exclusion caused by unemployment is neither a possession of individuals nor even of social spaces. Instead, it is a necessary characteristic of unequal capitalism.

It might now be clear that economic disadvantages that can be seen in poverty, low income and unemployment are critical elements constructing and/or resulting from social exclusion. In understanding social exclusion, however, it is widely believed that it is necessary to consider not only economic factors but also other factors in the political and cultural spheres (Madanipour, 1998; Burchardt, et al., 2002), as in the previous section’s discussion of the multi-dimensional approach to social exclusion. This point of view can be supported by the fact that social exclusion can emerge between individuals or groups who are not economically different from each other (Barry, 2002). Similarly, Burchardt et al. (2002) suggest that social exclusion as non-participation can occur in a number of ways, such as through discrimination, chronic illness, cultural identification, and not necessarily through economic disadvantages.

Therefore, social exclusion needs to be distinguished from poverty and economic inequality, although they are key precursors and outcomes of social exclusion (Walker, 1997; Madanipour, 1998; Barry, 2002; Hobcraft, 2002). This distinction is precisely explained by Walker (1997:8, original emphasis): ‘...we have retained the distinction: regarding poverty as a lack of the material resources, especially income, necessary to participate in British society and social exclusion as a more comprehensive formulation which refers to the dynamic process of being shut out, fully or partially, from any of the social, economic, political and cultural systems which determine the social integration of a person in society’. It might be obvious that this statement clearly relates to the approach of understanding social exclusion as a multi-dimensional process. Social exclusion can, therefore, be regarded as non-
participation in, or the lack or denial of access to, the multi-dimensional activities in a society, and it can be understood in the broader perspective of citizenship (Madanipour, 1998), rather than focusing solely on economic factors.

3.3. Citizenship

The concept of citizenship has been regarded as central to understanding social exclusion. The studies on citizenship indicate the exclusive nature of the concept and suggest that various forms of exclusion are indispensable to any social relationship (Madanipour, 1998). Understanding this perspective is important for this research in order to shift the focus of the discussion from the exclusionary perspective to the inclusive perspective, which will be explored in the next chapter. This is the reason why the concept of citizenship is examined here. This section examines the relationship between social exclusion and the concept of citizenship by looking at how the concept emerged and how it has been criticized for the fundamental nature of the concept.

Like many concepts in sociology, citizenship is equally considered to be a contentious concept, and it is hard to define (Barton, 1993). Rather, Riley (1992) suggests that, in attempting to understand the concept of citizenship, it is important to identify how the term is used. In addition, the focus of the conceptual debates on citizenship has been on specifying who is and who is not eligible to exercise the certain rights of citizenship (Allen, 1998). This question entails the important issue of inclusion and exclusion, namely, who is a citizen and who is excluded from the group (Riley, 1992).

3.3.1. Marshall’s concept of citizenship

Much of the discussion on citizenship can be traced back to the work of Marshall (1950) who suggested with social class concerns that citizenship bestows three rights; civil, political and social.

Civil citizenship comprises rights that are related to individual freedom and equality of treatment. ‘Liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice’ (Marshall, 1950:10) are
examples of civil citizenship. It is the right to affirm individual rights based on equality before the law, and therefore, the most closely related institution to civil rights is the courts of justice (Marshall, 1950). Crook, et al. (1992) point out that civil citizenship becomes the basis of political rights to participate in constructing law in terms of universalistic equal legal treatment.

Political citizenship signifies rights to participate in exercising political power as a member of a political body or as a voter of members of the body. The institutions associated with political citizenship are national governments, national parliaments and local government councils (Marshall, 1950). It implies that political citizenship is conferred in a specific boundary, often within a country.

Social citizenship confers rights to enjoy 'the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in the society' (Marshall, 1950:11). It was explained that social rights can be secured by institutions such as the educational system and social services (Marshall, 1950). It might be said that social citizenship sees material welfare as a major precondition to ensure social rights; therefore, it emphasises the importance of securing a minimum level of economic welfare.

Along with Marshall's three elements of citizenship, Christie (1999) lists some dimensions of citizenship: legal, social and cultural, informational, and economic. Although many of them accord with Marshall's citizenship, the new dimension added is informational right. Information is regarded as crucial in order to make the most of rights and responsibilities, and therefore, it is important to ensure access to information (Christie, 1999). For example, Craig (2004) shows cases of older people who miss out a substantial amount of pensions due to a lack of knowledge and the complexity of the pension systems.

Marshall (1950) suggests that those rights of citizenship were identified based on historical analysis. He mapped the dimensions of citizenship over three centuries. Riley (1992) summarises Marshall's points: eighteenth century saw the flourishing of civil rights – access to the rights before the law; the nineteenth century witnessed the growth of political rights – the development of new political parties; and the twentieth century saw the flowering of social rights – the demand for social protection against poverty. Although this division might
It is clear that citizenship is regarded as an evolitional process or 'the extension of political, social and civil rights to all sections of the population' (Barton, 1993:241).

In order to evaluate Marshall's citizenship, Riley (1992) hints that it is important to consider the work context and people's fascination with the reconstruction of society in the Second World War and the post-war periods. It was hoped by people that a range of rights, such as a decent level of living, education, and housing, would become accessible to all individuals. Thus, it is not surprising to see Marshall’s attempt to explain citizenship in terms of civil, political and social rights in this context.

3.3.2. Responsibility and obligations

One of the implications of Marshall's arguments is that citizenship entails both rights and duties (Barton, 1993). Marshall (1950) argues that duty is allied with the right not only due to citizens' responsibilities to themselves, but also due to the requirement from society. For instance, education is regarded as a right of children as well as the responsibility of parents, because they have a duty to themselves and also because the society requires educated citizens (Marshall, 1950). Although societies develop the image of ideal citizenship, there are no common practices to specify what rights and duties societies should possess (Marshall, 1950).

Within a range of duties, Craig (2004) argues that 'paid work' has been given an emphasis, particularly by New Labour in the UK, as a precondition to achieve the status of citizen. By referring to Marx, Crook et al. (1992) also mention that the meaning of life is affected by human labour under modernisation, especially capitalism; therefore, people's identities are placed in the production system. Hence, people who are not in paid work within the labour market are unlikely to attain the status of citizenship (Craig, 2004). This argument relates to the notion of active/passive citizenship, which will be discussed shortly.

Furthermore, the important implication of this is that citizenship is a 'status' that only members of a community are able to gain (Marshall, 1950:28-29). In other words, those who are not regarded as members of the community are not bestowed the rights and duties that are common to members of the community as a whole. For example, women were regarded as
non-citizens until the end of nineteenth century, and, for that reason, they were protected in exchange for full citizenship (Marshall, 1950). Therefore, the exclusionary nature of the concept of citizenship can be seen.

### 3.3.3. Approaches to the concept of citizenship

Allen (1998) introduces two approaches in discussing citizenship and evaluates them with some critiques. The first is the communitarian approach, which highlights belongingness and the exclusion of outsiders. Namely, people can receive resources owned by a community only if they are members of the community. Flaws of the communitarian concept of citizenship are that it fails to deal with the relations between a range of rights and the processes of conflict and exclusion within the community, the nation in most cases, and it does not address the issues of diversity among the citizens (Allen, 1998). This approach might show that the concept of citizenship excludes outsiders in order to include citizens in a specific community.

In relation to the communitarian approach, one question arises: who is a citizen? As has been explained, a citizen is usually defined as a member of a nation. In fact, the claims toward citizenship show that they are made on a locally bounded basis, and they are different from claims towards general human rights (Riley, 1992). According to Riley (1992), the notion of citizenship was originally related to membership of a city. Tracing back to the Roman-era, certain rights enjoyed by Roman citizens were restricted to people who belonged to the city of Rome, prior to being gradually expanded to people in the Roman Empire. Therefore, the notion of citizenship used today inherits the early idea of membership of a nation. Owing to this Roman origin, it needs to be considered that the notion of citizenship has a primarily western origin (Riley, 1992). It can be argued that this view of citizenship as rights for the nation essentially involves an exclusionary nature, as citizenship is not conferred on those who do not belong to the nation. In spite of the increase in globalisation, it can be said that the communitarian approach to citizenship still remains relevant to understand the social exclusion of certain groups of people, such as ethnic groups and immigrants.

The second approach is built on the differentiation between active and passive citizenship, deriving from a solidaristic view of social rights. The perspective on active citizenship was developed in the context of free market individualism. An active citizen is defined as 'the employed individual who, whilst committed to the pursuit of economic well-being, seeks to
do good to others, but purely in a private capacity' (Barton, 1993:244). It connects to the view of citizens as individual consumers of services; therefore, those who do not or cannot access services are regarded as non-citizens (Lee et al., 1995, referred in Allen, 1998). Thus, active citizenship attributes its rights to its active economic activities. Conversely, passive citizens who are unemployed are not given citizenship rights, particularly under free market individualism. Therefore it might be apparent that the focal point of the active/passive citizenship debate is on access to employment and relations between employment and other social rights (Allen, 1998). The idea that passive citizens exclude themselves by being in unemployment is used to justify not giving citizenship rights to passive citizens (Allen, 1998).

As far as this concept of citizenship is concerned, the issues of social exclusion are something to do with passive citizens who are excluded from citizenship rights due to their non-participation in active economic activities. This point relates to the argument introduced before about citizenship and work. It emphasises the significance of work in relation to the notion of citizenship, and consequently to issues of social exclusion.

3.3.4. The exclusive nature of citizenship

Although the conceptualisation of citizenship aimed at achieving equality, it has been argued that it is not a panacea for inequality. In fact, while Marshall believed in the significance of the growth of citizenship in promoting equality, at the same time he realised that there cannot be absolute equality due to the economic system and the continuities of social class (Marshall, 1950; Riley, 1992). Although there is discussion on the exclusive nature of the concept of citizenship in the context of social exclusion, it is clear that citizenship is used as a concept that emphasises the rights of people and as a tool for promoting social inclusion. Thus, both an exclusive and inclusive nature can be found in the concept of citizenship.

Marshall was aware that citizenship could be an architect of legitimate social inequality. It can reinforce the advantageous position of men over women and majority over minority ethnic groups (Dean and Melrose, 1999, referred in Craig, 2004). This is because the notion of citizenship is essentially constructed on the idea of difference (Marshall, 1950), as we saw in the previous discussion on the idea that citizens are often seen as equal to nationals. More fundamentally, it is argued that social inequality is considered as essential and purposeful since it can encourage individuals’ effort and draw the distribution of power (Marshall, 1950).
As Allen (1998) points out, the issues that need to be considered are how the difference is defined, how people are treated differently and how such treatment is justified. As one of the hints to answer these questions, O'Brien and Penna (1996) give an interesting account of Europe's colonial encounter. They explain that Europe's colonial encounter is pivotal in shaping the links between exploitation and oppression, as both the formal public world of rights and the informal everyday world of personal experiences call on the legacy and persistent effects of the modern European empires. In other words, they suggest that the ideas of exclusion and distinction have a recent origin, deriving from the colonial experience. As was mentioned earlier, the notion of citizenship accompanied the processes of nation building, which are rooted in gendered and racially bounded notions of social inclusion (Yar and Penna, 2004). In considering Europe's colonial encounter and citizenship as nation building, it can be argued that the marginalisation of 'others' is a requisite for the inclusion of 'us' in modern society because the boundaries of citizenship for 'us' can be built in concrete and actual identities with the existence of sufficient 'others' (O'Brien and Penna, 1996; Yar and Penna, 2004). Therefore, while citizenship represents an ideal of inclusion and a standard of entitlement for everyone (Riley, 1992), it can be understandable that inclusion is based on exclusion, and the notion of citizenship draws a borderline between people who are entitled to the rights and those who are not.

It has been pointed out that inequality and exclusion can be required for economic growth. In the capitalist market, inequality can play the role of a necessary motor for bringing economic growth (Riley, 1992). Therefore, there is a strained relation between the promise of equality represented in the idea of citizenship and the stubborn discrepancies of ownership, wealth and power in free market economies (Riley, 1992). In this context, as citizenship rights are distributed to individuals according to their power (Riley, 1992) in spite of its supposed egalitarian aim, some groups of people are denied access to citizens' rights practically.

For instance, although women should be included as citizens in theory, they have continually been excluded from citizen rights due to the sexual division of labour and their great involvement in the unpaid care work of family members that are regarded as private works; therefore, they are not recognised as making a contribution to the public (Riley, 1992; Craig, 2004). This argument shows, again, that full citizenship is closely associated with paid work. Those who are not employed, whatever the reasons, such as women, elderly people and
disabled people are not regarded as full citizens. In order to diminish the difference in what people earn, they may receive public support such as allowances and pensions. However, Riley (1992) indicates that they are not adequately distributed to claimants since the welfare state continues to make a patriarchal division in which waged work is a prerequisite for full citizenship. In the process of social provisions on individual needs, people are stratified and classified. Thus, it can be said that the notion of citizenship would end in 'an actual operation of “social stratification”' (Riley, 1992:203).

3.3.5. Citizenship and social exclusion

The previous sections have examined the notion of citizenship from different aspects. In relation to social exclusion, the discussion of citizenship is significant as it suggests that there are different forms of exclusion and different ways of justifying the exclusion (Allen, 1998). As a result, ‘some groups are more excluded than others, either because of the forms of exclusion which they experience, the ways in which their exclusion is justified, or the principles which deny them access to the basic rights necessary to contest their exclusion’ (Allen, 1998:38). It can be said that the call for citizenship is brought by the growing interest and inquiries into social exclusion. Since there has been more discussion on people’s rights as consumers than as citizens over the years (Christie, 1999), the concept of citizenship has been regarded as useful because it involves people’s struggle for membership and participation in a community (Barton, 1993).

As has been explored in the previous sections, the notion of citizenship has both an inclusive and an exclusive nature. Riley (1992:187-188) critically asks the following questions: 'Is the ideal of citizenship in an unequal society only a smoke-screen to hide real differences of opportunity? Or, is the egalitarian promise inherent in citizenship valuable in itself?' There can be different answers to these questions. In considering the exclusive nature of citizenship, one of the answers might be that it is just an ideal conception to evade the truth and mitigate the feelings of those excluded. It is argued that exclusion is a necessary and inescapable component in the dynamic modern political process (O’Brien and Penna, 1996); therefore, it cannot be eradicated and the concept of citizenship cannot help diminishing it, and people claim citizenship rights without knowing that citizenship can actually become a motor to strengthen differences and exclusion.
The other side of answer might be to focus on its potential to promote inclusion. The concept of citizenship has emerged as a principle of equality, and one of the advantages of citizenship is that citizenship rights are evolutionary. Thus, the legitimate equalities that the three types of citizenship assert become a starting point for the institutionalisation of the actual social and economic equalities (Crook, et al., 1992). Although some commentators believe that citizenship comprises unrealised dreams, the strength of its idealism might continue to be important in the discussion of social exclusion. This is because it claims rights inhering in each individual simply due to the fact that the person is a being in society (Riley, 1992). This point relates to the universality of the notion of citizenship, which has been emphasised by Riley (1992). It is maintained that because of its assertion of universality, the ideals of citizenship can establish the foundation for the pursuit of equal participation by everyone, along with entitlements and responsibilities. Riley (1992:187, original emphasis) concludes that ‘citizenship as a theory sets out a claim and an egalitarian promise, about real democratic participation; it envisages participation as a potential’. Although there is an exclusive nature in the notion of citizenship, the significance of the concept is that it can encourage the quest for equal participation into different dimensions of social life, and it questions the emergence of non-participation and exclusion in different ways.

Through this chapter, the notion of social exclusion has been examined using different approaches. At this point, it might become clear that the concept of social exclusion is dynamic and multidimensional. The idea of relationality explains that social exclusion is a process derived from changes in social structure and relationships among people in a society. The discussion above shows that exclusion is an inevitable factor in social life. Madanipour (1998) maintains that various forms of exclusion are indispensable to any social relationship. Exclusion can be an institutionalised mechanism to control people’s access to places, activities, resources and information, and, importantly, this mechanism influences people’s actions and political, cultural and legal structures (Madanipour, 1998).

On the other hand, it has also been pointed out that despite the significance of exclusion in society, there needs to be inclusive activities and a good balance between exclusive and inclusive processes in order to keep the continuity of the society. It is thus argued that the problem is a lack of the balance between the two processes (Madanipour, 1998). If it is right that both exclusionary and inclusionary processes are necessary to the social world, the recent studies on social exclusion might express that there are enough forms of exclusion in the
society; therefore, what is needed is to have more inclusionary activities. Thus, it can be said that it does make sense to promote inclusive activities, rather than trying to reduce exclusive processes. The end result could be the same, but it can be more constructive to promote inclusive activities because exclusive processes are inherent and rooted deeply in the society, and therefore they are not easily tackled. Since exclusive processes are fundamental to any society (Madanipour, 1998), it can be argued that unintentional exclusion might exist, where people exclude some groups of people unintentionally and unconsciously. This point suggests that the reasons for inclusion are not necessarily the simple opposition of the reasons for exclusion. Thus, it is crucial to promote inclusive activities in an inherently exclusive society to make a good balance in order to tackle social exclusion. This transition of argument can be summarised in Figure 3.2 below, which leads to the discussion of inclusive design in the next chapter.

---

If both exclusionary and inclusionary processes are necessary to the social world, the recent studies on social exclusion indicate that there are enough exclusionary practices in the society, therefore, what is needed then is to have more inclusionary activities. Thus, it is crucial to promote inclusive activities in inherently exclusive society to make a good balance between exclusionary and inclusionary practices in order to tackle social exclusion.

---

Figure 3.2: Shift from reducing exclusionary practices to increasing inclusive practices
3.4. Social exclusion and disabled people

The literature discussing the relationship between disabled people and social exclusion mainly addresses the ways in which disabled people are excluded from different dimensions of mainstream society (Lee and Murie, 1999).

In considering the voiceless position of disabled people, it has been pointed out that the exclusion of disabled people is based on the definition of difference, which is mostly expressed in a negative way (Barton, 1993). As we saw in the previous chapter on disability, since otherness is rarely seen in a positive way, disabled people are regarded as a problem to the society. As a result, disabled people become ‘members of a subordinate and systematically disadvantaged group’ (Barton, 1993:242). In order to tackle this problem, both ideological and structural constraints need to be challenged (Barton, 1993). The institutional discrimination involves access to work, housing, education, transport, leisure and other services (Barton, 1993), and it can be found from many studies that discrimination and exclusion of disabled people can be identified in every dimension of social life. In other words, it can be contended that disability, in terms of the social model of disability, and the exclusion of disabled people from a range of dimensions, are forms of preclusion from citizenship.

There are some main areas in society from which disabled people are excluded. Firstly, the issues of work might be regarded as being of critical importance, in proportion to the large amount of studies on disabled people and employment. The main reason why work is regarded as being so important is that it is fundamental to the notion of social inclusion and citizenship, as we saw earlier. It is undeniable that work is the main source of income, and it can determine and influence self-definition, identity (Watson, 1992) and the sense of inclusion. Thus, it might be true to say that ‘being in paid work has become the badge of “social inclusion”’ (Christie, 1999:28-29). It is reported that many disabled people are not economically fortunate and often settle at the bottom of the income hierarchy or are out of work (Barton, 1993). The income distribution shows that over one-quarter of disabled people stay within the bottom fifth of the distribution, and this has not changed much since 1985 (Agulnik, et al., 2002). This fact might prove that the inequality in income distribution has reproduced the risks and vulnerability of disabled people and kept them at the bottom of the hierarchy.
The issues of the situation of work and income for disabled people are well elaborated by Christie (1999). Drawing on the autumn 1998 report of the Labour Force Survey, the UK’s principal dataset on employment, it was revealed that: disabled people constitute about 20 percent of the population of working age, although only around 11 percent of them are in employment; the unemployment rate of disabled people is seven times that of non-disabled people; and disabled people are more likely to be in long-term unemployment compared to non-disabled people (Christie, 1999). Along with the high unemployment rates, it was pointed out that disabled people are more likely to be in low-paid and low-skilled jobs, which relates to the fact that disabled people are over twice as likely not to have validated qualifications than non-disabled people (Christie, 1999). It was raised as one of the characteristics of modes of employment for disabled people that disabled people are more likely to be in part-time jobs and self-employment (Christie, 1999), and it might imply the needs of disabled people to work in flexible modes. All of this information demonstrates that disabled people are in a more difficult employment situation than non-disabled people.

However, it has been disclosed that even if disabled people get jobs, many of them face prejudice and lack of awareness of disability and their needs from employers and colleagues (Christie, 1999). Prejudice and lack of awareness can also be one of the reasons preventing disabled people from being employed. This may produce psychological barriers for disabled people in searching for employment and in undervaluing their own potential (Christie, 1999). A survey conducted in 1996 for the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) showed that only 17 percent of employers had disability policies (Christie, 1999), although this was after the introduction of the 1995 DDA. It is suggested that disability issues are often more neglected than other equality issues, environmental matters and corporate social responsibility and that, if employers and businesses cannot see the real benefit of doing so, they would not work on disability issues (Christie, 1999). In other words, businesses will take inclusive approaches if they see the benefit. This point might be the reason why tourism development organisations have tried to show tourism businesses the significance of the market potential of tourists with disabilities, in order to promote accessible tourism services and products. Similarly, the Employers’ Forum on Disability (EFD) claims that businesses are missing out on the potential profitability of a growing market of disabled people by ignoring them from staffing, marketing and product design (Christie, 1999). However, as a trend over the next ten years, it is anticipated that employers will need to be more
accountable for inclusive provisions for disabled people. This will be because of the pressure from the government to execute the DDA and to be socially responsible in business and the need for businesses to gain distinctive advantages from maximising public trust, as a consequence of the growing competitive market (Christie, 1999). It can be summarised that disability discrimination in workplaces needs to be tackled by both sides; businesses need to give attention to legal and social responsibilities, and the government needs to promote disability awareness and the enforcement of the DDA.

The second area of social life from which disabled people are excluded is education. Education and learning opportunities are regarded as a foundation for future employment, quality of life and life as a citizen (Christie, 1999). In the case of disabled people, however, it is indicated that many of them experience poor education due to numerous problems. Disabled students in special schools may receive lower standards of education than mainstream schools, and this may implant the self-image of being excluded in disabled children. Regarding this problem, Christie (1999) proposes an idea of inclusive primary and secondary schools where disabled and non-disabled students learn together and accept differences and respect the rights of each other. There are also problems in terms of accessibility. Many school, college and university buildings are not physically accessible for people with physical impairments. School websites might have accessibility problems, and consequently, disabled people are not included as future students in requesting school information. Negative attitude towards disabled people can also be one of the factors that prevent disabled people from educational opportunities. Even if disabled students go to mainstream schools, it is suggested that they are treated differently, and Grewal et al.’s (2002) survey reports that disabled people are more likely to have negative experiences in school than non-disabled people. Therefore, the promotion of equal access and disability awareness in education is necessary in much the same way as in workplaces. It might be apparent that the exclusion of disabled people starts in their childhood. An inclusive and high standard education is crucial for employment opportunities and the social inclusion of disabled people.

Furthermore, disabled people face access problems in voting in elections, and it is reported that many of the polling stations in the UK are still not accessible (Christie, 1999). This is clearly a form of exclusion of disabled people from political participation. There is also exclusion related to information. While the rapid spread of the Internet contributes to easy
access to information by disabled people, it can lead to greater disadvantages since disabled people who are in unemployment and low income cannot afford computers, and it is revealed that many of the websites are not accessible to disabled people. Furthermore, exclusion from the physical environment has been well reported. Kitchen (1998) argues that spaces are not only organised to exclude disabled people, but that they also reproduce and sustain disabling practices. Inaccessible toilets, transport facilities, and public buildings are just some of the innumerable examples excluding disabled people from spaces and environments.

Thus far, this section has looked at the exclusionary situations for disabled people in a range of social life dimensions. The relationship between the social dimensions and social exclusion might suggest that improvement in accessibility in the areas of social life, such as work, learning and leisure, can contribute to the promotion of social inclusion of disabled people. Moreover, it has also been repeated throughout this chapter that social exclusion is a complex process that includes a lack of access and opportunities to a range of dimensions in a society. It cannot be said, however, that all disabled people experience social exclusion to the same degree (Christie, 1999). The degree and forms of social exclusion might differ according to a range of factors such as the types and degree of impairments, the areas they live, the range of services they can receive and the amount of income and benefit they can obtain. For instance, Barton (1993) claims that disability activism has been directed toward middle class and educated disabled people, although it brings benefit to all disabled people. It can be suggested that the truly marginalised, poor and uneducated disabled people are not well represented in official dialogues. Therefore, the heterogeneous nature of disability, which was elaborated in the last chapter, should be considered in the relationship between disabled people and social exclusion.

Moreover, in understanding disability and social exclusion, it is crucial to appreciate that disability is not a distinct group that other people do not have a chance to join in (Christie, 1999). People may experience disability through their own impairment, or that of their friends, relatives and colleagues (Christie, 1999). The experience of social exclusion on the grounds of disability can be universal among all people. Thus, tackling the social exclusion of disabled people and promoting access and opportunities can be beneficial not only to disabled people, but to all people in society.
It may become explicit at this point that disabled people are excluded from a range of areas of social life. Barton (1993:236-237) summarises this point as follows: ‘The absence of disabled people’s voices and concerns is not because they have nothing to say, but rather, that they are not encouraged or given opportunities to speak’. The chapter now moves on to the discussion on tourism, which is one of the areas in which social exclusion of disabled people can be found.

3.5. Social exclusion and tourism

The issues of social exclusion have recently gained more attention in tourism research. Among the existing research, the topics investigated so far include: tourism and low income issues; the role of the organisations in supporting disadvantaged families to travel; the effects of taking holidays; and discussion in relation to the concept of social tourism. It can be said that these approaches mainly focus on the issues of the disadvantaged visitors and potential visitors.

The impact of low income on holiday participation is addressed by Hughes (1991). He demonstrates that the main reason for not taking a holiday is simply that people cannot afford them. The estimation that around 40 percent of adults in the UK do not take annual holidays suggests that it cannot be said that taking a holiday is a common practice among the UK adult population (Hughes, 1991). He maintains that the most outstanding barriers to holiday participation are not disability or illness; rather, the major reason for not taking a holiday was related to financial matters. However, it has been revealed through this chapter that the issues of disability and low income are closely related. As one of the characteristics of people with low income, it is suggested that people tend to give up spending money on something that can enhance quality of life, such as leisure and holidays (Oppenheim, 1997). Nevertheless, it is regarded that it is difficult to tackle the issue of low income as a barrier to holiday participation by the tourism industry alone, and strategies to overcome the barrier need to be developed at the governmental level (Hughes, 1991).

Despite the difficulties in combating the barriers involved in taking a holiday, it is emphasised that holiday is an essential part of modern life, and this point is supported by a study on poverty in the UK, which uncovered that 63 percent of the adult participants in the
survey felt that a one week holiday a year was necessary (Hughes, 1991). If a holiday is considered to be necessary for human and social life, or something 'normally taken for granted by the average person' (Dawson, 1988:221-231, cited in Hughes, 1991:194), those who cannot participate in taking holidays for whatever reason can be regarded as socially excluded, according to the notion of social exclusion. And consequently, people who cannot involuntarily participate in holidays may have a feeling of deprivation and being excluded.

The significance and positive effects of holiday have been described by Hughes (1991) and Minnaert (2006). Hughes (1991) focuses on one of the characteristics of holiday; the escape and release from daily life and reality. He maintains that this release is necessary for all people in society regardless of their financial situation. Therefore, holidays should be understood as an investment in the well being of the society. Minnaert (2006) explores a range of positive effects from taking a holiday. Among these effects, what she uncovered as one of the major effects of taking a holiday was the improvement it made to family relationships. Many families in her research reported that they made real changes in family relations after their return from holidays. The improvement in self-confidence and mental health, and the attempt to have a more active lifestyle were also found as potential effects of a holiday, and these findings show that holidays can bring positive effects at a psychological level rather than the material level (Minnaert, 2006). Therefore, it can be said that the effects of taking a holiday for disadvantaged people are not tangible, direct and easy to be identified. This might be one of the reasons why the significance and positive effects of taking a holiday are often neglected. In addition, it has been suggested that holiday experiences can enhance people's quality of life in general. Neal et al. (1999) tests the significance of satisfaction with leisure travel/tourism services in life satisfaction. As quality of life and life satisfaction can be influenced by evaluations of all of life's domains and sub-domains, it is indicated that the greater the level of satisfaction with such domains, including leisure and holidays, the greater the satisfaction with overall life (Neal et al., 1999). The findings from their survey suggest that travel experiences have a direct impact on the overall life satisfaction of the travellers. A holiday can thus not only bring benefits to participants, but can also have a direct impact on their quality of life.

Focusing on these positive effects of holidays, there are organisations that provide support to people who are disadvantaged to take holidays. In the UK, while there are limited public schemes to encourage holiday participation with financial support, the origin of NPOs
promoting holidays for disadvantaged people can be found in the late 19th century (Hall and Brown, 2006). Table 3.1 introduces some of the major organisations in chronological order.

Table 3.1: UK organisations supporting disadvantaged people to take holidays
(Source: Hughes, 1991; Snape, 2004; Hall and Brown, 2006; Kids Out, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Year established</th>
<th>Target groups</th>
<th>Characteristics and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearsons Holiday Fund</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Children from inner city</td>
<td>Offer seaside and country holidays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Holiday Association</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>People with low income</td>
<td>Offer holiday grants to disadvantaged families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Care Service</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Disadvantaged people</td>
<td>Hold and provide information of holidays for disadvantaged people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Holiday Association</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Working-class people</td>
<td>Provide countryside holidays characterised by its focus on relaxation and educational aspects of holiday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids Out</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Disadvantaged children and young people</td>
<td>Organising day out activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the significant role of these organisations in promoting holidays for disadvantaged people, Hughes (1991) argues that an expansion of holiday opportunities should not be considered just as a charitable and considerate practice, but as an inevitable investment in the wellbeing and social composition of the country. Therefore, holidays and tourism can be regarded as an essential dimension of social life from which disabled people should not be excluded.

3.6. Chapter conclusion and summary

Throughout this chapter, the notion of social exclusion has been examined from different perspectives. It has been emphasised that social exclusion is a dynamic and multidimensional process in which various forms of exclusion are combined (Madanipour et al., 1998). Moreover, it has also been repeated that social exclusion is a complex process of lack of access and opportunities to a range of dimensions in a society. In this regard, disabled people are clearly regarded as one of the socially excluded groups of people, as they have faced exclusionary situations and practices in a range of social life dimensions, and many of them often do not have enough access to those dimensions such as employment, education and holiday taking.
The discussion of the significance of economic factors in social exclusion and the relationship between the notion of citizenship and social exclusion showed that exclusion is an inevitable factor in social life. Exclusion can be an institutionalised mechanism to control people's access to places, activities, resources and information, and various forms of exclusion are indispensable to any social relationship (Madanipour, 1998). Therefore, what is needed is to increase inclusionary practices in society in order to tackle social exclusion and promote social inclusion. This point leads to the need for the idea of inclusive design, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Furthermore, the issue of social exclusion and tourism has also been explored in this chapter. Tourism can be regarded as an essential dimension of social life from which disabled people should not be excluded. However, it has been claimed that disabled people have been excluded from tourism participation. As this and previous chapters have addressed, due to the potential positive effects of tourism participation on disadvantaged people and their right to travel, disabled people should be involved more in tourism. The social exclusion of disabled people from tourism has mainly been studied by focusing on the guest side. Nevertheless, tourism involves a range of areas, activities and stakeholders, and thus, it should be considered not only from the visitor perspective, but also from various other perspectives. The next chapter introduces the idea of the design of tourism, which understands tourism as a continuous and iterative process toward the creating of tourism comprising a sequence of stages of tourism. It also develops the idea of inclusive design of tourism in order to promote the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism.
CHAPTER 4
INCLUSIVE DESIGN OF TOURISM

4.1. Introduction

The previous chapters on disability and social exclusion examined how the notion of disability is socially constructed and how disabled people are excluded from a range of dimensions of social life, including tourism. As Madanipour (1998) points out, inclusive practices are needed to overcome social exclusion. This chapter shifts the focus to the way in which to increase inclusive practices in different areas of tourism by conceptualising the idea of inclusive design of tourism, which is the theoretical framework of this study. It first introduces the idea of inclusive design together with the examination of the concept of design. Secondly, an attempt to apply inclusive design to tourism is made, and the potential of inclusive design of tourism to increase inclusive practices in tourism is discussed in comparison with the concepts of tourism development and planning; the discussion also presents critiques of existing public participation approaches in tourism such as community-based tourism (CBT) and stakeholder theory in relation to the involvement of socially excluded people in tourism. Finally, the approaches and techniques of inclusive design are introduced, and how they can be applied to tourism is discussed in examining the existing examples of the use of inclusive design in the tourism context.

4.2. Inclusive design

4.2.1. The concept of inclusive design

As was mentioned in the introductory chapter, inclusiveness has become key to any kind of development due to the increased diversity in society, which is the fundamental aspect of the socioeconomic and human development process (Bieler, 2006); the idea of inclusive design has rapidly gained attention in recent years as a way to promote inclusive practices in society. Coleman (2006) adds that an aging population is also a factor provoking growing interest in inclusive design among the design community. The idea of inclusive design has been used in
various areas such as manufacturing, architecture, product development, education and political statements (Dong and Clarkson, 2006; Greater London Agency, 2004; DRC, 2003). It is defined by Coleman (2006:13) as: 'an intentional project that sets out to include significant sectors of society that are all too frequently ignored or over looked'. Inclusive design can be understood as both a process and a method. The main characteristic of inclusive design as a process is that it involves users in a design process in which continuous evaluation and improvement of a product, environment or service are made (Dong and Clarkson, 2006). Shiose, et al (2010) also point out that the main feature of inclusive design is that disabled people participate in different stages of the design process such as surveys, basic design and testing. On the other hand, inclusive design as a method can be seen as one of the business strategies that aim at making products, an environment or service accessible and useable for as many people as possible (Dong and Clarkson, 2006). These two approaches to understand inclusive design can be interrelated, since the end result of the involvement of users can be a product which is accessible to a wider population. However, this research takes the former idea of inclusive design as a process, instead of the latter approach of making an environment and services accessible, in order to focus on the discussion of the involvement of disabled people in different stages of the design of tourism.

The term inclusive design has been used interchangeably with other terms such as universal design, user or human-centred design, and design for all. While universal design is widely used in the USA and Japan, and design for all in Europe, in the UK the term inclusive design is more accepted. The main common idea among these terms is to cater products and services to as many people as possible regardless of age, sex and disability (Katsuo, 2006).

It might be useful to make a comparison between the concepts of inclusive design and universal design in order to highlight the significance of inclusive design. The concept of universal design was first introduced by Mace (1875) in the USA (Ostroff, 2001). Universal design is regarded as a design approach that proclaims that the range of human ability is not special, but ordinary (Ostroff, 2001). There are a variety of definitions of universal design in different countries. One of the definitions introduced by Mace (1988) is: 'Universal design is an approach to design that incorporates products as well as building features which, to the greatest extent possible, can be used by everyone' (Ostroff, 2001). In addition, the definition by the Center for Universal Design at North Carolina State University is that 'the design of all products and environments to be usable by people of all ages and abilities, to the greatest
extent possible' (Story, 2001:10.6). The centre also introduced seven principles of universal design summarised in Table 4.1. In short, the main idea of universal design is to develop designs for all people regardless of their age or disabilities.

**Table 4.1: Seven principles of universal design**
Adapted from Story (2001:10.6) and Center for Universal Design (1995, cited by Imrie, 2004:280)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Equitable use</td>
<td>The design does not disadvantage or stigmatise any groups of users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Flexibility in use</td>
<td>The design accommodates a wide range of individual preferences and abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Simple and intuitive use</td>
<td>The use of the design is easy to understand regardless of the user's experience, knowledge, language skills, or concentration levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Perceptible information</td>
<td>The design communicates necessary information effectively to the user, regardless of ambient conditions or the user's sensory abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Tolerance for error</td>
<td>The design minimises hazards and the adverse consequences of accidental or unintended fatigue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Low physical effort</td>
<td>The design can be used efficiently and comfortably and with a minimum of fatigue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Size and space for approach and use</td>
<td>Appropriate size and space is provided for approach, reach, manipulation and use, regardless of the user's body size, posture or mobility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the concept of universal design has been increasingly welcomed in different areas, several criticisms exist. Firstly, universal design’s attempt to cater for ‘all’ people has been questioned (Imrie, 2004). This is due to the diversity of disability involving various levels within various types of disabilities. For example, a design which is accessible to people in wheelchairs might not be accessible to people with visual impairment. The interest and requirements of people with different disabilities might be contradictory to each other and cannot be exactly the same. Therefore, it is argued that it is not possible to develop a universal design for all. In this regard, the seven principles of universal design in Table 4.1 which represent the features that a product should ideally have cannot be easily achieved. Secondly, in relation to the targeted users of universal design, which is ‘all’ people, it is not clear how different interests from different people can be integrated and consulted during the design process. Thirdly, it is suggested that the focus of universal design is particularly on the architectural profession, and it does not consider other factors affecting the design process such as social, political and economic factors (Imrie, 2004). This point indicates that the concept of universal design fails to address the dynamic mechanism of how some people are excluded from the design, as discussed in the previous chapter on social exclusion. Despite a
range of rights and citizenship that are supposed to be delivered to everybody, some people are still excluded from enjoying these rights.

On the other hand, inclusive design has its origin in the UK, and it emerged from the work of a community of UK practitioners (Coleman, 2006). Coleman (2006: 13) defines inclusive design in the following way: ‘inclusive design is not a new type of design, but an intentional project that sets out to include significant sectors of society that are all too frequently ignored or overlooked’. The idea of inclusive design has similarities to universal design in terms of its focus on designing products and services for as many people as possible. However, the main difference between universal design and inclusive design is that, while universal design targets all people (Shiose, 2006), inclusive design’s focus is particularly on those who have traditionally been excluded from society, as seen in Coleman’s definition. While the idea of universal design tends to use words such as ‘…can be used by everyone’ or ‘design for all people’, inclusive design considers socially excluded people in particular. In this sense, it might be obvious that the issue of social exclusion is behind the idea of inclusive design. Simamura-Willcocks (2006) suggests that the ultimate goal of inclusive design is social inclusion. Therefore, inclusive design can be understood as a means to combat social exclusion and promote social inclusion.

To sum up, although the goal of universal design and inclusive design is the same- to provide products, services and environment accessible and useable to as many people as possible- there are fundamental differences between the two concepts in terms of the target group and awareness of the issues of social exclusion. Therefore, the idea of inclusive design is more suitable for this particular study in discussing the inclusion of disabled people in tourism.

4.2.2. The concept of design

At this point, it is useful to consider the concept of design, in order to examine how to counter social exclusion by designing inclusively, and to have a better understanding of inclusive design. The word ‘design’ is normally used as a noun or verb. Oxford Dictionary of English (2003) describes ‘design’ as a noun as ‘(1) a plan or drawing produced to show the look and function or workings of a building, garment, or other object before it is made’, or ‘(2) purpose or planning that exists behind an action, fact, or object’. On the other hand, ‘design’ as a verb refers to ‘decide upon the look and functioning of (a building, garment, or
other object), by making a detailed drawing of it’ and ‘do or plan (something) with a specific purpose in mind’. This might show that the concept of design can be understood as a plan showing the look, function and features of an artefact that is developed before it is actually made, and a process of developing the plan, entailing a series of decision-making activities. It should be mentioned that the idea of design has been used in developing services as well, not only for tangible objects. In addition, a design can be drawn and proceeded with even after the entity is made; this is particularly the case for the re-development or improvement of products or services based on the examination and evaluation of existing products or services.

Taking the idea of design as a process, Miller (2004) defines design as ‘the thought process comprising the creation of an entity’. Five key features of the notion of design are identified; Thought, Process, Comprising, Creation and Entity (Miller, 2004). Firstly ‘thought’ refers to the instinctive nature of design. It entails the ability to examine the problem and to develop possible solutions by looking at the potential connection between problem and possibility. Second, ‘process’ emphasises the view that design is an activity, involving sequential events and procedures leading to the creation of what is being designed. In this view, a clear distinction is made between design and product. It is explained that product is the output of design. Moreover, design needs to be regarded as a repeatable process that includes the construction of prototypical forms, as well as their assessment and reformulation. They are part of the iterative design process toward finding the next better solution. Third, ‘comprising’ indicates that the design process comprises various thoughts and actions that are necessary to create what is being designed, including:

- the identification of a set of needs
- the initial conceptualisation of a way to meet those needs
- the further development of that initial concept
- the engineering and analysis required to make sure it works
- the prototyping of its preliminary form
- the construction of its final form
- the implementation of various quality control procedures
- selling its value to the consumer
- its delivery to the consumer
- providing for after-service
- and obtaining feedback regarding its utility and value (Miller, 2004).
Each of the steps above is understood as a part of the design process. Though the stages to be included in the design process vary depending on the type of entity being designed, they all contribute to the creation of form (Miller, 2004). The fourth is ‘creation’, which reminds us that the comprehensive process of design aims toward the creation of an entity. It suggests that design is regarded as a prerequisite for the creation of an entity, in which the image of possibility is completed as the tangible or intangible realisation. In other words, without creating the designed entity, design remains as a mere drawing or plan and eventually becomes a useless sketch. The last element is ‘entity’, which denotes the diverse products of the design process. Miller (2004) suggests that an entity can be: physical (e.g. an object that occupies space); temporal (e.g. an event occurs at a particular time); conceptual (e.g. an idea); or relational (e.g. a relationship between entities). In other words, it suggests that the entity can be anything, and, conversely speaking, anything can be produced by the design process. The significance of Miller’s definition is that it addresses a range of key issues, not only the functions of design but also a range of activities within the design process.

In addition, a model developed by the Design Council confirms Miller’s definition of design. The ‘Double Diamond’ model comprises four main phases of activities in design that commonly take place in any design process; Discover, Define, Develop and Deliver (Design Council, no date). Figure 4.1 describes the design process in a graphical way.

The model explains that the design process is a sequence of various activities, like Miller’s definition. The first quarter of the model, the Discover phase, represents the start of a design
project where designers try to look at things in a fresh way and seek inspiration. The initial stage helps to identify user needs, problems and opportunities. At the second, Define stage, the ideas and possibilities identified in the Discover phase are combined into a clear brief involving actionable tasks and design challenges. The third quarter represents the Develop stage where design solutions are developed, prototyped, tested and iterated. The trial and error activities at this stage help designers to improve and refine the ideas developed through the Discover and Define phases. Finally, in the Deliver phase, the final concept that successfully addresses the problem identified at the Discover stage is produced, and the resulting product or service is finalised and launched (Design Council, no date). It might be obvious that the Double Diamond model covers the five key features of design suggested by Miller (2004)- Thought, Process, Comprising, Creation and Entity- and the activities at each phase of the Double Diamond model match Miller’s various thoughts and actions in the design process. To sum up, together with the general definition of design introduced earlier, design in this study refers to the iterative process toward the creation of an entity, comprising a series of thoughts, decisions and activities.

4.3. Inclusive design of tourism

4.3.1. The concept of inclusive design of tourism

Having examined the concepts of inclusive design and design, this section deals with the application of inclusive design to the context of tourism and the conceptualisation of inclusive design of tourism. First, the relevance of the concept of design to tourism is examined by making a comparison with other terms such as tourism development and planning.

The concept of design examined in the previous section becomes useful in discussing the involvement of disabled people in different areas of tourism. As discussed in the previous chapter, the issues of exclusion of disabled people from tourism should be studied in a comprehensive way, not exclusively from the perspective based on the simple distinction between host and guest. There are various stages and areas of tourism where disabled people can be included, and various roles they can take toward the creation of tourism, not only as customers or visitors, but also as planners, developers, trainers, employers, employees and
auditors. To increase inclusive practices in tourism, the inclusion of disabled people in tourism needs to be discussed from these various perspectives. In order to do so, the use of the concept of design has a potential in the context of tourism, as it can address the fact that there are various steps toward the creation of an entity that represent a series of thoughts and action in the design process. Applying the concept of design to tourism, based on Miller's (2004) definition of design, 'the design of tourism' can be understood as a continuous process toward the creation of tourism comprising a sequence of steps with various thoughts and actions. The idea of the design of tourism is summarised in Figure 4.2 with the possible steps of the design of tourism, adapted from Miller (2004) to the tourism context, including: user research and marketing; planning products and services; developing and constructing; promotion; staff training; sales and service delivery; user and customer feedback; and evaluation. The design of tourism in Figure 4.2 shows tourism as a dynamic design process in which tourism is planned, developed, distributed and evaluated, and each of the steps is understood as a part of the design process. The design of tourism can be recognised as a circular and iterative process, as the evaluation of tourism products or services at the last stage can be utilised for planning new or better products or services at the first stage of the process.
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**Figure 4.2: The design of tourism**

The design of tourism can be applied to different levels and contexts of tourism. In a big context, it can be adapted to an entire tourism destination. In taking an example of tourism in
South East England, planning can be done by SEEDA or Tourism South East, promotion is
done by Tourism South East, and sales is done by the individual tourism businesses and
attractions in the South East. On the other hand, in a smaller context, the process of the
design of tourism can occur within a company or organisation. For instance, in a museum,
there might be separate departments for planning, promotion, and customer service within the
organisation. Therefore, the design of the tourism process can be found in any context of
tourism. However, it should be noted that not all of the stages presented in Figure 4.2 are
relevant to every organisation. There might be unnecessary or additional stages depending on
the types of activities the organisations are doing. Thus, the proposed stages are potential
stages of the design of tourism. Furthermore, the involvement of disabled people in the
design of tourism can take many forms. For instance, disabled people’s involvement can be in
the planning stage as a resident offering input to local tourism planning, or in the sale stage as
a customer purchasing services or as a member of staff providing services. Namely, any type
of disabled people’s participation in any of the stages of the design process is regarded as a
form of involvement in the design of tourism.

In discussing the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, it is crucial to
consider the barriers of tourism participation for disabled people. As examined in Chapter 2
(2.3.3.), there are various barriers and constraints for disabled people to participate in tourism,
such as intrapersonal (including health-related problems, lack of knowledge and physical and
psychological dependency), interpersonal (including attitudinal and communication barriers),
environmental (including physical, ecological and transportation barriers) and structural
barriers (including economic barriers and rules or regulations). As discussed previously, these
barriers are dynamic in nature, and they are interrelated with each other.

In the design of tourism, the various barriers above not only prevent disabled people from
participating in the design of tourism, but also prevent tourism businesses and organisations
from involving disabled people in the design of tourism. It is crucial to remove the barriers in
order to encourage disabled people to participate in tourism and also to encourage tourism
businesses and organisations to involve disabled people, and the effort to remove the barriers
should be made by all tourism stakeholders. Therefore, the question of how the barriers can
be removed has significant relevance to the discussion of how inclusive design of tourism can
be achieved. In addition, the barriers might exist at various stages in the whole process of the
design of tourism. Figure 4.3 shows the influence of the barriers on the design of tourism.
Inclusive design of tourism can be achieved by removing the barriers of tourism participation and increasing the involvement of disabled people in the various areas of tourism to make the design of tourism inclusive to disabled people.

4.3.2. Potential of inclusive design of tourism

The idea of inclusive design of tourism has potential advantages in increasing the involvement of disabled people in various areas of tourism. The relevance and potential of the concept of design and inclusive design to tourism can be highlighted by making a comparison with other concepts in tourism such as tourism development and planning, and by presenting critiques of the existing tourism approaches in relation to the involvement of disabled people.

Firstly, it is important to consider how the notion of the design of tourism differs from the concepts of tourism development and planning. Tourism development encompasses two main concepts: tourism and development. There is no single definition of development, and
numerous interpretations and different uses of the term exist. Pearce (1989:6) introduces Friedmann’s (1980:4) definition that development ‘suggests an evolutionary process, it has positive connotations... And of course, development is always of something particular, a human being, a society, a nation, an economy, a skill...It is often associated with words such as under or over or balanced: too little, too much or just right...which suggests that development has a structure, and that the speaker has some idea about how this structure ought to be developed.’ The implications of this definition in the context of tourism are that tourism development generally aims at achieving better outcomes from tourism, and that there might be some general idea of how tourism should be developed. From reviewing a range of tourism research, better outcomes might include: greater economic effects on the destination, better tourist satisfaction, enhanced quality of life for the local community, and more sustainable forms of tourism products (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2006). Moreover, it should be noted that these improved outcomes of tourism can differ depending on the time when tourism is developed. For example, sustainable issues became a concern after the recognition of the problems of mass tourism in which the primary concern was economic effects. Therefore, although the idea of inclusive development has attracted attention in recent years, it can be argued that inclusivity has not yet gained as much attention as sustainability when discussing development, and the term tourism development does not always entail consideration of inclusivity issues.

Tourism planning is also a difficult term to define. Among the various definitions, some common characteristics of tourism planning emerge. Murphy (1985:156 in Hall, 2008) maintains that ‘planning is concerned with anticipating and regulating change in a system, to promote orderly development so as to increase the social, economic, and environmental benefits of the development process’. Furthermore, Hall (2008) argues that the demands for tourism planning are the reflection of the undesirable effects of tourism development, that tourism planning can minimise negative impacts and maximise favourable returns for the future. These accounts might imply that the role of tourism planning is to provide a plan for development with desirable outcomes. Thus, it can be argued that tourism planning essentially comes before tourism development. In this sense, it might be clear that the terms tourism development and planning can only represent limited parts of the various activities and areas of tourism described earlier in the design of the tourism process. Thus, in order to examine the involvement of disabled people in various areas of tourism, the concept of the
design of tourism is more relevant to this particular study than tourism development or planning.

Moreover, in terms of the level or scale of planning, tourism planning is normally regarded as focusing on destination planning rather than individual business planning; it thus reflects broader trends in terms of urban and regional planning (Hall, 2008). In this regard, it might make sense that tourism planning is generally done by public body or agencies. Within the public bodies, tourism planning is prone to combine economic, social, political and environmental considerations, all of which indicate the diverse factors affecting tourism development (Hall, 2008). Therefore, the scale of tourism planning is set at the holistic destination level, rather than the individual business, attraction or particular site levels. It indicates that the term tourism planning might not be able to address the issues across the different levels and contexts of tourism in discussing the involvement of disabled people. The concept of the design of tourism, on the other hand, can be applied to both the bigger context (e.g. destination) and the smaller context (e.g. business or attraction). As a result, it can address different types of involvement of disabled people by various stakeholders at different levels. Therefore, the concept of the design of tourism is, again, more relevant and advantageous in examining the involvement of disabled people in tourism in a comprehensive way.

The view that tourism is planned by public bodies is enforced by Hall (2008) in his examination of the relationship between tourism planning and policy making. Hall (2008:8) argues that planning and policy are closely related: ‘planning is a kind of decision making and policy making...it deals with a set of interdependent and systematically related decisions rather than individual decisions’. Therefore policy is understood as a product of planning. In viewing tourism planning as a generator of tourism policy, it should be noted that tourism planning is distinguished from the ‘action’ and ‘evaluation’ of tourism, and it is just one part of the whole tourism process.

Tourism public policy as a product of tourism planning, therefore, is ‘whatever governments choose to do or not to do with respect to tourism’ (Hall, 2008:10). This public-led tourism planning has been criticised, since it places a great deal of power in a governmental bureaucracy (Gunn, 1994). As planning departments are given legally authorised control over tourism development in many regional and local governments, the decisions and policy they
make might not be preferred by other tourism stakeholders, such as businesses and the local community. Gunn (1994) claims that much of this discontent is due to the power and titles ascribed to professional planners. Since technical knowledge is exclusive to the professional planners (Gunn, 1994), tourism planning can become closed and inaccessible for other stakeholders. In this regard, greater public involvement in tourism planning is required. The traditional top-down planning has been replaced by bottom-up planning approaches, and the role of planners becomes much more one of a catalyst and facilitator (Gunn, 1994). As Gunn (1994:29) asserts, the aim of tourism planning should be 'the long-term betterment of all involved'.

In this sense, a range of public participation approaches in tourism have been developed, but their ability to address the issue of the involvement of socially excluded people in tourism has not been well studied to date. The significance of inclusive design of tourism as a way to address the involvement of disabled people in tourism can be examined by presenting critiques of the existing public participation approaches to embrace disabled people in the design of tourism. Firstly, community approaches to tourism need to be examined with the definition of community. There are various definitions of community in different studies. However, most of the literature in tourism studies agrees that community is defined as those who live or work in a particular area, and it does not mean just those who are actively interested in tourism (Long and Glendinning, 1992).

As scholars such as Mowforth and Munt (2003), Scheyvens (2002) and Miller and Twining-Ward (2005) point out, there is a general recognition in tourism studies that community should be understood as having a heterogeneous rather than homogeneous nature. This is because individual community members might have different interests, opinions and attitudes toward the design of tourism in the area (Lindberg, et al., 2001). It has been suggested that the key to get support from the local community and to achieve sustainable tourism development is to involve as many members as possible from the community and to work in coordination with them in tourism planning and development. One of the reasons why tourism studies see the community as a heterogeneous group is because tourism developers have seen the difficulties in coordinating local people in a destination owing to their different interests and needs.
Tosun's (2000) work on community participation in the general development process gives notable inferences for understanding the context of the emerging importance of community issues in tourism. He refers to Swell and Coppock's (1977) argument that community involvement in the development process encompasses two considerations. The first is the philosophical aspect, which is associated with the political idea of democracy in which people are entitled to be informed and to claim their opinions on issues that could have an impact on them. Hence, community participation in the development process has been taken for granted as the people's right under the notion of democracy. The second aspect is a pragmatic matter, which is mainly related to the conventional decision-making process that might not reflect public interests properly. In this context, the community participation approach is a tool aiming at avoiding the traditional bureaucratic development process and shifting power from the governmental authority or developers to the community (Tosun, 2000); the interest in the community participation approach is the result of the needs of the government itself to respond to public action (Smith, 1981 cited in Tosun, 2000). Therefore, community participation in development process has been required by both local people and governmental authorities. It is not surprising that proposing non-participatory development strategies is now almost conservative (Tosun, 2000).

One of the most well developed community approaches in tourism is the community-based tourism (CBT) approach. It is defined as a tourism approach in which local communities have a high level of control over tourism activities (Scheyvens, 2002). It could also be defined as tourism involving active participation of local communities. The involvement of the community is regarded as an essential element of sustainable tourism (Cooper and Wanhill, 1997), since the long-term capability of tourism relies on the contribution and involvement of the local community (Eber, 1992). The benefits of CBT approaches include: the considerable employment opportunities to local community (Ashley and Roe, 1998); the improved living standards and environment in the area (Eber, 1992); and the promotion of a sense of pride in the community (Ashley and Roe, 1998; Eber, 1992).

However, the implementation of the CBT approach is regarded difficult, and there are obstacles and disadvantages associated with using the approach. Firstly, due to the heterogeneous nature of the community, it is difficult to find a common goal in CBT. Communities are often split into various groups, and they make different claims on CBT based on their interests (Scheyvens, 2002). Consequently, the process of CBT takes
considerable time and effort. Secondly, there might be people who have strong power within the communities, and they may be able to dominate other people’s opinions. Such people, called the elite, often monopolise the benefits of tourism, and this results in inequalities in the distribution of the benefits, leading to conflicts and competition within a community (Ashley and Roe, 1998; Mowforth and Munt, 2003). The third problem with implementing the CBT approach is that local people often lack information and resources in the tourism process (Scheyvens, 2002), as well as the ability to initiate new development and skills to establish their own tourism businesses. This problem can lead to a further problem that local communities have to rely on companies or development agencies from outside.

Although the importance of the involvement of different members of community is emphasised in the CBT approaches, it can be argued that the issue of social exclusion is not comprehended enough in CBT. This is related to the heterogeneous nature of community and the existence of people whose interest can be subordinate to the interest of the dominant group of people within the community. These issues are closely related to the discussion of social exclusion and disability. However, the term community, which is the central concept of CBT, does not visibly address the issue of social exclusion, and the CBT approaches do not offer ways to deal with these problems. Thus, it is questionable whether the CBT approaches are capable of dealing with the mechanism of social exclusion and the issue of the exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism. In order to examine and focus on the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, a more inclusive approach that can include socially excluded people is required.

It is also worthwhile to examine the concepts of stakeholder and interest group to reinforce the argument that a more inclusive approach to the design of tourism is required. Stakeholders are defined as the actors including individuals, groups or organisations that have an interest in a common issue (Jamal and Getz, 1995). Cooper et al. (1998:113) call different groups in tourism destination as ‘destination stakeholders’ that could have both compatible and contradictory interests. Every destination has several stakeholders, including: indigenous people, tourists, the tourism industry, the public sector and other stakeholders, such as pressure groups and chambers of commerce (Cooper et al., 1998). Sautter and Leisen (1999) employ Freeman’s (1984:55) ‘tourism stakeholder map’ to give a more particular account of the relationships between nine stakeholders.
The tourism stakeholder map in Figure 4.3 indicates a wide range of stakeholders in tourism; however, it is not clear who the tourism planners at the centre of the map are, as any stakeholder can be a planner. The number and types of stakeholders may vary depending on the characteristics of tourism destinations. Moreover, the map does not show the relationships between the stakeholders. The relationships among tourism stakeholders might be more complex than the map shows. Freeman also developed stakeholder theory, which explains that each stakeholder has the power to affect the performance of an organisation or project; therefore, they have to participate in deciding the future direction of the project (Sautter and Leisen, 1999). If any of the stakeholders are not involved in the decision-making process, it will cause the failure of the project (Sautter and Leisen, 1999), and therefore, the coordination of the stakeholders is important in tourism.

Furthermore, the concept of interest groups is defined as 'a group of people who work together to achieve something that they are particularly interested in, especially by putting pressure on the government' (Oxford Dictionary of English). In the context of tourism, Tosun (2006) uses the term interest groups as key players affecting tourism. Needham and Rollins (2005) use 'stakeholder' and 'interest group' as the same concept, which represents a group of people who have shared views or interests in tourism. One of the similarities between stakeholder and interest groups is that people in the group basically have the same interests, objectives, or goals. On the other hand, the main difference between the two is that, while stakeholders can affect decision-making as a part of the organisation and can be affected by the performance of the organisation, people in an interest group work together based on a
shared interest in a particular issue, and they are not necessarily a part of the organisation. The main discussion in tourism studies on stakeholders and interest groups is related to how to manage and coordinate different stakeholders and interest groups in tourism.

The examination of the concepts of stakeholder and interest group can suggest that it is questionable whether these concepts can sufficiently address the issues of social exclusion and disability. For instance, stakeholder theory claims that each stakeholder can affect the project's performance, but it does not address how some people's voice dominates over others and how the mechanism of social exclusion works within the unequal relations among the various stakeholders. Therefore, again, in the context of this particular study, a more inclusive approach needs to be developed in order to focus on the issue of social exclusion in the design of tourism, and to promote the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. The accounts on community, stakeholders and interest groups in tourism presented here suggest the potential of inclusive design of tourism to address social exclusion and involve disabled people in different areas of tourism. The next section deals with the approaches and methods of inclusive design and its application to tourism.

4.4. Application of inclusive design approaches to tourism

Having examined the idea and potential of inclusive design of tourism, this section discusses how inclusive design of tourism can actually be implemented. The approaches and methods used in inclusive design are introduced first, and the difficulties and challenges in inclusive design are discussed. Moreover, the differences between the use of inclusive design in product development and in tourism are clarified. Finally, it discusses the application of inclusive design approaches and methods to tourism.

4.4.1. Approaches and methods of inclusive design

The concept of inclusive design has been used in various areas, such as product development, architecture and political statements. In these areas, a variety of methods and approaches of inclusive design have been identified. Keates and Clarkson (2004) summarise those methods commonly used in inclusive design, including self-observation, user-observation, user
interviews, user questionnaires, user trials, checklists and guidelines, simulation and expert appraisal.

Firstly, ‘self-observation’ is one of the most commonly used methods in inclusive design whereby designers use products themselves and try to find out the difficulties and problems that potential users might encounter. The self-observation method is regarded as cheap and fast to perform, and it can be implemented frequently during the design process. However, the disadvantage of this is that the information gained from using this method is of questionable quality, as it largely depends on the designer’s understanding of the needs of the end users (Keates and Clarkson, 2004). Secondly, ‘user-observation’ is a method involving an observer who observes users’ interaction with the product, ideally in a realistic environment, and the users are asked to talk through their thoughts and experience of using the product. The advantage of this method is that real users are involved in assessing the product; therefore, the observer or designer does not need to make their own assumptions about the needs of the end users. However, the user-observation method costs time and money in identifying and recruiting users and analysing the gathered data. Thirdly, ‘user interviews’ is a method where an interviewer asks users about their experience of using the product. This method is of value in collecting qualitative aspects of the assessment of the product. The fourth is ‘user questionnaires’, which is a method of collecting data from users who answer the questions in written format. In both user interviews and questionnaire approaches, the questions need to be set adequately in order to obtain quality data. Fifthly, the ‘user trials’ approach asks users to interact with the product, but it does not need to be observed, in order to encourage more natural interaction with the product and avoid any attitudinal change that may occur from being observed. The users provide feedback on the trials. However, the quality of the feedback strongly depends on how well the users understand the purpose of the trial. The sixth are ‘checklists and guidelines’ that are used to provide structure to the design process with all the necessary information to develop accessible and usable products. However, many of the checklists and guidelines are often too long, and it is not guaranteed that the designer can interpret them correctly. Thus, it is suggested that the checklists and guidelines should be regarded as a resource to answer specific questions, rather than as the central benchmark in the design process. Seventhly, the ‘simulation’ method involves physical simulations by a designer to mimic the effects of having impairments, with simulators such as wheelchairs or goggles that can produce different visual impairments. Simulation is regarded as very popular among designers, since
it can provide the benefit of self-observation, and also because it enables designers to gain experience of some of the difficulties faced by disabled users. However, Keates and Clarkson (2004:121) have emphasised that: ‘...it does not provide designers with an understanding of what it is like to have a functional impairment. Instead, it simply provides a feeling for the effects of the impairment’. Thus, it is suggested that simulation would never be perfectly able to replace the actual involvement of users in the design process. Finally, ‘expert appraisal’ is also a common approach used in businesses. A given company contacts an expert with knowledge to do the assessment of inclusive design, instead of having designer to perform the assessment. The difficulty in expert appraisal is the availability of suitable experts and whether they have enough knowledge of the needs of users, the product and the context in which the product is used. It is suggested that having internal user champions or access officers as experts is useful in involving them throughout the design process (Keates and Clarkson, 2004).

Having reviewed the methods and approaches used in inclusive design, it might be obvious that one of the main features of inclusive design approaches is user involvement in the design process. Since the focus of many of the design practices is still placed on producers and products rather than users (Bennett, 2002), inclusive design approaches can have important implications in involving users in design, and particularly those who have traditionally been excluded from the design process. This is because users (disabled people in this research context) are too aware of problematic and inaccessible products, services or environments that result from the design process without consulting disabled people (Tregaskis, 2004). Ferguson (1997) argues that the involvement of the primary users in the design process is essential in order to minimise the gap between the designers and users and to maximise the functionality of the product, service or environment. In inclusive design, potential users are involved in a whole design process from the initiation of a project to the evaluation stage (Dong and Clarkson, 2006). The focus of the design process is to listen to users’ opinions, perspectives and ideas, and the possible design is proposed based on communication with the users. In this sense, it can be argued that the significance of inclusive design is its focus on the process of involving socially excluded people into the design process, and accessible products and services for the wider population can be understood as a consequence of the design process involving socially excluded people.
In addition, the benefit of user involvement in the design process embraces the idea that designers can find a common ground with disabled people by working together with them; this will allow them to become relaxed about the differences between themselves and disabled people, since direct exposure to disabled people and hearing their experiences can help to overcome misconceptions about their ability and to build confidence to work with disabled people (Tregaskis, 2004). The advantage of inclusive design approaches can also be seen from the user’s point of view. Disabled people often have an experience whereby they were misled into the belief that products or services are accessible, when in fact they were not, and they tend to distrust information concerning accessibility provided by non-disabled people. Tregaskis (2004) argues that disabled people tend to attach greater importance to information that is provided and tested by other disabled people. Therefore, disabled people’s distrust toward the accessibility of products or services and the information provided about accessibility can be overcome by involving disabled people in the design process and gaining their approval for the information or products.

Furthermore, the inclusive design methods and approaches reviewed above suggest the importance of the frequent involvement of users in the design process. However, Keates and Clarkson (2004) indicate that the assessment of design often takes place only in one stage, at the end of the design process, to confirm if the final design has met the initial requirements. If any problem is found at the end of the process, the designer needs to feed this back to the re-design process. Although having a single large evaluation could be the fastest way to complete the design, the problem with this approach is that there may be many problems to be considered at the end of the design process. This point is particularly the case in inclusive design since the designer has to deal with a range of user capabilities that the designer may not be familiar with (Keates and Clarkson, 2004). Thus, it is recommended that potential users are frequently involved throughout the design process to identify problems and solve them in a proactive way (Dong and Clarkson, 2006). The approaches and methods of inclusive design introduced earlier can be implemented at different stages of the design process in order to involve disabled people.

While the advantages of inclusive design approaches have been emphasised, there are some difficulties in implementing inclusive design. Firstly, one of the most widely acknowledged challenges of inclusive design is to deal with the possible diversity of the targeted potential users. When the targeted users are disabled people, although designers often make an
assumption that disabled people are a homogeneous group, the needs of disabled people are in fact hugely diverse (Ferguson, 1997). Even when wheelchair users are specifically targeted as potential users, it can be difficult to decide which wheelchair users to involve in the design process, as there are different types and levels of disability among wheelchair users. The common approaches to choose when targeting users to involve are: finding users who represent a spread across the population, and finding users who represent the extremes of the population (Keates and Clarkson, 2004). The advantages of the former approach are that it is easy to find such target users, and it can cover a broader range of the targeted user’s needs, whereas the disadvantage is that this approach does not cover the ‘edge-cases’. On the other hand, the advantage of the latter approach is that the ‘edge-cases’ are investigated in depth, and if the resulting product can satisfy the extreme users, the other targeted users should be able to use the product. The disadvantage of the latter approach is that it is difficult to find such extreme users (Keates and Clarkson, 2004). Choosing which approach to take is difficult due to these advantages and disadvantages, but careful consideration is required for the sampling, in order to obtain potential users who ideally represent the full range of the targeted end-users. However, it should be noted that, although none of the targeted users should ideally be excluded from the resulting product, it is not always possible for a product to meet the needs of all targeted users. Keates and Clarkson (2004) point out that there are many cases where a product to include one group of targeted users can lead to the exclusion of another group of users. This point is the case with any target population regardless of the size. Thus, different needs have to be carefully considered, and trade-offs often have to be reached in the design process (Keates and Clarkson, 2004).

Secondly, the difficulty in implementing inclusive design approaches arises when working with users in the design process. In working with users with special needs, designers need to be sensitive to their needs, but not to be patronising. It has been pointed out that many designers feel reluctant or uncomfortable in working with such users due to a fear of saying something offensive or upsetting the users (Keates and Clarkson, 2004). In order to overcome this reluctance, Keates and Clarkson (2004) recommend that designers spend more time with different types of users, as the interaction with them can help to obtain a deeper understanding of the users and to develop greater empathy. As a result, this approach enables designers to improve their ability to design for the needs of the users. Moreover, Coleman (2006) argues that conflicting stakeholder interests is also a challenge when working with users in the inclusive design process. In order to deal with the conflict of interests, it is crucial
to consider the issue of power. Bennett (2002) contends that the power relations among participants in the design process are not given sufficient attention in the discussion of inclusive design. As examined in Chapter 3 on social exclusion, it is inevitable that some people have more power over others within a group. In challenging the power balance in the design process, Bennett (2002) states that it is crucial to understand that the users with less power, such as disabled people, are in an oppressed and socially excluded position. This point supports the argument that the concept of inclusive design fundamentally comprehends the issues of social exclusion behind its idea. Therefore, in order to tackle the issues of conflicting interests and unbalanced power between the users in the inclusive design approaches, it is essential to pay particular attention to socially excluded people in the design process and consider the mechanism of social exclusion and its consequences to the users.

4.4.2. Application of inclusive design approaches to tourism

Although the methods of inclusive design have primarily been used in the area of product design and development, its concept and approaches can also be applied to the context of tourism. In applying inclusive design to tourism, it is important to understand that there are key differences between designing a product and designing tourism. Firstly, while product development starts by designing a product from scratch (although re-designing might be possible), this might not be the case with tourism since tourism already exists in a tourism destination context in most of the cases. In other words, in understanding tourism as an evolving process, inclusive design of tourism can start from any stage of the design process. Disabled people can be involved in any of the stages of the design of tourism, and their first involvement does not need to be in the planning stage. Secondly, whereas product development usually only takes companies, designers and users into consideration, the design of tourism needs to embrace a variety of stakeholders such as tourism development organisations, tourism businesses, tourists, and the local community. Therefore, the issue of conflicting interests among the related stakeholders in tourism can be more complex than in product development. Thirdly, the concept of inclusive design and its approaches have been more accepted in product development than in tourism. While the importance of inclusive design has increasingly been recognised by many major companies in terms of usability and accessibility for product development (Coleman, 2006), inclusive design is still an emerging concept in tourism. Therefore, there is a future potential for interdisciplinary studies in tourism, integrating the subjects of social exclusion, disability and design.
A few attempts have been made to introduce the concept of inclusive design into tourism. Rains (2004) conceptualised the term ‘inclusive tourism’, which is underpinned by the idea of inclusive/universal design, by referring to ‘inclusive’ as accommodating a range of tourists including disabled people. Moreover, there is a case that addresses the idea of inclusive/universal design in tourism destination management. Chiba prefecture in Japan promotes ‘universal tourism’, which refers to tourism that can accommodate a range of tourists, including disabled tourists and tourists from abroad (Chiba Prefecture Tourism Division, 2006). The main approach of Chiba’s universal tourism is to develop a ‘barrier-free’ destination in terms of physical accessibility for disabled and elderly people and language accessibility for tourists from abroad. It can be argued that these examples of attempts to introduce inclusive design to tourism are primarily based on the guest-related approach, and this perspective is limited in its focus to addressing the dynamic process of the design of tourism. As discussed throughout this chapter, the involvement of disabled people in tourism can be studied in a more comprehensive way with the idea of the design of tourism, which can be addressed in the different areas of tourism. In this sense, the existing inclusive tourism approach that focuses solely on the guest perspective is not sufficiently able to maximise the potential advantage of inclusive design of tourism.

Furthermore, the existing cases of the application of inclusive design to tourism imply that inclusive design is regarded as a product or environment that can accommodate a range of people including disabled people. This perspective suggests that inclusive design here is defined as a method of developing accessible products and services, rather than a process involving users in different stages of the design toward the creation of an entity. Inclusive design as a method can only address the issues associated with the end product, whereas inclusive design as a process can include a range of issues in the whole design process. Therefore, by examining the concept of design and understanding the design process, the application of inclusive design to tourism can have more value and benefit in addressing the involvement of disabled people in different areas of tourism.

The inclusive design approaches and methods to involve disabled people introduced earlier can be beneficial in the tourism context. For instance, ‘user interviews and questionnaires’ can be used in the user research stage or feedback stage of the design of tourism, and ‘simulation’ can be used in the training stage. Moreover, in considering the various stages
involved in the design of tourism, the inclusive design of tourism approaches can be more
diverse. The possible forms of involvement would include consultation with disabled people
in planning new development, staff training by disabled people, service delivery by disabled
staff, service purchases by disabled customers, some forms of access audits conducted by
disabled people, and evaluation and feedback from disabled people on tourism products and
services.

While appreciating the potential of the application of inclusive design to tourism, there are
some challenges and issues that need to be considered in implementing inclusive design of
tourism. Firstly, as mentioned earlier, the related stakeholders in tourism are more diverse
than those in product design. Since design of tourism occurs in a bigger scale, such as
destination and national levels, tourism stakeholders vary from governmental agencies to
local community, and from private businesses to non-profit organisations. Thus, it is crucial
to understand that it is more difficult and challenging to coordinate different interests of the
various stakeholders in the design of tourism process.

Secondly, the influence of public policy and legislation on the design of tourism process
needs to be taken into account. For instance, the UK's anti-discrimination law, the Equality
Act in 2010, clearly has an influence on the service providers in tourism. Under the Equality
Act, service providers including tourism businesses have to remove unreasonable difficulties
for disabled people in using the services. This case relates especially to the sales stage as to
providing products and services to disabled people. In addition, it might be possible that the
service providers involve disabled people in the other areas of the design of tourism to
comply with the Act. Therefore, it is crucial to consider that public policy and legislation's
influence is at work in the whole process of the design of tourism.

Thirdly, it needs to be acknowledged that although the stages of the design of tourism are
presented in a circle as a step-by-step process, it is not always possible that the design of
tourism follow the suggested stages in order. Rather, the design of tourism can be regarded
unsystematic and complex process. For instance, some of the stages might be skipped or
repeated several times depending on the type and nature of the organisation. For instance, the
issue of training for staff might not be relevant for a B&B owner who runs the business alone.
Therefore, it is crucial to appreciate that not all stages of the design of tourism are relevant to
every organisation, and the design of tourism process can be more complex in reality than it is in the model.

4.5. Chapter conclusion and summary

This chapter examined the idea of inclusive design of tourism, which is the theoretical framework of this study. The notion of inclusive design of tourism was developed through the examination of the concepts of design and inclusive design. The potential advantages of inclusive design of tourism were examined by making a comparison with the concepts of tourism development and planning and evaluating the existing public involvement approaches in tourism. This led to particular attention being placed on the involvement of disabled people in different areas of tourism. The approaches and methods of inclusive design were introduced, and the application of the approaches to tourism was discussed. In adapting the idea of inclusive design to tourism, inclusive design of tourism considers the involvement of socially excluded groups of people, specifically disabled people in this particular study, into various stages of the design of tourism.

The idea of inclusive design is still new in the context of tourism, and the approaches and methods of inclusive design of tourism have not been well developed. Therefore, the inclusion and exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism and the issues related to achieving inclusive design of tourism need to be investigated. This point is a part of the aim of this study. Having examined the three main theoretical concepts, disability, social exclusion and inclusive design of tourism, the next chapter deals with the methodological position of the study and the research methods selected for the data collection.
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES AND METHODS

5.1. Introduction

The terms method and methodology are often confused in terms of their meanings and the ways they are used, and it has been suggested by Tribe (2001) that a distinction needs to be made between the two terms. A research method is regarded as a means or technique to address a research question (Tribe, 2001). On the other hand, methodology is defined as ‘the process for ensuring that a particular technique has scientific validity’ (Tribe, 2001:442) by addressing the limitations the methods have and the issues such as reflexivity and research ethics throughout the whole research process. Methodology considers the nature of the research question and a range of possible methods to answer the question (Tribe, 2001). It also considers researchers’ assumptions, which influence how the topic is researched (Travers, 2001), including the research process, method, analysis method and interpretations. In this respect, research methodology ‘refers to the assumptions you have as a researcher, which can be epistemological or political in character, or mean that you support the view of the world promoted by a particular theoretical tradition’ (Travers, 2001:vi). Hence, it can be argued that research methods and methodologies are interrelated with each other and should not be considered separately. In discussing research methods, it is crucial to address methodological perspectives that can open the whole research process to critical reflection (Tribe, 2001). This is the reason why both method and methodological issues are incorporated in this particular chapter.

Although there has been the traditional dominance of scientific quantitative research with the recognition that the role of qualitative research is to provide supplemental information to quantitative research, qualitative research has acquired much attention, and a variety of qualitative methods have been developed in social science in general and in tourism in particular (Polkinghorne, 2005; Walle, 1997; Phillimore and Goodson, 2004).

The aim of this chapter is to examine the issues surrounding research methods and methodologies that need to be considered in conducting qualitative research, and to introduce
the research methodology and method selected for this research. It first confirms the research questions and objectives of the study once again. The characteristics of qualitative research are examined in conjunction with methodological perspectives and paradigms in which qualitative research can be classified. The main qualitative research methods are evaluated, and the chapter presents the method employed for the study with some justifications, followed by an introduction of interview strategy, sampling methods and data analysis method. It is inevitable for qualitative researchers to make their worldviews and assumptions open to the readers in order to help them understand researchers' positions in close relation to the research (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004; Morrow, 2005).

5.2. Research problems, questions and objectives

The first question to be asked in considering research methodologies and methods is what this research is trying to find out. In order to answer this question, the research questions and objectives need to be addressed here once again. Having reviewed the literature on disability, social exclusion and inclusive design of tourism, it has been demonstrated that disabled people have been excluded from a range of dimensions of social life in general, and from the design of tourism in particular. Factors preventing disabled people from participating in the design of tourism have not been well revealed, and the way to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism needs to be developed. These problems are the starting point of this study. In attempting to answer and provide insights into these problems, the following research questions were formulated:

(1) Are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism?
(2) How can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome?

Answering the first question can suggest what the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism are, by identifying the reasons for the inclusion and exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism. This in turn leads to the second question of how the barriers can be overcome. In attempting to answer these two research questions, six research objectives were formed:
a) To examine if there is inclusion/exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism.
b) To develop the concept of inclusive design of tourism.
c) To explore how disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism.
d) To consider why disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism.
e) To explore the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism.
f) To discuss how the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism can be overcome.

These objectives are not distinct, but they are interrelated with each other, and they can be answered throughout the whole process and every step of the research including the secondary and primary research.

5.3. Qualitative research and the paradigms

This section first addresses the nature and attributes of qualitative research, followed by an examination of some of the main research paradigms: scientific positivism, postpositivism, constructivism-interpretivism and critical-ideological paradigms. The examination of the paradigms can highlight the researcher's particular worldview and the way in which the methodological position influences the research process (Ponterotto, 2005). The differences between the paradigms can be clarified from ontological, epistemological, methodological and axiological perspectives respectively.

5.3.1. The attributes of qualitative research

Before examining the research paradigms, the nature of qualitative research needs to be considered. Qualitative research refers to 'an emphasis on the qualities of entities and on processes and meanings that are not experimentally examined or measured (if measured at all) in terms of quantity, amount, intensity, or frequency' (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005:10). Similarly, Berg (2004) claims that the concept of quality is central to the nature of things, and it refers to the what, how, when and where of things. Therefore, qualitative research deals with 'the meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and descriptions of things' (Berg, 2004:3).
While it is contended that qualitative research does not need to be paired or compared with quantitative research as it is a genuine and valid method of inquiry (Yeh and Inman, 2007), qualitative research is often discussed as differentiating from quantitative research. A number of ways have been identified in which qualitative research differs from quantitative research, and making the comparison might be a useful way to identify the attributes of qualitative research.

The first difference is whether or not they adopt positivist or postpositivist perspectives. The basic idea of positivism is that there is a reality that can be studied, captured and understood, whereas postpositivism claims that reality can only be approximated, and can never be entirely understood (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). The notion of positivism and postpositivism will be explained more in the subsequent section. Quantitative research can be regarded as relying on positivism, as it takes a deductive approach and aims at measuring and quantifying phenomena (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005), namely its assumption is that there is a reality to be measured and quantified. On the other hand, qualitative research does not take a positivist and postpositivist approach, since it uses inductive approaches and stresses the constructed nature of reality; therefore, it accepts there are different realities.

Qualitative research perspectives reject positivist and postpositivist perspectives as irrelevant since a certain kind of science reproduced by positivist criteria ignores too many voices (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). However, it should be noted that it is inadequate to assume that all qualitative researchers share the same presumptions revealed here. As qualitative research embraces complex and interconnected traditions, concepts and assumptions (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005), it is erroneous to simply group quantitative research with positivism and postpositivism and qualitative research with non-positivist approaches. Instead, positivism and postpositivism should be examined within qualitative research paradigms, as other alternative qualitative paradigms emerged based on the critique of positivism and postpositivism. As Denzin and Lincoln (2005) argue, all the diverse traditions and assumptions define and form the discourses of qualitative research. Moreover, among the various paradigms, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) remind us that qualitative research does not privilege any methodological practice over another.

The second difference concerns whether or not they focus on an individual's point of view. It is argued that the aim of both quantitative and qualitative research is to obtain an individual’s
point of view; however, there are different approaches to obtain it. Qualitative researchers try to capture participants’ perspectives through detailed interviews and observation. On the other hand, it is argued by qualitative researchers that quantitative researchers rarely get close to participants’ perspectives due to the more remote and empirical methods they use (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

Moreover, in terms of sampling, quantitative researchers are engaged in etic science based on a study with a large number of samples randomly selected, while qualitative researchers pursue an emic and case-based position which pays attention to the particulars of specific cases (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Etic designates ‘universal laws and behaviours that transcend nations and cultures and apply to all humans’ whereas emic denotes ‘constructs or behaviours that are unique to an individual, sociocultural context that are not generalizable’ (Ponterotto, 2005:128). The basic assumption related to this etic and emic is that qualitative researchers postulate that rich descriptions are valuable in understanding the social world, whereas quantitative researchers are not concerned with rich descriptions consciously since such details may impede the development of generalisations (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

These differences between quantitative and qualitative research imply that there are different ways of viewing the world. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) summarise this by stating that the meaning of qualitative research differs for different people, and therefore it is difficult to define. However, they suggest there are two fundamental essences of qualitative research: ‘a commitment to some version of the naturalistic, interpretive approach to its subject matter and an ongoing critique of the politics and methods of postpositivism’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005:10). It is important at this point to address some of the main qualitative research paradigms.

5.3.2. Qualitative research paradigms

Guba (1990:17) defines a paradigm as ‘a basic set of beliefs that guides action, whether of the everyday garden variety or action taken in connection with a disciplined inquiry’. The paradigm selected becomes the base that guides the researcher in making particular philosophical assumptions and selecting methods, research participants and data analysis methods (Ponterotto, 2005).
Denzin and Lincoln (2005) and Guba (1990) claim that paradigms can be understood in terms of ontological, epistemological and methodological issues. In addition, the issues of axiology can be added to the above (Ponterotto, 2005). First, ontology concerns the nature of reality and human beings, and asks the question: what is the nature of reality, and what can be known about the reality? (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Ponterotto, 2005; Guba, 1990). Second, epistemology refers to the study and acquirement of knowledge and focuses on the relationship between the ‘knower’ (the research participant) and ‘would-be-knower’ (the researcher), and asks the question: what is the nature of the relationship between them? (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Ponterotto, 2005; Guba, 1990). Third, methodology is concerned with the process of research and asks the question: how does the researcher find out knowledge? (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Ponterotto, 2005; Guba, 1990). Research methods naturally stem from a researcher’s position on ontology, epistemology and axiology (Ponterotto, 2005). Fourth, axiology is concerned with the role of a researcher’s values in a research process (Ponterotto, 2005). Namely, it asks if there is room to consider the value of researchers in the research process, and if so, what roles the value has.

The net embracing the ontological, epistemological, methodological and axiological premises can be termed a paradigm (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). It is crucial to consider the four points above in qualitative research, since they are closely attached to the researcher, and are based on the set of ideas with which the researcher approaches the world (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). The personal biography of the researcher appears behind the four actions; namely, the four actions imply the way and stance in which the researcher talks from a particular class, gender, racial, cultural and ethnic community standpoint (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). These beliefs shape how the researcher sees the world and acts within it (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). In this sense, therefore, it can be said that all research, irrespective of whether it is quantitative or qualitative, is interpretive, as it is guided and conducted through the lenses of the researchers’ beliefs and perception on how the world should be viewed and understood (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

This study categorises the paradigms into three groups in order to elucidate the key characteristics of the main qualitative research paradigms: scientific positivism and postpositivism, constructivism-interpretivism, and critical-ideological paradigms.

5.3.3. Scientific positivism and postpositivism
Scientific positivism and postpositivism paradigms and its approaches have been dominant in science for over 150 years (Ponterotto, 2005). Ponterotto (2005) explains that the origin of positivism can be traced back to the Enlightenment period, which led to the notion that the world is objectively knowable. In that period the main concern was to write colonising accounts of field experiences objectively, and the issues of validity, reliability and objective interpretation were concerned in their study (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). The objects of study were recognised as the ‘other’ who was alien, outsider and strange (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). It uses scientific methods involving hypothesis formulation and testing with empirical evidence (Tribe, 2001; Poterotto, 2005), and its priorities are placed on the dehumanisation of research in attempting to reduce bias and increase rigour (Walle, 1997).

Postpositivism emerged out of the discontent with some aspects of the positivist approach. While positivists accept that there is an objective reality, postpositivists understand that reality can only be apprehended imperfectly, therefore, ‘one can never fully capture a “true” reality’ (Ponterotto, 2005:129). In terms of research methods, it uses semi-structured interviews in which questions are derived from literature and are standard for any participant, and the complete sample is selected before the research, instead of incorporating theoretical sampling. In the analysis stage, the thematic categories are established before the research and the data is split into the categories (Ponterotto, 2005). These practices embody the postpositivist worldview.

Ontologically, positivists argue that there is one true reality that can be identified, measured and studied (naïve realism). Whereas postpositivists also accept one true reality, they contend that the reality can only be understood and measured imperfectly (critical realism) (Potenrotto, 2005). This truism indicates that any phenomenon under study must be empirically observable and verifiable (Walle, 1997). Epistemologically, positivists are concerned with dualism and objectivism. It is believed that the researcher and research participants are independent (dualism) and that the participants and research topic can be studied without bias (objectivism) (Ponterotto, 2005). The fundamental assumption of this standpoint is that the researcher can study participants without influencing them in any way. Positivists, on the other hand, accept that the researcher might have some influence on the participants; however, objectivity remains an important guideline in the research process (Ponterotto, 2005).
In terms of axiology, both positivists and postpositivists believe that there is no space for researchers’ values, hopes, expectations and feelings in scientific inquiry (Ponterotto, 2005). Any influences researchers might have on the participants need to be avoided by using standardised and systematic methods. In terms of methodology, both positivism and postpositivism attempt to take strict scientific methods in order to achieve the goal of identifying relationships among variables leading to universal laws that can predict and control phenomena (Ponterotto, 2005).

The goal of both paradigms is to obtain an explanation leading to prediction and control of phenomena, and both ‘emphasize cause-effect linkages of phenomena that can be studied, identified, and generalised, and both paradigms proffer an objective, detached researcher role’ (Ponterotto, 2005:129). Therefore, it can be said that both paradigms are based on an etic perspective. However, it has been pointed out that these paradigms have drawbacks owing to the nature of society and humankind (Walle, 1997). Namely, it is argued that they are not able to address issues such as voice, empowerment and praxis (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Through the shift from positivism toward non-positivist paradigms, the commitment to objectivism and production of timeless truths is in doubt (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

5.3.4. Constructivism-interpretivism

Constructivism-interpretivism emerged as an alternative paradigm to the positivist paradigm. This paradigm takes the ontological position of relativism, which accepts multiple and equally valid realities, rather than a single reality as is the case in positivism’s naïve realism (Ponterotto, 2005). In constructivism-interpretivism, there is no single truth, but any truth is partial and incomplete (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). In the constructivist position, reality is ‘subjective and influenced by the context of the situation, namely the individual’s experience and perceptions, the social environment, and the interaction between the individual and the researcher’ (Ponterotto, 2005:130). Constructivists and interpretivists are concerned with the production of reconstructed understanding of the social world (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Reality is constructed by individuals in a society, and therefore reality may differ depending on people and societies. In this respect, the issue of validity and rigorous generalisation in positivism is irrelevant in this paradigm, as there can be multiple interpretations of the data by different researchers. In this sense, it can be argued that theories from the constructivism-
interpretivism perspective are context specific; namely, their focus is given on the local attempting to provide a "snapshot" in time and place" (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004:18).

From the epistemological perspective, the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm emphasises the dynamic interaction between researcher and participants, which is regarded as central to capturing and describing the 'lived experience' of the participants, and it is argued that deeper meaning can be uncovered only through this interaction (Ponterotto, 2005). In terms of axiology in the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm, the multiple realities and interpretations indicate that the role of researcher is not independent from research itself. As a result, the issue of reflexivity and the personal biography of the researcher becomes more important (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). Researchers in the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm attempt to consider their own subjectivities, biases, values and standpoint — such as their cultural background, ethnicity, age, class, gender, and sexuality— and disclose them in order to inform readers that these factors affect each stage of the research and that there could be multiple interpretations of the data (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). In terms of methodology, the paradigm emphasises the researcher-participant interaction and uses methods such as in-depth face-to-face interviews and participant observation, in order to bring meaning to the surface through deep reflection (Ponterotto, 2005).

5.3.5. The critical-ideological

The fundamental assumption behind the critical-ideological paradigm is that not all societies are undoubtedly democratic and free (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Instead, the paradigm assumes that all thoughts are essentially mediated by socially and historically constituted power relations, and that in any society certain groups are privileged over others (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). The ultimate goal of the critical-ideological paradigm is to empower the participants and to emancipate them from oppression (Ponterotto, 2005). Thus, criticalists are researchers who attempt to employ their studies for social or cultural criticism and regard their work as the first step toward political action, which can rectify injustice (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). For the criticalists, any study or theory that only increases knowledge and does not address the needs and suffering of the oppressed is insufficient (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005).
Whereas the critical-ideological paradigm shares some of the features of the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm, one of the main differences from the other paradigms is that critical theory accepts that ‘all thought is fundamentally mediated by power relations that are social and historically constituted’ (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005:304). Namely, the ontological position of the critical-ideological paradigm is to understand realities as shaped by cultural, social and political values, and to focus particularly on realities that are resolved by socially and historically constituted power relations (Ponterotto, 2005). Therefore, understanding the various and complex ways in which power operates to dominate and construct consciousness and identifying who gains and who loses is central to critical theory (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005).

The fundamental assumption of the critical-ideological paradigm is the existence of imbalance and inequality in society. To explain inequality, Tribe (2001) hints that the interests of human beings are inferior to the interests of particular interest groups. The privileged groups are often interested in supporting the status quo in order to secure their advantages (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). The researchers in the critical-ideological paradigm attempt to remedy this inequality and imbalance and to emancipate the oppressed from the domination of any particular ideology (Tribe, 2001). At this point, Kincheloe and McLaren (2005) caution criticalists to be aware of the possibility of being arrogant in emancipating ‘others’, which needs to be considered carefully.

From an epistemological perspective, critical theory sees the relationship between researchers and participants as transactional and subjective, just like the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm (Ponterotto, 2005). As with the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm, critical theory also takes reflexivity issues into account. Kincheloe and McLaren (2005) call this self-conscious criticism, in which researchers attempt to become conscious of the ideological imperatives and epistemological presumptions. In terms of axiology, the critical-ideological paradigm can be seen as ‘one of emancipation and transformation, one in which the researcher’s proactive values are central to the task, purpose, and methods of research’ (Ponterotto, 2005:129). Criticalists not only accept researchers’ values but also expect their values to influence the research process. Methodology for the critical-ideological paradigm emphasises, like the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm, the researcher-participant interaction including in-depth face-to-face interviews and participant observation methods (Ponterotto, 2005).
5.3.6. The selected paradigms – a comparison of the paradigms

Among the qualitative research paradigms above, this study takes the middle position between the constructivism-interpretivism and critical-ideological paradigms. The reasons for this selection need to be explained by addressing the nature and context of the research.

Firstly, this study regards the ontological position of positivism and postpositivism as inappropriate. The ontological position of positivism and postpositivism is that there is a single true reality, which can be identified and measured (albeit imperfectly in the postpositivism paradigm). However, as revealed in the discussion of disability and social exclusion, disability can be understood as a socially constructed notion; that is, the meaning of disability can vary depending on societies and cultures. Social exclusion is also a concept that is closely related to the cultural, economic and political factors that are unique and different to each society and change over time. In this respect, it is contended that the scientifically rigorous approach associated with positivism and postpositivism in finding out one true reality is unable to address the complexity of disability and social exclusion issues, and their claim of the uniformity of nature in time and space is irrelevant in this study’s context. Therefore, in considering the nature of the key concepts of this study, the ontological position of the positivism and postpositivism paradigms is not adequate. Rather, the constructivism-interpretivism and critical-ideological’s ontological view whereby realities are socially, culturally and historically constructed is more relevant to this research.

Secondly, this study questions the epistemological position of positivism and postpositivism regarding the idea that the researcher and participants are independent from each other. This is because it does not consider any possibility of a researcher’s influence on participants and research process by arguing that the research topics and participants can be objectively studied without bias (Ponterotto, 2005). Rather, this study supports the constructivism-interpretivism and critical-ideological paradigms’ position that acknowledges the importance of the interaction between researcher and participants, which is central to capturing and describing the lived experience of the participants (Ponterotto, 2005). It is also contended that the deeper and hidden meaning can be uncovered and brought to the surface only through this interaction. During the data collection of this study, the researcher asked different and further
questions to the interview participants according to their background, what they do, and also their responses during the interviews.

Moreover, this study acknowledges the ideological influence of the researcher not only on the participants but also on the whole research process, including the selection of research topic, methods, interview questions and the interpretation of the data. What people are interested in or what people decide to research might reflect their views toward the world. This point was discussed at the very beginning of this thesis (Chapter 1: 1.1. and 1.4.) in terms of how the research questions reflect the belief or moral judgement that has been developed through the researcher’s experience. This point closely relates to the reflexivity issue, and the constructivism-interpretivism and critical-ideological paradigms’ careful consideration of reflexivity issues is one of the reasons for the selected paradigms for this research. This study accepts that any researcher from any paradigm cannot escape having bias, and that it is natural to get some extent of bias. In terms of axiology, it is also argued that the values of researchers are ‘naturally’ reflected in the selection of study topics (Ponterotto, 2005). It is important for this study to acknowledge the researcher’s biography and make it open and accessible, instead of attempting to eliminate biases. Therefore, this study accepts the epistemological position of the constructivism-interpretivism and critical-ideological paradigms.

In terms of methodology, the study considers that the approaches and methods of the positivism and postpositivism paradigms are not appropriate. Their reductionist approach and rigorous and empirical methods can lead to the exclusion of phenomena that cannot be easily approached by using these techniques, and to the oversimplification or distortion of the complex lives of human beings (Tribe, 2001; Ponterotto, 2005). Additionally, their empirical approach involves using a large sample with the aim of generating ultimate laws of nature from data and obtaining a single reality (Ponterotto, 2005). This attempt toward simplification and generalisation is also one of the reasons for the weakness of the positivist and postpositivist approach in capturing a complex reality. However, this research attempts not to lose any perspectives that the positivism and postpositivism approaches might ignore, as it recognises the complexity of lives of human beings and the diverse factors surrounding the issues of disability and social exclusion.
Through the arguments above criticising the positivism and postpositivism paradigms’ approach, it might become clear that the perspective of this research is closer to the ones of the other two main paradigms; the constructive-interpretive and critical-ideological paradigms. The appropriateness of the two paradigms to this study needs to be explained further.

5.3.7. The selected paradigms – justification

In considering the nature of the research questions of this study, it can be suggested that the paradigmatic position of the question involves the constructivism-interpretivism and critical-ideological paradigms. The first question: (1) are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism, is related to the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm, owing to its attempt to seek understanding of the phenomena under study and its reasons. Seeking to understand the meaning of phenomena is particularly important in the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm since it is the meaning-making activities that form and influence people’s action or inaction (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). At the same time, it can be said that the first question is also related to the critical-ideological paradigm as the ultimate aim of asking this question is to obtain the implications of developing solutions to exclusive situations. The second question: (2) how can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome, surely reflects the critical-ideological paradigm, as it seeks to find solutions to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism, in aiming at increasing the involvement of disabled people who have been excluded from a range of dimensions of social life, rather than being satisfied with obtaining an understanding of the phenomena.

Moreover, in considering the notion of disability, the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm’s ontological position matches with the one of this study, as it understands disability as a socially constructed notion and it therefore accepts multiple realities depending on societies. It shares the ontological perspective of the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm that reality is ‘subjective and influenced by the context of the situation, namely the individual’s experience and perceptions, the social environment, and the interaction between the individual and the researcher’ (Ponterotto, 2005:130).

The concept of social exclusion also suggests a close relation to the constructive-interpretive paradigm. The constructivism-interpretivism paradigm emphasises and promotes
understanding of phenomena from a range of stakeholders. Due to the multiplicity of reality, Tribe (2001) argues that reality needs to be considered from different stakeholders’ point of view. As a result, the approaches of the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm provide a greater voice to people who have traditionally been excluded. This point relates to the main theme this study aims to achieve, namely the promotion of inclusive design of tourism not just for people in the mainstream, but also for all stakeholders including often excluded groups of people, such as disabled people. In this sense, this study accepts the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm’s ontological position, as well as the critical-ideological paradigm’s ontological assumption that realities are influenced by socially and historically constituted power relations, and certain groups of people in any society might be privileged over others (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005).

The nature of the research questions and the aim of the research also indicate that this study is informed by the critical-ideological perspectives. The aim of this study is not only to learn the reasons for the inclusion/exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism, but also to find ways to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism. Namely, this study agrees with the stance of criticalists that will never be satisfied with merely increasing knowledge, but takes their task as a first step to contribute to the struggle for a better world (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005).

Therefore, considering the ontological, epistemological and methodological perspectives and the nature of the research questions and key concepts of this research, the paradigmatic position of this study can be positioned in the middle between the constructivism-interpretivism and critical-ideological paradigms. More specifically, the position of the research is based on the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm, while also being informed by the critical-ideological perspective. The main reason why the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm is the primary model used is because it accepts situations where inclusive practices might exist. This study is exploratory, because not much research has been done on inclusive design of tourism. For this reason, it should not be assumed that there are only exclusionary practices at work in the design of tourism. While the precondition of the critical-ideological is the existence of problems of inequality to be tackled, this study accepts the possibility that inclusive practices in the design of tourism might already exist.
Taking the middle position between the two paradigms can be justified because the borders between the qualitative paradigms and the paradigmatic categories are vague and keep altering (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). Guba and Lincoln (2005) also discuss that it is possible to combine the elements of different paradigms together in order to represent the best of both worldviews. Although combining the paradigms has to be done with careful consideration, it can especially be the case when the paradigms share similar axiomatic perspectives (Guba and Lincoln, 2005).

5.4. Reflexivity

In qualitative research, investigators are closely linked with the research process, and they should not be considered separately (Yeh and Inman, 2007). This methodological approach, involves understanding how selves construct evidence, interpretations, analysis and theory, is referred to by various terms such as self, self-awareness, subjectivity or reflexivity. The fundamental idea of reflexivity is that by examining a researcher's positions and self-identities it becomes possible to see how their choices in creation and representation of the data are made (Yeh and Inman, 2007). In other words, 'Depending on the researcher's own identity and intentions, a particular identity or voice may be represented. Such choices depend on the purpose of the study, the audience we want to address, the interaction between participant-selves and author-selves, and the praxis of interpretive communities' (Hoshmand, 2005:184, quoted in Yeh and Inman, 2007:371). Therefore, throughout the research process, researchers need to be critically aware of the influence of their selves on their choices of research questions, research methods and interpretation of the data.

The researchers' positions or backgrounds comprise a range of social factors such as ethnicity, race, geography, family, economic, political and educational factors, and among those, Yeh and Inman (2007:377) point out that cultural self-awareness is particularly important as 'one's background, minority status, or White privilege may be implicitly or explicitly used as a means of comparison of the cultural group under study'. It should be noted that the background is based on the researchers' subjective social location, which relies on their self-understanding, and more importantly, this self-understanding also reflects how research participants describe their experiences and how researchers analyse and interpret these experiences (Yeh and Inman, 2007).
In relation to this study, it is crucial to consider whether and how being or not being a disabled person reflects each step of the research process. Studying disability issues can entail some sensitive issues, particularly when the research aims at working with disabled people and contributing to a change in the social world, which has excluded disabled people. The issues include, for example, establishing relationships with disabled people, listening to their voice (Barton, 1996), and using the languages that do not disempower disabled people. Being white, male and non-disabled, Barton (1996:4) critically asked himself the following questions in conducting disability study:

- What right have I to undertake this work?
- What responsibilities arise from the privileges I have as a result of my social position?
- How can I use my knowledge and skills to challenge forms of oppression disabled people experience?
- Does my writing and speaking reproduce a system of domination or challenge that system?

Asking these questions is clearly a reflexive approach, and researchers have been encouraged to take this self-critical approach when conducting research on disability, particularly if they are non-disabled people. This is because they are often not sensitive to the reality of experiencing of disability; therefore, research conducted by non-disabled people can be oppressive to disabled people (Oliver, 1996a). Therefore, it is important to engage with these questions seriously throughout the research process.

On the other hand, there is an objection to disability study by non-disabled people. Oliver (1996a:96), as a sociologist and disabled person, claims that ‘I regard personal experience as more important than methodology. In other words, I believe that only disabled people should do disability research’. He supports his emphasis on the personal experience of disabled people by quoting Gouldner (1975:70): ‘social theories are grounded in the knowledge the theorist has gained through personal experience’. This statement indicates that non-disabled people cannot develop social theories of disability because they do not have the personal experience of being a disabled person. However, this statement might be questioned.

Oliver’s point can be powerful because this is obviously a voice from a disabled person who has experienced oppressive research by non-disabled people, and who saw many cases of
inaccurate and distorted understanding of disabled people’s day-to-day experience. This debate is controversial. However, it can be said that non-disabled researchers do not necessarily have to be excluded from disability studies. If disabled people deny non-disabled people to be involved in disability research, the cleavage between disabled and non-disabled people might become deeper. If non-disabled people are excluded from disability studies, then disabled people will only study themselves, and non-disabled people will only study themselves. As a result, there will be no mutual understanding between them, and disability issues will continue to be excluded from sociological research as well as from society.

It can be argued that the experiences of disabled people can be learnt and known through listening to their story and voices. As Barton (1996) suggests, one of the important ways to start thinking of self-critical questions is to listen to disabled people’s voices directly. Therefore, the importance of people’s imagination to understand other people should not be neglected. The traditional and often oppressive disability research can also be changed and improved by learning and seriously listening to criticism from disabled people. At the same time, it is cautioned by Yeh and Inman (2007) that researchers should not romanticise marginalised voices, including disabled people’s voices.

In addressing the reflexivity issues in this particular research, the personal background of the researcher introduced at the beginning of Chapter 1 needs to be considered. The personal experience acquired through the interaction with friends with disabilities has developed the researcher’s belief that disabled people should be involved in the design of tourism. This belief inevitably affects the development of the research questions, and particularly the second research question concerning how the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism can be overcome. This reflects the researcher’s belief that if barriers toward inclusive design of tourism exist, they need to be overcome. The researcher is not a disabled person, but believes that she has disability awareness to some extent developed through the experience of the walking club and travels with disabled people. The importance of the use of words that do not disempower disabled people is recognised by the researcher. At the same time, the researcher does not romanticise disabled people’s voices without careful consideration, since she knows there are some disabled people who can be too passionate to claim their rights and needs.

Moreover, as a woman and a non-English person, the researcher’s position can be categorised in one of the groups that were traditionally marginalised from the mainstream society. Thus,
it can be argued that it might be easier for the researcher to catch a sense of exclusion in some particular contexts than a male, white, English and non-disabled person. It should be noted that the position as a non-English person and international student might have had some influence in data collection. The interview participants might have used simple words to the researcher or might not have told something that they thought the researcher would not understand during the interviews because she is not English and would not understand difficult language or share their cultural background. The researcher has a perception from the experience of living in England that there are some people who intentionally or unintentionally look down on non-English people; thus, the researcher spent a lot of time on preparation before the interviews and tried to show the interviewees that she has enough knowledge on what she is doing, and the issues of disability and accessible tourism in the UK and South East England, in order to be treated as a competent researcher.

Furthermore, the researcher’s nationality as Japanese has an influence on the selection of the research topic. In Japan, one of the developed countries, the issue of accessibility for disabled people has gained much attention, and tourism has gradually been recognised as a right of disabled people. The similar situation can be found in England, which is the research context of this study. However, in considering the fact that there are many disabled people in the world who do not even have a job or support to go out, the right to travel is not something that all disabled people can enjoy in any country. If the researcher was born and grew up in such a country, she would not have chosen to conduct this research, or she would not even had thought about the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. Therefore, it should be noted that this study is conducted by the researcher as a person from a developed country.

To sum up, in conducting qualitative research, it is inevitable to study a researcher’s background and position and to examine how analysis and interpretation reflect one’s background and position. Conversely, it can be said that the issue of reflexivity indicates that the data and interpretation generated by a researcher with consideration of reflexivity cannot automatically be reproduced by different researchers, and the researcher is not replaceable with someone else in producing the data and interpretation.
5.5. Ethical issues

There is increased awareness and concern over the ethics of research. It is argued by Berg (2009) that researchers, particularly social scientists, have an ethical obligation to research participants, since they conduct investigations into the lives of other people. Therefore, researchers must avoid any physical and psychological harm and ensure the participants’ rights, privacy and welfare (Berg, 2009). Particularly, careful consideration should be given to the (potentially) disadvantaged groups of people such as children, students and disabled people, in relation to the ethical issues.

Ethical issues in this research were considered through dialogue with the School of Management Ethics Committee and the University of Surrey Ethics Committee in applying for ethical approval before conducting data collection. Unexpectedly, it took several months to gain the final ethical approval from the university, since disability was not dealt with in the management studies in the School in the past, and the School Ethics Committee was unable to agree on how to deal with the disability issues. The focal points were the definition of ‘vulnerable people’ and if all disabled people are regarded as vulnerable. As it was obvious that the School Ethics Committee regarded disability as a medical term, it was explained by the researcher that this study takes the social model of disability approach. After a long conversation and discussion with the School Ethics Committee, the research proposal was sent to the higher level, the University of Surrey Ethics Committee to make the decision. After adding some detailed explanations, the research proposal was ethically approved by the University Ethics Committee.

The proposed and agreed approaches to address ethical consideration were:

- Recruit disabled people recommended by disability charities and organisations.
- Recruit disabled people excluding those who are children or over the age of 65, who have mental impairments or impaired cognitive ability and who cannot give informed consent.
- Conduct interviews in a public space.
- Provide an information sheet to the interviewees.
- Have dated and signed consent forms from the interviewees.
The criteria of disabled people and the way to recruit them that were included in the proposal to the Ethics Committee will be addressed in section 5.7.2. In addition, the research protocol cover sheet for ethical approval, two types of information sheets and the consent form can be found in Appendices 2, 3 and 4.

5.6. Qualitative research strategies and methods

In taking the research questions and selected qualitative research paradigms into account, this section deals with research strategies and research methods. Research design involves an explicit focus on the purpose of the study and the research questions and a consideration of what information will appropriately answer the research questions (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). At this stage, the selected qualitative research paradigms are linked to the empirical world.

Before selecting a research strategy and method, it should be noted that this research can be classified as an exploratory study due to the nature of the research questions. As addressed in Chapter 1, while the issue of tourism and disability has mostly been studied from the guest perspective, disabled people's involvement in the design of tourism has been under-researched. Exploratory research is carried out when there is not much information or studies available on the topic (Neuman, 2000; Sekaran, 2003). The strength of exploratory study is that it is flexible and adaptable according to changes that occur as research progresses, and the focus can be broad initially and become more specific as the research progresses (Saunders, et al., 2003). It is important to bear in mind that this study has an exploratory nature and needs to be flexible and adaptable to possible changes in the research process.

5.6.1. Qualitative research strategies

The main qualitative research strategies include: case studies, grounded theory, narrative research, phenomenology and participatory action research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Yeh and Inman, 2007; Creswell, et al., 2007). Each strategy has its own advantages and disadvantages. However, after careful examination of each research strategy, it was found that none of them were suitable for this study. As space is limited, the features of the main
research strategies are not discussed in great detail, but the reasons why they are not appropriate for this study need to be explained.

Firstly, narrative research is a qualitative research strategy in which a narrative is understood as any text or discourse, with a particular attention to people’s stories (Creswell, et al., 2007). In order to understand how participants’ experiences unfold over time, the stories are analysed by being re-organised in a chronological order. In considering the research questions, this research does not aim to identify how the experience of the participants of inclusion/exclusion from the design of tourism unfolds over time. Thus, a focus on the chronology of people’s experiences is not relevant to this study.

Secondly, case studies are an exploratory research strategy that is used when the research poses ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions (Yin, 2003). There are two main variations of case study. The first are single-case studies that are appropriate under several circumstances, including: when it represents the critical case in testing a well-formulated theory; when the case represents an extreme or unique case; when the case is the representative or typical case; when researchers have opportunities to uncover some prevalent phenomenon previously inaccessible; and when the case is the longitudinal case (Yin, 2003). The aim of this study is not to test a well-developed theory, and it cannot be said that the South East England region represents an extreme or typical case that enables the researcher to identify the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism. Moreover, what this study tried to find out was not previously inaccessible. Secondly, a multiple-case study implies that a study may contain more than a single case (Yin, 2003; Stake, 2005). The key in a multiple-case study is how to define the unit of analysis. Yin (2003) argues that the definition of the unit of analysis (the case) is related to the primary research question in terms of what the research is trying to achieve. It can be said that this research can be conducted in any context and with any participant within the identified tourism stakeholders, not necessarily in South East England or with the recruited interview participants. Thus, neither the research context nor the participants can be regarded as a case; hence, the use of case studies is not an appropriate research strategy for this study.

Thirdly, grounded theory is a qualitative research strategy that is conducted to develop an explanation or a theory of a process, action or interaction formed by participants’ views (Creswell, et al., 2007). The main feature of grounded theory is the generation of a theory
grounded in data. Importantly, grounded theory involves simultaneous data collection and analysis, and analysis is intertwined with ongoing theoretical development until arriving at theoretical saturation (Charmaz, 2005). Grounded theory is appropriate when a researcher attempts to extend an existing theory or develop a theory (Creswell, et al., 2007; Yeh and Inman, 2007). However, the aim of this study is not to develop a theory of inclusive design of tourism, but to identify the barriers in involving disabled people in the design of tourism, and the ways to overcome the barriers that do not need to be common to the recruited participants.

Fourthly, phenomenology is a research strategy that aims to describe what the participants commonly have in experiencing a phenomenon (Creswell, et al., 2007). The main aim of phenomenology is to ‘reduce’ individuals’ experiences of a phenomenon to an account of the common essence by paying more attention to individuals’ specific experiences and statements, and eventually researchers can identify the phenomenon (Yeh and Inman, 2007; Creswell, et al., 2007:252). The aim of this study is not to extract the common essence from participants’ experiences on the inclusion/exclusion from the design of tourism; rather, it seeks to explore the reasons why disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism and the ways toward inclusive design of tourism.

Finally, participatory action research (PAR) aims at improving the lives of people by solving social problems through initiating community action or producing social change, which is a process made by and for disadvantaged, oppressed and socially excluded people (Byrne, 1999; Creswell, et al., 2007). In this regard, PAR is described as emancipatory in helping people to identify and solve social problems (Creswell, et al., 2007). The aim of PAR is achieved in a collaborative way in which participants are involved in research throughout the research process (Yeh and Inman, 2007; Creswell, et al., 2007). The focus of PAR is relevant to this study, which deals with the exclusion of disabled people. However, in order to identify the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism in a comprehensive way, the study needed to collect data from various stakeholders, not only from disabled people.

The selection of research strategy depends on the nature of the research and research questions, since the strategies are different in what they are trying to accomplish. Having considered the features and focus of the five main research strategies, it was found that they do not match exactly with the nature and purpose of the study. Although none of the research strategies were regarded suitable for this study, there is no rule that a study must have one of
the names of the established research strategies. Rather, it can be argued that if the methodological position is firmly clarified and articulated, it is possible to connect the methodology to the empirical world by employing an appropriate research method. The next section deals with the research method selected for this study in connection with the methodological position of the study.

5.6.2. Qualitative research methods

A research method refers to the methods used to collect data. Berg (2004) argues that data collection techniques are intricately associated with theoretical perspectives. Data collection methods need to be selected based on the research questions and methodological paradigms. Among the various qualitative research methods, the interview was employed as a primary method, and documentation, physical artefacts and direct observations were used in conjunction with the primary data collection method solely to support the data from interviews.

Interviews are one of the most common tools used in qualitative research to understand other human beings (Peräkylä, 2005; Fontana and Frey, 2005). Interviews enable researchers to reach areas of interest that would not be accessible otherwise, such as people’s subjective feelings, attitudes and experiences (Peräkylä, 2005). Interviews vary in many ways, such as types, ontological assumptions, and ways of interviewing and the relationship between interviewer and interviewees, depending on the purpose of the research.

Traditionally, the interview is seen as a neutral tool to gather true information from respondents (Fontana and Frey, 2005). It is believed that an interviewer just needs to ask the right questions in the right manner, and the respondent’s reality will be obtained (Holstein and Gubrium, 2002). With such a view toward interviews, the type of interview most used is the structured interview. In structured interviews, the interviewer asks the same pre-established questions to all respondents in the same manner and order. As a result, there is very little flexibility, and structured interviews do not allow the interviewer to exercise independent judgement. However, this perspective is criticised by Fontana and Frey (2005) by referring to Converse and Schuman’s (1974:53) claim that ‘there is no single interview style that fits every occasion or all respondents’.
Qualitative researchers have increasingly realised that an interview is not a neutral data-gathering tool; rather, it is a dynamic interaction between the interviewer and the respondent(s) (Fontana and Frey, 2005). In this regard, Holstein and Gubrium (2002:123, original emphasis) argue that it is important to consider ‘how the meaning-making process unfolds in the interview’ as well as ‘what is substantively asked and conveyed’. Interviews have increasingly been regarded as a conversation or negotiated text, a site where power, gender, race and class intersect (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Fontana and Frey (2005) voiced reflexive concerns about the ways in which the researcher influences the study, both in the methods of data collection and in the techniques of reporting findings. The emphasis is shifting to allow the development of a closer relationship between the interviewer and the respondent. Therefore, it has been argued that the meaning or reality is constructed between the respondent and interviewer. The respondent becomes an ‘active’ interviewee rather than a passive object of the research (Holstein and Gubrium, 2002).

Semi-structured interviews were selected for this study over other qualitative interviews, since semi-structured interviews can not only illustrate ‘what’ and ‘how’ but also investigate the ‘why’ of the objects (Saunders et al., 2003). While a topic guide to interview questions was prepared, these questions can be slightly different in a semi-structured interview depending on the context of the organisation. The advantages of semi-structured interviews are that the main points can be covered by following the list of predetermined questions, and additional questions can flexibly be asked to explore the topic in detail according to the situation. Furthermore, the face-to-face interview was selected as a means of conducting the semi-structured interviews. Face-to-face interviews can help the researcher to clarify doubts and ensure that the interviewees understand the questions properly by repeating or rephrasing the questions (Sekaran, 2003). On the other hand, the expense of time, costs and resource consumption are the main disadvantages of the face-to-face interview (Sekaran, 2003). The time and cost to travel and the cost of sending letters and calling people have to be considered in this research. Semi-structured face-to-face interviews were conducted based on two phases. The detail of the interview strategy is presented in the next section.

Moreover, documentation, physical artefacts and direct observations were used in conjunction with the interviews. Firstly, various forms of documentary information including letters, minutes of meetings, administrative documents, articles and other written reports of events were used in this study. Any document is written for specific purposes, and
documentary information ‘reflects a communication among other parties attempting to achieve some other objectives’ (Yin, 2003:87). Thus, the use of documents requires careful and critical review. Documents can be used to support the evidence from other sources and check the correct spellings, names of organisations or people that are mentioned during interviews (Yin, 2003). Secondly, physical artefacts such as a technological device, a tool or instrument, or some other physical evidence were observed by the researcher when the interview participants showed the researcher their facilities or services that are physically accessible for disabled people. Thirdly, direct observation, which involves observing people's behaviour, or the environmental conditions at the research site, was conducted in this study. It is suggested that direct observation can be conducted in a casual way throughout a field visit when the main data collection is conducted (Yin, 2003). The information from these three methods was not incorporated directly in the data, but it was used to add supplemental information to the data from the primary research.

5.7. Data collection strategy

5.7.1. Interview strategy and questions

The research strategy of this study includes two phases of data collection. They are explained below together with the research objectives to be achieved, the interview participants, interview topics and questions accompanying each phase.

The first phase

The aim of this phase is to answer the first research question: are disabled people included in or excluded from the design of tourism? The purpose of addressing this question is to achieve the following objectives:

• To identify how disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism.
• To identify why disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism.
• To explore the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism.
Therefore, the first phase of data collection deals with the examination of the exclusion/inclusion of disabled people in the design of tourism by looking at the way and the reasons for the exclusion/inclusion.

The interview participants in the first phase are people who are actually in a position to decide whether or not they involve disabled people in their activities. This is because it is these people after all who decide whether they involve disabled people in their activities or not, whatever the motives and reasons for the decision. They were selected from the stakeholders of the design of tourism that are listed in Table 5.1 in section 5.7.2.

The principal interview topics and questions are as follows:
- Have disabled people been involved in their activities or businesses?
- What are the reasons for and against involving disabled people?
- What are the barriers in involving disabled people in the design of tourism?
- Why do the barriers exist?

The interview questions needed to be tailored for each participant in order to obtain relevant answers. The basic interview questions are presented in Appendix 5.

**The second phase**

The second phase of the data collection dealt with the second research question: how can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome? The second phase attempted to achieve the final research objective:

- To discuss how the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism can be overcome.

This phase attempts to explore the way to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism, based on the findings of the first phase of the data collection.

The participants for the second phase were the participants selected for the first phase interviews, and, in addition to them, two more tourism stakeholder groups- local disabled people and disabled tourists- are included. This was done because it is crucial to consider not only the views of the tourism stakeholders for the first phase who are in a position to decide whether they involve disabled people in the design of tourism, but also the views of other
tourism stakeholders who are not in such a position, in discussing possible ways to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism.

The principal interview topics are as follows:
- How do we overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism identified in the first stage of the data collection?
- What do we need/have to do to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism?

These questions were asked based on the barriers toward inclusive design identified through the interviews in the first phase. In order to obtain data to answer the first and second phases' research questions, the participants were asked to answer the first phase interview questions followed by the second phase interview questions in one interview. On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, the participants from the additional two tourism stakeholder groups were asked to answer the second phase interview questions only. Therefore, all of the participants were asked to participate in an interview on one occasion only, and there were no following interviews.

Interviews were conducted in public spaces, but every effort was made to find a quiet space to carry out the interview. The information sheet was shown to the interviewees in order to let them know what was involved in the interview. After the participants understood the information sheet, fully informed consent was given by the participants before starting the interview. The interview itself was conducted based on the topic guide of the interview questions, and it took about between 30 minutes to 1 hour 30 minutes. The interviews were digitally recorded with the prior permission of interviewees.

A pilot study involving two interviews with tourism businesses was conducted before the main data collection. The pilot study gave the researcher an opportunity to check the interview procedure, test the interview instrument and questions, and develop confidence to conduct interviews. Based on the pilot study, the interview questions and interview flow were improved. For instance, one of the lessons from the pilot study was that careful consideration is required in terms of the use of the key words of the study. It was found that the key words such as ‘involvement’, ‘barriers’ and ‘the design of tourism’ can be regarded as vague concepts by the interviewees, thus the interview questions were modified where necessary with simpler words that are easy to understand.
5.7.2. Sampling strategy

As addressed in Chapter 1, the context of this research is the South East England region. This section explains how the interview participants were selected in this context. Participants for the first and second phases were recruited through letters, phone calls and emails, by employing a range of non-probability sampling methods such as judgment sampling, snowball sampling and convenience sampling.

The sampling strategy has to produce an effective way to answer research questions with a small number of people (May, 2002). In order to ensure an adequate sample, non-probability sampling was selected for this research. According to Neuman (2000), non-probability sampling is useful when researchers do not know the whole population. In the South East England context, it is not easy to identify the whole population of tourism stakeholders. In addition, as there is a time limitation to conduct this research (Neuman, 2000), it is impossible to contact the whole population of disabled people and other tourism stakeholders in South East England. Therefore, non-probability sampling suits this research.

To recruit some of the stakeholders, judgment sampling, which is one of the non-probability sampling methods, was employed because it focuses on 'the choice of subjects who are most advantageously placed or in the best position to provide the information required' (Sekaran, 2003:277). It is the only feasible sampling method to obtain information from people who alone have the needed information (Sekaran, 2003). For instance, some of the disability organisations that work on accessible tourism and tourism businesses that are award winners on accessibility are regarded as the respondents who are likely to add particular aspects to the data to answer the research questions. They were identified by the researcher from the list of Access for All Tourism Award winners within Tourism ExSEllence Awards by TSE. In addition, snowball sampling was employed. This involves asking people who have already been contacted to identify other people who fit the selection criteria. Snowball sampling is an effective method when it is difficult to identify populations and when the characteristics of the target are not widely revealed (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003). For example, it was only possible to make an appointment with the Regional Development Agency for an interview by having been introduced by one of the respondents who knew the person in the Agency, because the request for an interview was initially refused by another person in the Agency.
without the introduction. Finally, convenience sampling, which refers to the collection of information from people among the population who are conveniently available, was also used to recruit some of the stakeholders, such as tourism businesses and tourist attractions. In order to gain data from people who do not alone have the needed information, the researcher needed to rely only on possible respondents’ availability. The stakeholder groups such as tourism businesses, tourist attractions and local disability organisations were recruited by using this sampling strategy. The possible respondents were picked up from the lists available on the internet such as lists of local disability organisations, tourist attractions, and tourist information centres in the SEE. In selecting which people to contact, an attention was paid to make sure a good balance in terms of which county they are from, out of the six counties in the SEE. Although convenience sampling tends to produce some influences, as people only appear in the sample due to the ease of obtaining them (Saunders, et al., 2003), the sampling method for some of the stakeholders needs to depend on convenience if there are no other choices to contact them. Therefore, the combination of the non-probability sampling techniques, including the judgement, snowball and convenient sampling methods, were employed for selecting participants from the stakeholder groups.

Contact details of the possible participants were gathered from publicly available sources. Where snowball sampling was used, details were obtained from contacts, but this was disclosed to the respondent. Letters were sent to the possible participants, asking for their participation in the interviews. The letter included the information the participants needed to know, such as the purpose of the research, why they had been contacted and what they will be required to do. A copy of the recruiting letter can be found in Appendix 6. In case the possible participants’ postal addresses were not obvious, the request for participating in an interview was sent by email. The researcher telephoned the possible participants during office hours; after 1 week the request letters or emails were sent off, and they were asked whether or not they could participate in the interview.

In recruiting disabled people for the interviews, the criteria for disabled people needed to be established. As discussed in Chapter 2, this study regards disability as a socially constructed notion and distinguishes disability from impairment. Therefore, the definition of disabled people is not conditioned on the type of impairments. It should be noted that there might be a possibility to obtain different opinions and findings unique to some participants with a particular impairment. For example, there may be unique findings from people with sensory
impairments that cannot be found from people with physical impairments. However, the main intention of this research is not to investigate how different the opinions of disabled people can be, depending on the types of impairment. Rather, the aim of the interview with disabled people was to listen to their opinion in order to explore the research topics from one of the various tourism stakeholders.

As a practical definition for the purposes of data collection, disabled people are those who regard themselves as disabled, and those who belong to and use services of disability charities or local disability groups. Disabled people were recruited through charities and local disability groups that work with disabled people. The charities and disability groups acted as gatekeepers in only recommending potential participants with physical impairments who they believed would have no difficulties in offering informed consent. The researcher contacted potential participants and ensured through questioning that they understood fully what was being asked of them. If the researcher had felt that the potential participant was unable to give informed consent at this point, the interview would have been terminated.

As emphasised above, the nature of the participants' disabilities is not of issue to this research, other than the exclusion of those unable to give informed consent. However, since the charities and disability groups work with people with a range of disabilities, the sample can be expected to include representation from those with various disabilities. In taking a qualitative approach, the study does not seek to produce generalisable results. The detailed description of disabled participants can be found in the Table 5.1 below.

Moreover, there was no need to conduct interviews with disabled children in order to accomplish the aim of this research; therefore, only disabled adults were approached. Similarly, elderly people did not need to be consulted to achieve the aim of this research, and therefore, the researcher asked the disability charities and local disability groups to only recommend people under the age of 65. Again, it was checked that all respondents, regardless of the type of impairments they had, were mentally capable to give fully informed consent and to understand what was being asked, and this was determined by the disability charities and local disability groups. Thus, the criteria of disabled people also excluded people who had mental impairments or impaired cognitive ability.
The selected interview participants based on the sampling methods are listed in Table 5.1 below, together with the nature of the sample and the participant’s code, which is used in the data analysis and the presentation of the findings. The detailed description of disabled participants can be also found in the Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1: The list of the interview participants and participant codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Groups</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>The nature of the participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>GOV (x4)</td>
<td>National tourist board</td>
<td>Responsible for tourism promotion and development in England including accessible tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional development agency</td>
<td>Responsible for tourism in terms of regional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional tourist board (x2)</td>
<td>Responsible for tourism promotion in the SEE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>REG (x3)</td>
<td>County tourist board</td>
<td>Dealing with research and development. Working on accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td></td>
<td>County council 1</td>
<td>Dealing with tourism promotion. Do not particularly have access officer or section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County council 2</td>
<td>Dealing with economic development. Do not particularly have access officer or section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>LOC (x2)</td>
<td>Local tourist board</td>
<td>Dealing with information provision. Working with local disability group. Have Equality Team in their council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td></td>
<td>Town centre management</td>
<td>Working with local access group. The council used to have access officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>TI (x3)</td>
<td>Tourist information centre 1</td>
<td>Working with local disability group and Equality Team in the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist information centre 2</td>
<td>Working with local disability group and access officer in the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist information centre 3</td>
<td>Have not particularly worked on disability and accessibility issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 5:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractions</td>
<td>ATT (x3)</td>
<td>Local gallery 1</td>
<td>Awards winner on accessibility. Working with local disabled people. Have an internal disability focus group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local gallery 2</td>
<td>Working with local disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping complex</td>
<td>Working with disability organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 6:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>TRA (x4)</td>
<td>Train company</td>
<td>Have an access manager. Working with local disability groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7: Tourism businesses</td>
<td>BUS (x4)</td>
<td>Do not particularly have access officer or section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline company</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have a diversity manager. Have an internal disability group. Working with disabled people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry company</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do not particularly have access officer or section. Working with disability organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8: Non-profit organisations</td>
<td>NPO (x3)</td>
<td>The respondent: a wheelchair user.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO for natural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have an access officer and internal disability group. Have Forums and scheme on accessibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPO for heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have officers on social inclusion and diversity. Working with disability organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity for conservation of cultural and environmental assets</td>
<td>Have an access officer. Working with disability organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 9: Disability organisations</td>
<td>DORG (x5)</td>
<td>Organisation working with people with cerebral palsy. The respondent: a wheelchair user with cerebral palsy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability organisation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisations for and of blind and partially sighted people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability organisation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pan-disability network. Working with disability organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability organisation 3 (x2)</td>
<td>Charity for accessible tourism</td>
<td>Charity to promote accessible tourism. Working with disability organisations and tourism businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 10: Local disabled people</td>
<td>COMD (x3)</td>
<td>The respondent: a scooter user.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local disability organisation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The respondent: having walking difficulty and being deaf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local disability organisation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>The respondent: a wheelchair user.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local disability organisation 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>The respondent: a wheelchair user.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 11: Disabled tourists</td>
<td>TSTD (x2)</td>
<td>The respondent: a wheelchair user.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled tourist 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The respondent: a wheelchair user.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled tourist 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>The respondent: a wheelchair user.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A limitation of the selected sampling methods was recognised after data analysis. It should be noted that the findings from the disabled respondents might not have reflected the view of the 'truly marginalised' disabled people. This is because the disabled respondents recruited for
the data collection can be regarded as those who are called ‘active’ disabled people. It might be suggested that the researcher only interviewed active disabled people, since the recruitment of disabled people was done through disability charities and local disability groups based on the recruitment plan developed with ethical consideration; disabled people who belong to these organisations and are interested in participating in this kind of interview are likely to be active disabled people. In other words, it was unlikely that the truly marginalised disabled people, such as housebound or unemployed disabled people, were approached by the researcher. Although this study does not aim to present a generalised view of disabled people, it might have been more meaningful if the view of the truly marginalised disabled people had also been obtained in the data. Therefore, this point can be included as one of the limitations of this study.

5.7.3. Number of participants

The total number of participants was set to be between 23 to 35 people. This number comes from the sum of the number of participants, ranging between 1 to 3 people, from each tourism stakeholder group. All of the stakeholder groups were contacted. The researcher spoke with 35 people from a range of tourism stakeholders. Of these, 5 people in total were interviewed because they have a disability. The list of the interview participants above shows that the number of disabled and non-disabled participants is not balanced. This is due to the aim of the interview, which is to listen to all tourism stakeholders on the issue under study, including those who are in the position to decide whether they involve disabled people in their business or activities or not, and also those who are not in such a position. Thus, disabled people are only a small part of the wide range of tourism stakeholder groups.

It has been pointed out that there is no firm rule concerning how many interviews need to be done until data saturation (Travers, 2001; Creswell, et al., 2007). The number of interviews is determined by many factors such as the time available and the costs involved in collecting, transcribing and analysing the data (Travers, 2001). Creswell et al. (2007:251) explain in their research that their choice of participants is not based on a correct number, but ‘on the idea that our theory needs to be well detailed and saturated at a point where any new information gathered would not further develop our model’. Although this statement is derived from their research employing grounded theory, it has a meaningful implication for considering data saturation. This study takes the same stance. When no more new findings
and categories were found from the data, a decision was taken to stop the data collection, and
no more interviews were conducted. This study initially saw 23-35 people as a reasonable
point to reach data saturation, while the actual number of interviews ended in 35. All
interviews were transcribed and analysis was ongoing throughout the data collection. This
helped the researcher to recognise when data saturation occurred, as it occurred. Table 5.1 in
the previous section shows the number of interview participants and their stakeholder groups.

5.8. Qualitative data analysis strategy

Analysis of data gathered through qualitative research has been seen as a troublesome process
due to the attributes of qualitative data, which are essentially diverse, non-standardised,
heterogeneous and difficult to classify (Turner, 1994). The aim of qualitative analysis is to
establish patterns, themes, and relationships that show the participants’ view toward the topic
under study (Yeh and Inman, 2007). Ritchie and Spencer (1994) suggest an analytical process,
which incorporates a number of distinctive though highly interconnected stages, including
familiarisation, identifying a thematic framework, indexing, charting, and mapping and
interpretation. Following a well-defined procedure allows the researcher to re-examine and
revise ideas accurately as the analytical process is documented and thus accessible (Ritchie
and Spencer, 1994). This study employs Ritchie and Spencer’s (1994) data analysis process
as follows:

Stage 1: Familiarisation
Firstly, it is important to be familiar with the range and diversity of the data before beginning
the process of classifying the data, since familiarisation allows the researcher to gain an
overview of the material gathered and a feel for the material as a whole. This stage involves
immersion in the data, such as listening to the tapes and reading the transcripts. Additionally,
this stage is also the beginning of the process of abstraction and conceptualisation. Therefore,
key ideas and recurrent themes are jotted down during this stage.

Stage 2: Identifying a thematic framework
At the second stage, the researcher returns to the research notes and tries to identify the key
issues, concepts and themes. In other words, a thematic framework is developed at this stage,
and the material can be sifted and categorised within the framework. In order to develop the
thematic framework, it is necessary to seek conceptualisations that encapsulate and represent the diversity of the phenomena. The thematic framework was continuously altered throughout the data analysis process.

**Stage 3: Indexing**

The third stage denotes the procedure in which the thematic framework is systematically applied to the data in its textual form. At this stage, all the data are reviewed and annotated according to the thematic framework. Index references are displayed on each transcript by a numerical system, which helps the researcher to access each reference and see patterns and the contexts. One of the advantages of indexing is that the procedure is done in a visible and accessible way to others; therefore, others can understand how the data is sifted and organised. Moreover, indexing is an effective method to see the relationships between the themes since it is quite common to find that different main topics are connected and interlinked each other.

**Stage 4: Charting**

At the fourth stage, a whole picture of the data is formed by examining the range of phenomena for each issue or theme. Data is picked from the original context and rearranged according to the thematic references and charts with headings and subheadings. In this process, cases should always be kept in the same order for each subject chart, since it becomes easier for the researcher to review the whole dataset for each case and to make a comparison between and within the cases.

**Stage 5: Mapping and Interpretation**

At the final stage, researchers begin to organise key attributes of the data and to draw and interpret the dataset as a whole. The basic processes at this stage are: reviewing the charts and research notes, comparing and contrasting the phenomena, searching for patterns and relationships, and seeking explanations for these.

How this study conducted data analysis by applying Ritchie and Spencer's (1994) analytic process should be explained. At the familiarisation stage, the researcher listened to the 35 recorded interviews at least twice in order to acquire the immersion in the data, and the interview transcripts were produced. One of the interview transcripts of this research is presented in Appendix 7. Moreover, the researcher read the transcripts carefully and started
to gain broad ideas and themes at this stage. At the second stage, the researcher concentrated on the transcripts and tried to identify key issues, concepts and themes and developed a thematic framework. At the third indexing stage, all the data were annotated according to the established thematic framework. The index references were manually displayed on the two transcription books. At the charting stage, the data was picked from the transcription books and rearranged according to the thematic references in the chart book with headings and sub-headings. At the last stage, the researcher reviewed the chart book and interpreted the data. The relationship among the themes and sub-themes appeared in the previous stage was examined, and some of them were re-organised in writing up the data analysis and discussion. The thematic framework was continuously altered throughout the data analysis process. It should be noted the way to develop the thematic framework was essentially related closely to the literature review. In other words, the thematic framework and references developed in the data analysis process are linked to the key concepts of the study established through the literature review.

The key throughout the data analysis framework involving the five stages is to deconstruct data. Deconstructing evidence denotes the continuous examination and refinement of data (Yeh and Inman, 2007). The aim of qualitative analysis is to establish patterns, themes, and relationships that show the participants’ view toward the topic under study, and it can be done by deconstructing data and constructing themes, relations and categories that are all rooted in the data (Yeh and Inman, 2007). Thus, the deconstructing data and creating themes was carried out throughout the data analysis process.

In terms of the ontological position of this research underpinned by the constructive-interpretive paradigm, it does not support the generalisation of the findings or produce universal laws of the phenomena under study. Instead, this research, taking the constructivism and interpretivism position, focuses on understanding the phenomena and tries to obtain a deeper meaning of the phenomena, which is often time, place, and context specific in nature. However, this does not necessarily mean that the findings of this study cannot be applied to any other contexts. Rather, the findings of the study may have meaningful implications for different contexts where the exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism is found.
5.9. Quality issues in qualitative research

The goodness of research in conventional quantitative and positivistic research is measured in terms of reliability, internal and external validity and objectivity. However, it is argued by qualitative researchers that these criteria used in quantitative research cannot be applied directly to qualitative research (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; King, 1994), as they cannot capture the range of issues that a concern for quality must address (Seale, 1999). In the interpretive paradigms, the concept of trustworthiness is the core of the quality issues (Seale, 1999). The positivist standards of quality are replaced by the alternative criteria to ensure trustworthiness such as credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). This section addresses how this study assures the alternative quality criteria to enhance trustworthiness of the research.

Firstly, credibility refers to ‘how truthful particular findings are’ (Decrop, 2004:159). This element of trustworthiness of research includes the quality and depth of qualitative data with various aspects of evidence. Credibility of data does not necessarily mean to obtain expected data. Rather, it is necessary to face inconsistent or negative cases as they can provide meaningful opportunities to understand the complexity of the researched phenomena (Yeh and Inman, 2007). Credibility can be enhanced by techniques such as prolonged engagement in the field, persistent observation, referential adequacy, repeated comparisons and member checks (Seale, 1999; Decrop, 2004; Yeh and Inman, 2007). This study gathered and utilised various documentary information including minutes of meetings, administrative documents, articles and other written reports of events in order to enhance referential adequacy which is concerned with the arrangement of contextual information in order to support the interpretation and analysis of the data (Decrop, 2004). The interviewees were contacted by the researcher after the interviews where necessarily in order to ensure that the data is precise and avoid the likelihood of misinterpretation of the data. In terms of repeated comparisons, the researcher continuously compared the categories, themes and concepts against the empirical material including negative and inconsistent data in order to make the findings credible.

Secondly, transferability, which concerns ‘the extent to which the research findings are applicable to another setting or group’ (Decrop, 2004:159), is also regarded as a criterion to enhance trustworthiness of research. Transferability in this study is enabled by employing
non-probability sampling methods and writing thick descriptions (Decrop, 2004). The sample of this study was established as varied as possible in order to acquire the broadest range of information from the 11 stakeholder groups that represent the comprehensive stakeholders in relation to the research setting. Moreover, thick descriptions of the data were provided to enhance transferability by presenting the interview quotations, and it can give readers the opportunity to interpret the data, appraise the findings and judge the applicability of the findings to other settings (Seale, 1999; Decrop, 2004).

Thirdly, dependability which replaces reliability in the conventional positivistic research is concerned with ‘whether the results are consistent and reproducible’ (Decrop, 2004:159). Dependability can be achieved by a course of action called ‘auditing’ which ‘consists of the researchers’ documentation of data, method and decisions made during a project, as well as its end product’ (Seale, 1999:45). In order to increase dependability, this study has elaborated on the research procedure including how the research was designed and conducted throughout this chapter as clearly as possible.

Finally, confirmability is a criterion to enhance trustworthiness which relates to ‘how neutral the findings are’ (Decrop, 2004:159). Confirmability can be achieved by ‘auditing’ which has been also addressed in dependability. Auditing in confirmability is ‘an exercise in reflexivity, which involves the provision of a methodologically self-critical account of how the research was done...’ (Seale, 1999:45). The reflexive issues have been discussed in this chapter (5.4.) by highlighting the researcher’s backgrounds and standpoint along with her personal experiences (1.1.) that have lead her to conduct this piece of research. By taking this self-reflexive approach, it is possible to be cognisant of the influences of the researcher’s self on research process (Yeh and Inman, 2007). This reflexive openness is crucial to maintain and promote fairness through the research process.

In considering quality and trustworthiness of this study, it should be acknowledged that trustworthiness and its criteria cannot be used as a final proof to ensure quality of research (Seale, 1999). This is because criteria of quality essentially depend on the research paradigmatic stance (Decrop, 1999; Morrow, 2007), and they offer only limited guidance to researchers to learn techniques and procedures that can contribute to improving the quality of their research (Seale, 1999). In this sense, ‘the quality of research is not automatically determined by the imposition of generalised quality criteria, but such schemes can help
sensitize researchers to the issues that a particular project may need to address' (Seale, 1999:50). Thus, the criteria to enhance trustworthiness addressed in this section are used in this study not to guarantee the overall quality of the research, but to highlight the methodological sensitivity and adequacy of the study based on the selected research paradigms.

5.10. Chapter conclusion and summary

This chapter examined different qualitative research paradigms, research strategies and methods, and the selected methodologies and methods were presented. The study adopts the methodological position of the interpretivism-constructivism paradigms informed by the critical perspective, and the semi-structured interview was employed as the main data collection method. Direct observation, documentary information, physical artefacts were used, where appropriate and available, as sources of data to support the primary data from the interviews. Although they were not directly incorporated into the main data, it can be said that they had an influence on how the researcher interpreted the data. The impression the researcher had from this data might have affected the interpretation of what the participants said during the interviews.

It is important to note that there are many possible methods to investigate the research topic. The employed research methods are not the only the methods this research could use; however, they were selected and regarded as the most advantageous among others based on the nature of the research questions and the researcher’s methodological position. Tribe (2001) points out that different research methods produce different outcomes. After all, the findings of this research are the findings generated by this particular researcher. As Denzin and Lincoln (2005:26) state, ‘there is no single interpretive truth’. Thus, this chapter focused on explaining why the particular methodology and methods were selected.

This chapter concludes with the summary of this study’s methodology and methods in Table 5.2 below, including the selected methodological paradigms, data collection methods, interview participants and interview questions, in relation to the research questions and objectives.
Table 5.2: Summary of the selected methodologies and methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Phase</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research questions</strong></td>
<td>Are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism?</td>
<td>How can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Research objectives** | - To examine if there is inclusion/exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism.  
                          | - To explore how disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism.       
                          | - To consider why disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism.      | - To discuss how the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism can be overcome.       |
| **Research paradigms** | The constructivism-interpretivism paradigm informed by the critical-ideological perspective |                                                                                       |
| **Data collection methods** | Face-to-face semi-structured interviews  
                          | (Direct observation, documentary information, physical artefacts: used as sources of data to support the primary data from the interviews) |                                                                                       |
| **Research context** | South East England  
                          | (Involving six sub-regions: Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire; Hampshire; Isle of Wight; Surrey and West Sussex; East Sussex; and Kent) |                                                                                       |
| **Participants** | - Governmental agencies  
                          | - Regional government  
                          | - Local government  
                          | - Tourist Information  
                          | - Attractions  
                          | - Transport  
                          | - Tourism businesses  
                          | - Non-profit organisations  
                          | (People who are in a position to decide whether or not they involve disabled people in their activities or businesses) | - Governmental agencies  
                          | - Regional government  
                          | - Local government  
                          | - Tourist Information  
                          | - Attractions  
                          | - Transport  
                          | - Tourism businesses  
                          | - Non-profit organisations  
                          | - Disability organisations  
                          | - Local disabled people  
                          | - Disabled tourists  
                          | (Including disabled people in addition to the participants in the 1<sup>st</sup> phase) |                                                                                       |
| **Number of participants** | 35 participants |                                                                                       |
| **Main interview questions** | - Have tourism businesses and organisations involved disabled people in their activities or businesses?  
                          | - What are the reasons for involving or not involving disabled people?  
                          | - What are the barriers in involving disabled people in the design of tourism?  
                          | - Why do the barriers exist? | - How do we overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism identified in the 1<sup>st</sup> stage of the data collection?  
                          | - What do we need to do or have to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism? |
CHAPTER 6
BARRIERS TO INVOLVING DISABLED PEOPLE
IN THE DESIGN OF TOURISM

6.1. Introduction

This and the next chapter present the findings of the primary research, which involved 35 interviews with people from the eleven main stakeholder groups in relation to the area of accessible tourism in South East England. The interview participants and participant codes are listed in Table 5.1 in the previous chapter.

Before presenting the findings, it is useful to repeat the research questions here:

1) Are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism?
2) How can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome?

The data was analysed based on the four sections (findings 1-4 in the Table 6.1) in order to demonstrate the link to the research questions. Findings 1 and 2 could answer the first research question, and findings 3 and 4 can support answering the second research question as summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism?</td>
<td>Finding 1: Involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and reasons for the involvement.</td>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding 2: Non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and reasons for the non-involvement.</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome?</td>
<td>Finding 3: Barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding 4: Possible ways and hints to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism</td>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the findings presented in each section inevitably overlap, as the topics and issues discussed by the participants are related to each other. For instance, the reason for non-involvement of disabled people can be found as a barrier to involve disabled people, depending on how the interview participants answer. Moreover, the reason for the involvement of disabled people can be found as a hint as to how to overcome the identified barriers toward inclusive design of tourism. In order to avoid presenting overlapped findings repeatedly, the presentation of the findings is made in the two chapters: ‘Barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism’ (Chapter 6) incorporating the findings on the non-involvement of disabled people into the design of tourism and the reasons for this; and, ‘Ways toward inclusive design of tourism’ (Chapter 7) incorporating the findings on the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and its reasons.

The findings are presented in relation to the eight stages of the design of tourism below (Figure 6.1). The involvement of disabled people can take any form, as explained in Chapter 4 on inclusive design of tourism. For example, at the sales stage, disabled people can be involved as employees who work for tourism businesses and organisations, or customers who purchase the tourism products and services, plus any other forms of involvement mentioned by the interview participants can be included.
Chapter 6 presents the first part of the findings concerning the barriers in involving disabled people in the design of tourism, in incorporating the findings of the non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and its reasons. The findings show the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism in a comprehensive way, not only from the guest perspective addressed in Chapter 2, but also from the perspectives of different tourism stakeholders.

The findings are classified in five main categories: lack of awareness and knowledge; already have confidence; lack of interest and low priority issues; organisational constraints and stakeholder conflicts; and barriers toward inclusive design of tourism from the perspective of disabled people.

6.2. Lack of awareness and knowledge

It was found that the interview respondents believe there is greater disability awareness in society than there was before, and people are more aware of the needs of disabled people. The respondents actually showed that they understand that there are different disabilities with different needs; they appreciate that disability issues are a part of the wider equality and social exclusion issues, and they value the concept of the social model of disability.

However, the majority of the respondents stated that there is still a lack of awareness and understanding of disability issues among tourism businesses and organisations. [DORG-2] suggested that tourism businesses and organisations ‘pretend’ they know about disability awareness, and [NPO-2] added that non-disabled people think they know the needs of disabled people and make assumptions about what disabled people need, and this leads to a misunderstanding of disability issues. For example, [ATT-1] indicated that people tend to think disabled people are all in wheelchairs. [REG-3] also introduced an example of the danger of making assumptions of disabled people's needs without involving disabled people.

'I think, there is a lack of awareness... I was talking to someone from the Accentuate (the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games legacy programme for the South East), who went to our hotel, not in our county, but in the South East, and they felt that they would provide...they had a ground floor room and everything, but the reception was in upstairs.'
And so, she had to be checked-in outside on the ground, so, I think there is a lack of awareness.' [REG-3]

In addition, it was suggested that some non-disabled people still have prejudice and wrongly perceive that disabled people are always complaining and moaning; therefore, disabled people are regarded as troublemakers ([TRA-4], [BUS-3] and [COMD-1]).

'...the biggest barrier to advancement and, and change and people adopting the inclusive tourism stance, if you will, is there is this stigma attached to: the disabled community are trouble-makers, difficult to please, demanding and, in turn, will probably go to the law courts and seek compensation.' [BUS-3]

Moreover, [COMD-1] stated that disabled people are portrayed as 'pathetic creatures, these poor things that cannot do things for themselves'. This point links to the issue of the representation of disability, suggesting that disability is represented in the media as a personal misfortune by exaggerating or romanticising disability (Shakespeare, 1994). This view toward disability clearly confirms the personal tragedy theory proposed by Oliver (1986) which explains that people’s lives suffer and are ruined by the unfortunate event to be a disabled. The finding supports French and Swain’s (2004) argument that the view of personal tragedy theory is still prevailing in society. [DORG-4] also introduced the idea that there is a misconception among businesses and organisations that disabled people cannot make good decisions as customers. [COMD-2] clearly stated that prejudice is human nature.

'I mean, you always have prejudice, I don’t think any.... human being is human beings, and we always have prejudice whether it’s in any place in the world, in a place whatever. And that’s something that everybody has to deal with, whether you are a woman, whether you are skinny or dark, or whether you’ve got a disability, doesn’t make any difference, so you’ve got to run up against people who have prejudices, that’s human nature.' [COMD-2]

This finding supports the argument discussed in Chapter 3 on social exclusion where various forms of prejudice and exclusion are indispensable to any social relationship (Marshall, 1950; Madanipour, 1998; O’Brien and Penna, 1996; Riley, 1992; Yar and Penna, 2004). [COMD-2]’s statement might imply that they realise consciously or unconsciously that social inequality and marginalisation of ‘others’ (disabled people) is a requisite for modern society.
In this regard, therefore, as stressed in Chapter 3, if exclusionary processes are necessary for the social world, what is needed is to add and promote more inclusionary activities.

Misunderstanding and lack of disability awareness can lead to non-disabled people’s patronising attitude toward disabled people. Attitudinal barriers are regarded as the main interpersonal barrier for disabled people to get involved in the design of tourism, which occur in the interaction and relationship between people (Hall and Brown, 2006). Examples of non-disabled people’s inappropriate attitudes toward disabled people were introduced by the disabled respondents.

‘You know, the amount of blind people that have been just dragged across a road because they don’t want to go; they stop there thinking, I wonder what time it is, and, now, where am I exactly in the street now so that I know which shop I’m going into? And they say, I’ll help you across the road, love. And off they go. Not, can I help you? Do you need to get across the road? They just drag you across the road. I can promise you, the amount of blind people that end up on the wrong side of the road, somewhere where they don’t want to go to. It’s regular.’ [COMD-1]

‘The barriers are people’s attitudes, aren’t they? I mean, what, the attitude I’ve certainly picked up on, at the Zakinthos end, from the Greek, is that I wasn’t told, you know, it’s a bit like smacked a bit, my brother said, of, does she take sugar? You know, it’s this sort of attitude. But you don’t get even spoken to, and things discussed... ’ [TSTD-2]

These examples might support Finkelstein’s (2004) argument that ‘able-bodied’ people who are dominant, in the majority and common in society have enough power to define disabled people as ‘others’ and to place them at the margin of society. The ‘able-bodied’ people give a particular role to disabled people as ‘others’. This further reflects the concept of ‘objectification’ in which disabled people are passive and objects rather than subjects (Shakespeare, 1994), and this leads to non-disabled people’s patronising and inappropriate attitudes toward disabled people. These non-disabled people’s attitude toward disabled people, and the misunderstanding and lack of disability awareness were introduced as a barrier towards making the design of tourism inclusive of disabled people.
On the other hand, lack of knowledge on disability issues also emerged as a barrier to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. Lack of knowledge is different from lack of disability awareness. While lack of disability awareness implies misunderstanding, misconception, bias and prejudice about disability, lack of knowledge indicates people simply do not know about disability issues for some reason; therefore, they had never thought about involving disabled people in the design of tourism. In brief, people cannot do or think of what they do not know.

Several respondents frankly said that they do not know what disabled people’s needs are ([GOV-2b]), and that they had simply never thought about involving disabled people in the design of tourism ([REG-2]). Moreover, [GOV-2b] did not know that local disability groups existed in their area; therefore, this respondent had not thought about involving local disabled people in the design of tourism. However, this does not mean that they do not intend to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. The disabled respondents, such as [COMD-2], [COMD-3] and [TSTD-1], also suggested that a lack of knowledge among tourism businesses and organisations is a barrier toward inclusive design of tourism. This is because, if they have not considered involving disabled people, they will never think about involving disabled people in what they are doing. [TSTD-1] mentioned that some non-disabled people are not trying to exclude disabled people, but they do not know the needs of disabled people, or, as [COMD-2] pointed out, ‘they don’t realise that they should do it’.

It emerged that a lack of knowledge leads to fear and anxiety in terms of involving disabled people in the design of tourism. Campbell (2000) points out that service providers are not sure how to deal with disabled people and do not feel comfortable with them. This lack of awareness, understanding and knowledge of disability can lead to negative attitudes toward disabled people (Darcy, 2007). By referring to Longmore (1987:66), Shakespeare (1994) explains: ‘What we fear, we often stigmatise and shun and sometimes seek to destroy...’ The respondents ([GOV-2a], [ATT-2], [BUS-2], [DORG-4] and [COMD-2]) argued that tourism businesses and organisations hesitate to involve disabled people due to fear or nervousness.

'Because some people feel very uncomfortable with people with disabilities whether they are blind or deaf or in a wheelchair. ...(When they had a person in a wheelchair to work for them during her summer holiday) And I noticed it, when we were in there sometimes, her and me, that people come through the door and they would see Ms A in a wheelchair, and they will
come to me. Now, I could be really mean, because I would stand back, so they have to actually, because the whole idea was Ms A got experience. But you could see that people were uncomfortable.' [COMD-2]

[GOV-1] and [BUS-4] explained that this fear is a result of a lack of knowledge and confidence in working with disabled people. As Murray and Sproats (1990) and Goodhall et al. (2004) point out, service providers are not aware of the needs of disabled people and do not have knowledge of what can easily be done to improve accessibility. [NPO-3] also pointed out that this fear might come from a lack of confidence in managing the expectations of disabled people because tourism businesses and organisations worry about not being able to deliver what disabled people want. Similarly, [DORG-3b] added that 'people are worried about providing something and not doing enough'. For this reason, [DORG-3b] suggested that tourism businesses often do not promote their accessible products and services in an active way, as they are afraid that if disabled people come and say what they are doing is not enough, disabled people would sue them. [REG-3] also pointed out that people are scared of upsetting disabled people, so they prefer not to deal with disabled people at all.

Moreover, it was pointed out that tourism businesses and organisations are worried about what they are going to be required to do, as a result of the involvement of disabled people. Several respondents pointed to the fear among businesses with regard to the DDA and the NAS. Businesses are worried what they are going to be 'forced' to make changes for disabled people ([REG-2]), and they are scared of receiving many expensive suggestions if they join the NAS ([BUS-2]). This finding might link to the argument of Phillips (2002) and Goodhall et al. (2004) that the tourism industry perceives that the cost of creating accessible products and services is high and that this outweighs the commercial benefits of having disabled customers.

6.3. Already have confidence

It became apparent from the findings that tourism businesses and organisations that already have confidence in what they are doing do not involve disabled people in the design of tourism. This reason was one of the most significant reasons for the non-involvement of
disabled people and can be regarded as a barrier in involving disabled people in the design of tourism. The respondents revealed this confidence in different ways.

Firstly, it emerged that the respondents who have confidence with the external sources they use do not involve disabled people in some of the stages of the design of tourism. For instance, [REG-1], [REG-2], [TRA-1] and [BUS-1] are confident with the access standards provided by Tourist Boards, IT providers or manufacturers; therefore, they did not think that they needed to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. However, it is not guaranteed that these standards and guidelines can be interpreted correctly. Thus, it is suggested that the standards and guidelines should be regarded as a resource to answer specific questions, rather than as the central benchmark in the design of tourism (Keates and Clarkson, 2004). Moreover, in terms of the use of external sources, [GOV-2a] and [BUS-4] did not involve disabled people in some of the stages of the design of tourism because they employed access consultants. The use of access consultants accords with the ‘expert appraisal’ approach, which is one of the inclusive design approaches that were introduced in Chapter 4.

Secondly, several respondents showed that they have confidence in their experience of working with disabled people ([ATT-3] and [BUS-1]) and the training programmes or trainers they have developed over the years ([ATT-2] and [TRA-2]); therefore, they did not think that they needed to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. In relation to this point, it was found that several respondents felt that it was enough to involve disabled people only in one of the stages of the design of tourism. For instance, [GOV-1] explained that one reason for the non-involvement of disabled people in planning a new project was because the project was partly born out of research they had conducted with disabled people, and therefore the project already reflected disabled people's views. In addition, [GOV-2b] justified their non-involvement of disabled people in the planning and developing stages on the basis that, once people took Welcome All training, they can learn the needs of disabled people from it, and this affects their planning and development of new projects or services. Therefore, the respondents showed that they involve disabled people in a particular stage of the design of tourism, and their input at this stage can affect the rest of the stages; therefore, disabled people do not necessarily have to be involved throughout the other stages of the design of tourism. This idea can be shown in the figure below:
The concentration on one stage can be also found in the context of inclusive design. The involvement of users in the design process often takes place only in one stage, at the end of the design process, to confirm if the final design has met the needs of the users, since the single large evaluation method could be the fastest way to complete the design (Keates and Clarkson, 2004). However, the problem of this approach is that there may be many problems to be considered at the end of the design process, particularly in inclusive design, since the designer has to deal with a range of user capabilities that the designer may not be familiar with (Keates and Clarkson, 2004). Similarly, in the design of tourism, the method of involving disabled people only in one stage might have weaknesses. For instance, although non-disabled people can learn the needs of disabled people at the training stages, there is no guarantee that the knowledge obtained from the training is useful to the other stages of the design of tourism. Thus, it is recommended to have the frequent involvement of disabled people throughout the design process (Keates and Clarkson, 2004; Dong and Clarkson, 2006) in order to have input from disabled people, identify problems and solve them in a proactive way.
Finally, [TRA-3] explained that one reason for their non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism was because they do not feel they have to involve disabled people, as they do not receive any negative feedback from disabled people. Thus, the fact that they do not get negative feedback from disabled people leads to their confidence in what they are doing, and it makes them think that they do not need to involve disabled people in the design of tourism.

This finding matches with the finding of a survey by the Department for Education and Employment in 1998, where the main reason for not taking action on disability provision in most businesses was that they believed that their services were fully accessible to disabled people (Shaw, 2007). However, in the same survey, about 70% of the businesses did not have staff training on disability. This indicates that the businesses' confidence in their disability provision does not necessarily reflect their awareness and understanding of disability. Moreover, some of the findings on the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism indicate that, although tourism businesses and organisations have confidence in what they offer to disabled people, this does not always match with the actual needs of disabled people. According to Campbell (2000), tourism businesses often do not realise that they offer poor standards of service to disabled people. Thus, it can be said that there is a gap between how tourism businesses and organisations evaluate their own products and services, and how disabled people assess or perceive them.

### 6.4. Lack of interest and low priority issues

It became apparent in the theming process that some of the identified barriers toward inclusive design of tourism arose from a lack of interest and low prioritisation among tourism businesses and organisations in involving disabled people in the design of tourism.

The first identified barrier related to the lack of interest and low priority issues is the limitation in resources such as time, budget and statistics. Financial barriers and lack of time are regarded as types of structural barriers that arise in relation to the social structure (Hall and Brown, 2006) as introduced in Chapter 2. Firstly, time constraints were raised as a barrier in involving disabled people in the design of tourism. It was suggested that time constraints are particularly significant for small tourism businesses such as guesthouses or B&Bs.
3], [BUS-1], [DORG-1] and [COMD-2]). For example, [BUS-1] said that it is difficult for them to find time to attend training courses, including Welcome All, as the owner runs the business on her own. Several respondents from the public sector ([GOV-2b], [REG-2] and [LOC-1]) expressed the difficulty of finding time to involve disabled people in the design of tourism, as they have their daily jobs and the disability issue is just a small part of their jobs.

'Quite a lot of staff time, and you know... so it's, it's something that needs to be considered, uh, amongst all of the other work that's going on, which isn't an excuse.' [REG-2]

On the other hand, [LOC-2&TI-3], [TSTD-1] and [TSTD-2] pointed out that time cannot be a barrier in involving disabled people in the design of tourism; rather, it is a matter of where tourism businesses and organisations place their priorities.

'In terms of the Visitor Information Centre, no. Time isn't a barrier. We make the time to provide the service relevant to their needs. ...There is a time element there and maybe cost element, because it costs to put advert into the publications that we are not currently doing. But again, it would be, have to be measured and weighed against other priorities. And if it deems to be important, it goes up the list, and money is found. So, I don't think locally, time or cost is a barrier.' [LOC-2&TI-3]

'These time, budget and space, they have to decide who they want to attract to their business... How much time and money and space they've got, it is fixed. And they have decided and they get concentrated on a certain group of people, and that is their decision. ...But it's entirely up to each company who they are going to target as their prime market.' [TSTD-1]

Secondly, budget limitations emerged as a barrier to involve disabled people in the design of tourism among most of the respondents. Several respondents revealed that they face budget cuts in what they are doing, and it becomes a barrier to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. [REG-2] disclosed that budget cuts across the county and district councils have had a huge impact on what they can do in tourism. In fact, one of the district councils in their area has withdrawn from tourism completely. Therefore, it is difficult for them to find money to spend on disability issues. Furthermore, it was stressed that it is particularly difficult to find money to spend on disability issues in the current recession.
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'So, it's just quite difficult at the moment with the recession. They (tourism businesses) are just trying to survive.' [LOC-1]

However, [GOV-1] pointed out that '...businesses are very quick to say "cost is the issue"'. [DORG-4] also criticised this claim on the basis that not having money to involve disabled people simply sounds like poor planning. In this regard, it was suggested again that it is a matter of where tourism businesses and organisations place their priorities ([NPO-2]), and how they manage what disabled people want and what they can afford to do ([BUS-4]). In considering the priority issues, 'what they can afford to do' can be understood as 'what they are prepared to do'.

Finally, several respondents mentioned that a lack of statistics is a barrier toward inclusive design of tourism. This was particularly the case for respondents from the public sector. ([GOV-2b], [REG-1], [REG-2] and [REG-3]) asserted that without having enough statistics or data to back up the benefit of involving disabled people, it is difficult for them to encourage tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people. However, [DORG-1] indicated that information and statistics are already available, but people do not know where to find the information.

'Well, it's being aware of where that information and knowledge is available. I mean, anyone that wants to know about information and knowledge will go to the LGA, Government Authority, or go to their development agency and say to them, where can I get more information and then there will be a list of resources and we'll be on there, amongst many other organisations. ...Information and knowledge, there's a lot of it out there already. There's a lot of it online and a lot of it free of charge. It's knowing where that is.' [DORG-1]

The second barrier related to the lack of interest and low priority among tourism businesses and organisation is physical barriers. Several respondents mentioned that physical accessibility in their buildings becomes a barrier when they consider involving disabled people. In particular, it was emphasised that it is difficult or sometimes impossible to make changes at listed buildings and in historic towns ([GOV-2b], [REG-2], [LOC-1], [TI-2], [TRA-2] and [NPO-3]). This point accords with Goodhall et al.'s (2004) study, which shows
the difficulty involved in making changes to heritage environments in order to improve accessibility.

A number of ways to overcome the physical barriers were identified, including finding alternative ways to deliver the service ([LOC-2&TI-3]), and informing disabled people about any possible limitations in advance ([BUS-3]). Moreover, [COMD-1] suggested that, in order to avoid having physical barriers, it is crucial to involve disabled people in the very first stage of design, when any new development or improvement of products or facilities is planned.

Physical barriers were also emphasised by the disabled respondents as a barrier toward inclusive design of tourism. It was found that physical barriers prevent disabled people from participating in the stages of the design of tourism, such as inaccessible meeting venues at the planning stage, inaccessible feedback forms at the feedback stage and inaccessible venues, as well as the inaccessible nature of the surrounding area and transport at the sales stage. As Smith (1987) argues, physical barriers not only deny disabled people's mobility and physical access to the environment, but also prevent them from using the existing resources. [COMD-1], [COMD-2], [TSTD-1] and [TSTD-2] pointed out that although they are willing to attend tourism businesses' and organisations' meetings that are open to public to give feedback on their service, if the meeting venues are not accessible, disabled people are not physically able to participate in the meetings.

In addition, the disabled respondents revealed the psychological impact that physical barriers impose on disabled people.

'And access is another thing... Access to actual legal system, physical barriers, access to polling places actually for disabled people to challenge that they are denied this service, because that would focus people's mind.' [COMD-3]

'...But the book, the checking in desk was a huge barrier. I couldn't see the person sitting behind at all. She had to lean over the desk in order to speak to the person sitting. I should think only at least an average height woman or man would be able to see over, to actually speak. This is, I mean, this is not acceptable for anybody, to be able to see who you're talking to. I couldn't see, let alone hear what was going on. ...The barriers where you can't even see
the person booking you in is just ridiculous. You can't speak... As a disabled person you can't speak to anybody. ' [TSTD-2]

Therefore, as [TRA-2] emphasised, it is critical to have physical accessibility in order to involve disabled people in the design of tourism.

The third barrier related to the lack of interest and low priority among tourism businesses and organisations is the difficulty in getting contact with disabled people. This emerged as one of the barriers in involving disabled people in the design of tourism. For example, it was mentioned by [NPO-1] that some of their properties do not know how to develop relationships with local disabled people. However, [DORG-4] argued that not having contact with disabled people is just ignorance and an excuse because: ‘Well, then, why they don’t go on google within 2 minutes to find out all those local disability associations are’.

On the other hand, [REG-3] pointed that, since there are a lot of disability organisations, they do not know which one to contact. [NPO-3] admitted that it is sometimes easier for some of their partners to pay access consultants than finding disability organisations and disabled people who could participate in the design of tourism. Moreover, [BUS-1] revealed that some big disability organisations just send an information pack when they are asked for help, rather than sending a person. Therefore, [COMD-2] and [COMD-3] pointed out that there is a gap in terms of contact between tourism businesses and organisations who intend to involve disabled people in what they are doing and disabled people and disability organisations who are willing to get involved in the design of tourism.

‘I think, again, lack of liaison, they (businesses) don’t know that we exist.’ [COMD-2]

‘Umm, we probably don’t know where they (businesses) are, and they probably don’t know where we (disability organisations and disabled people) are. That’s simple is that. ...We don’t know when tourism industry wants us to do what, you know.’ [COMD-3]

It emerged that a lack of interest among tourism businesses and organisations in involving disabled people in the design of tourism is one of the major barriers toward inclusive design of tourism. It can be said that the identified barriers presented in this section, such as resource limitations, physical barriers and difficulty in getting contact with disabled people, are related
to the issue of the priorities of tourism businesses and organisations. This is because, if they do not have any interest in this issue, they will not consider sparing resources, making the environment accessible, or putting effort into finding disabled people and disability organisations to involve in the design of tourism. As [REG-1] stated, it is entirely up to businesses' interest to involve disabled people. In this sense, it was argued that resource issues or physical accessibility issues are 'excuses' ([TI-1]) or 'artificial barriers' ([COMD-1]), and the 'real' barrier is the lack of interest of tourism businesses and organisations in wanting to involve disabled people in the design of tourism.

"...you want information on disabled people, I'm sure you'd definitely find it, if you really wanted. You would definitely find it. So, again it's easy, but it's not a barrier, is it? We can't really call that a barrier. So it's a matter of, you know, trying to find information, and there's a lot of data research that happened, and I think blue chip companies or any, or other organisations are able to actually do, they can afford to do that, and I'm sure they will have time and budget to do it as well, if they really want to find out. So I wouldn't put that as a barrier, to be honest." [DORG-3a]

Several reasons for the lack of interest among tourism businesses and organisations were identified. Firstly, it was suggested that tourism businesses and organisations do not see the benefit of involving disabled people in the design of tourism; therefore, they do not have any interest in working with disabled people.

"...I think a lot of them (businesses) have quite cynical view about it (disabled people's market), don't recognise that it could be important actual income stream." [LOC-1]

"They're barriers that they perceive to be difficult because they don't want to do the time and the energy, because they don't think we... that they'll earn anything out of it. You know, because businesses are businesses, and we accept that businesses are there to earn money. That's what they're there to do. If they thought that they were going to earn £1 million out of me, do you think they would invite me in tomorrow? Yes, they would. Well, if you get me there that gets 100, a few hundred disabled people going into that hotel because it's got full accessibility, that earns them the £1 million. They just don't accept it." [COMD-1]
The respondents ([GOV-1], [LOC-2&TI-3] and [DORG-1]) from the public sector and disability organisations realised the difficulty involved in convincing tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people and make them realise the benefit of this involvement. This difficulty similarly appears in Christie’s (1999) discussion on the employment of disabled people whereby, if employers and businesses cannot see the real benefit of doing so, they would not work on disability provision.

'It’s very hard to convince people that there’s business to be had and money to be made from being able to accommodate all people. They don’t understand that. They don’t see the benefit of it, short term, medium term or long term, and again, come back to this business of, only those that are affected by disability are keen to do more, which is sad...' [DORG-1]

Secondly, it was pointed out that some small tourism businesses run their businesses almost as a hobby and do not intend to get more customers by tapping a new market, although they may understand the benefit of involving disabled people in their businesses.

'I think there’s a bit of a perception in tourism in that some people run it as a hobby almost... they’ll run a B&B maybe. Um, maybe they’re semi-retired or they’re retired, and it’s not always run in the most... in the sense of a true business, and so people don’t tend to take up training perhaps as much as, um, in other areas. ...They don’t actually want to be full all the time. They just want a few people to give them a bit of income, you know, so...' [REG-2]

It was also explained by the respondents that tourism businesses and organisations do not have an interest in involving disabled people, simply because they are not willing to do this. In past studies (Burnett and Baker, 2001: Phillips, 2002: Shaw and Coles, 2004: Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005: Shaw, 2007), it was pointed out that the tourism organisations that promote accessible tourism are aware that the tourism industry is reluctant to deal with disability issues. This is because the industry is unwilling to make changes in their products or services to meet the needs of disabled people (Shaw and Coles, 2004). Similarly, [BUS-2], [DORG-1] and [COMD-2] indicated that there is a lack of will among tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people, and they think of reasons why they can avoid dealing with the issue and make excuses not involving disabled people. In fact, [DORG-1] and [COMD-1] pointed out that although necessary support such as advice, statistics and information is given to tourism businesses and organisations, some people do not take action.
'I don't know if you've heard the old expression, you can take a horse to water, but you can't make it drink? So you can take someone to the information, give them all the advice, but they don't have to do it. Which is a shame, because it's maybe a wasted opportunity.' [DORG-1]

[DORG-3b] also pointed out that the disability issue is often regarded by tourism businesses and organisations as something beyond the norm and discretionary, and it might make sense to consider this point in linking with the issue that 'able-bodied' people take it for granted that public services and products are developed for themselves, as they are the majority and are dominant in society. This thinking might be a factor that makes tourism businesses and organisations think that they do not need to have an interest in involving disabled people in the design of tourism, as it is something extra and discretionary. In this regard, [DORG-1] argued that working on disability issues largely depends on individual people.

6.5. Organisational constraints and stakeholder conflicts

This section deals with the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism that are associated with the organisational constraints and stakeholder conflicts. Firstly, there are barriers toward the inclusive design of tourism that are related to organisational issues. For instance, at the sales stage, the respondents from the public sector found it difficult to provide information to disabled people, due to the top-down standard information provision system provided by VisitBritain or VisitEngland. Due to this limitation, [REG-1] and [DORG-3b] pointed out that tourism businesses and organisations at county, regional and local level often cannot have flexibility in what information to provide and how to provide the information. This point was raised as a barrier to increase the involvement of disabled people in the sales stage of the design of tourism.

Moreover, [ATT-2] mentioned that when he tried to set up the Disability Access Focus Group in the gallery for the first time, he could not get an agreement from his manager at first. [ATT-2] explained that one of the reasons for this was because he did not have the authority to set up the group. Therefore, it was found that there are some cases where the tourism businesses and organisations cannot involve disabled people in the design of tourism due to organisational constraints, despite their willingness to involve disabled people.
Several respondents mentioned the organisational barriers that they have as big companies or organisations. [ATT-1], [TRA-4] and [NPO-3] raised the difficulty of making sure that disabled people are consistently involved in the design of tourism at different sites, airports, restaurants or shops within their organisations. In addition, [BUS-4], a large international hotel group, pointed out that, while they have an advantage as a big company in having more resources available to spend on involving disabled people, one of the disadvantages is that it is not easy to make small changes for disabled people in their service and facilities due to their brand standard.

Additionally, [ATT-2] indicated that disability issues tend to rest on one person's shoulder within an organisation. Together with the high staff turnover rate in the tourism industry, there is a possibility that the involvement of disabled people would stop once the active individual person leaves the organisation. This barrier is related to the problem of the loss of an appointed job for disability issues that was mentioned by [LOC-1]; after the council lost the Access Officer's post, there was a sharp decline and no drive forward within the council and the town in involving disabled people in the design of tourism.

Secondly, it was regarded by the respondent that conflicts among different stakeholders in terms of their interests had become a barrier to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. [NPO-2] and [NPO-3] mentioned that it is sometimes difficult to make a balance between conservation of the historic or natural environment and the needs of disabled people, and this difficulty can prevent them from involving disabled people in the design of tourism.

Moreover, it was emphasised by the majority of the respondents that it is difficult to consider the different needs of disabled people due to the different types and levels of disabilities. This difficulty has been recognised in a number of studies in accessible tourism and inclusive design (Haywood, et al., 1995: Ferguson, 1997: Campbell, 2000: Shaw and Coles, 2004: Hall and Brown, 2006). [COMD-3] gave the 'classic' example of this problem:

'Because the needs of wheelchair users can crash with the needs of someone blind or sight impairment. You know, they can be contradiction. ...You've got understand the result about how we are going to deal with those potential crashes. For instance, I will give you a classic example. Tactile pavement, if you know what I mean. It can be a nightmare for people in a
wheelchair, it's got spots and jumping around and got little bums and something like that, ...and disabled person find out walk on that sort of surface. But you know, yeah, it's good for blind people because it turns in where they are.' [COMD-3]

[GOV-1], the National Tourist Board, also had difficulty in dealing with disabled people with different requirements and accommodating all of their needs. However, [GOV-1] understands that this issue cannot be avoided, and when tourism businesses and organisations involve different disabled people it is inevitable that it takes time to listen to their views and agree on the best solution. Nevertheless, it should be noted that it is not always possible to reach a solution that can meet the needs of all targeted people. Thus, as Keates and Clarkson (2004) suggest, different needs have to be carefully considered, and trade-offs often have to be reached in the design of tourism process. This point will be elaborated further in the next chapter (7.7.).

At this point, it might be obvious that the identified barriers above are all related to environmental, structural and attitudinal barriers and are not about disabled people's impairment. In other words, no respondents in tourism businesses and organisations see disabled people's impairment as a problem itself. Therefore, it can be said that the findings show that the social model of disability, which understands disability as a socially constructed phenomenon, is widely accepted by tourism businesses and organisations.

6.6. Barriers toward inclusive design of tourism on disabled people's side

This section presents the identified barriers toward inclusive design of tourism that are related to the issues from the perspective of disabled people, rather than that of the tourism businesses and organisations.

Respondents such as [GOV-3], [TRA-2], [BUS-3], [BUS-4], [NPO-3], [DORG-3b] and [TSTD-1] pointed out that there are some disabled people who are demanding and only think about their disability and needs, and their radical attitude can be a barrier toward inclusive design of tourism. [BUS-3] who uses a wheelchair himself described this type of disabled people as:
'The only thing I consider to be a bit of a barrier is some disabled people are so focused on everything being equal and that they should have every opportunity to see as much as the able-bodied counterpart. Which then puts some people under a lot of pressure to try and find solutions... ...Some disabled people, I think, are quite radical and have very high expectations and are quite demanding to the point of almost unrealistic. ...these radicals (disabled people) go out there: this should be this; this should be that. Come on, guys, you know. ...you're alienating yourselves to the point people think, oh, I don't want that, you know, no, no, no. And they're critical of everything that they see.' [BUS-3]

Moreover, disabled respondents [BUS-3] and [TSTD-1] pointed out that there is a ‘suing culture’ among the disabled community. Some disabled people believe they deserve 100% equal rights, and they can be aggressive and complain all the time. Therefore, the disabled respondents warned disabled people that this kind of attitude places pressure on tourism businesses and organisations, and prevents them from involving disabled people in the design of tourism.

While the respondents pointed out that there are some disabled people who are demanding or passionate when they participate in the design of tourism, it was also mentioned that there are disabled people who do not have an intention or interest in participating in the design of tourism. [NPO-2] said that when they request help from disability organisations, they do not always get a response from the disability organisations. [TRA-2] also mentioned that although they have accessible facilities and services, disabled people feel that they do not want to use them.

As a reason for the lack of interest among disabled people, it was pointed out that disabled people do not have the confidence to go out and participate in the design of tourism ([ATT-3], [NPO-2], [COMD-1] and [COMD-2]). In terms of employment, [TRA-4] pointed out that some disabled people are fearful of disclosing their disabilities to possible employers, as they feel they may be discriminated on the ground of their disabilities, and this can be a reason for tourism businesses and organisations for not having many disabled people applying for jobs in general. This finding supports Christie’s (1999) argument that the fear among disabled people of being discriminated against on the ground of their disabilities can produce psychological barriers for them when searching for jobs.
[NPO-2], [COMD-2] and [TSTD-1] suggested that disabled people are scared of going out to unfamiliar places, and this leads to their non-participation in the sales stage. This point corresponds to Smith's (1987) argument that psychological dependency can restrict the leisure participation of disabled people, particularly when they have to travel away from home to unfamiliar places. The local disability organisations [COMD-1] and [COMD-2] pointed out the reality that some disabled people can be housebound if they do not have services to help them go out:

'...we provide free accessible coaches, because we do know that we have 19 local groups around the county that without our coaches going out to them once a month and taking them somewhere, through the local groups, volunteers in that area, they would be housebound. They would be in their house all the time.' [COMD-1]

Moreover, [NPO-2] mentioned the way in which disabled people were historically treated in society makes disabled people think that they cannot go out, and many disabled people have never even thought that they could possibly go out and participate in the design of tourism. This finding supports Christie's (1999) argument on employment and disability where many disabled people have faced prejudice and a lack of awareness, and this experience can produce psychological barriers for disabled people when searching for employment. From the guest-related perspective, this psychological barrier is one of the intrapersonal barriers identified by Hall and Brown (2006), which have a significant influence on deciding whether to participate in tourism. Disabled people have low aspirations and expectations, as many disabled people accept the difficulties and impossibility of accessing and participating in tourism (Goodhall, et al., 2004). Moreover, there is a perceived loss of opportunity to travel among disabled people, as some disabled people think that they do not have an opportunity to use the services offered by the tourism industry (Yau, et al., 2004), which can lead to a low assessment of their abilities and their avoidance of tourism participation (Haywood, et al., 1995). Together with these accounts, this finding implies that the way disabled people have been treated in society can create psychological barriers for them in participating in the design of tourism.

[ATT-3] suggested a part of the reasons for disabled people's lack of confidence might be that they think there are many barriers in the outside environment.
'...I think sometimes people that have got disability might think that they can't come to something because they can't hear, they can't...you know. If they think it's a barrier, therefore they won't come in to start with, I think it can be difficult.' [ATT-3]

It was also argued that many disabled people do not even think that they can actually go out and participate in the design of tourism.

'A lot of the disabled people themselves, and I think it's whole culture thing I am talking about now, automatically think that they can't get out of the urban environment. They feel comfortable in town, they know that they can get around and they know all the facilities they need. But a lot of people even never thought that they could possibly go out and do things outside of the urban environment and actually going and explore themselves. So, a lot of things are to do with that people even haven't thought about doing it.' [NPO-2]

Moreover, it was suggested that the lack of interest among disabled people to participate in the design of tourism is due to the inaccessible facilities and services in tourism businesses and organisations. As Smith (1987) suggests, physical barriers not only deny disabled people's physical access to the environment, but also prevent them from using the existing resources. Inaccessible facilities and services discourage disabled people from participating in the design of tourism ([COMD-1]). In relation to the physical barriers, [BUS-3] argued that, despite the fact that there are different types and levels of disabilities, the word 'accessibility' is not clearly defined in many cases, and this causes disabled people to lose trust with regard to the information concerning accessibility. As Murray and Sproats (1990) suggest, the word 'accessibility' can mean different things to different disabled people.

'So, many people use the word accessible, but what does it actually, physically, mean? It's not a clearly defined word. It's very ambiguous. It's very loose. You can turn around and say, this building is accessible because you can get into it. ...So, the term accessible is bandied around very, very freely and has let many, many disabled people down in the past because they've been, it's been misrepresented and, therefore, they've become quite cynical and lacking in trust.' [BUS-3]

The accessibility issue is related to the finding related to the feedback stage where, although the respondents have customer feedback forms open to all customers and visitors, they do not
receive feedback from disabled people. Disabled respondents [COMD-3], [TSTD-1] and [TSTD-2] explained the reason for the non-participation in the feedback stage as being because disabled people perceive the service or the venue as not accessible and do not use their service; therefore, the tourism businesses and organisations simply do not get feedback from disabled people because disabled people are not there. As Card (2003) states, if disabled people think they do not have access to facilities or services, they simply will not use them.

"Partly, I think that is because they don't use them, so they don't feedback on them because they aren't accessible. I'm not saying they aren't accessible, or they aren't friendly, but they are perceived as being not accessible and not friendly. You don't take the risk. ... So this hotel might say 'we don't have a lot of complaint form from disabled people'. The reason is they never come in, because there is the two steps outside." [TSTD-1]

To supplement the statement of [TSTD-1], the meeting venue for the interview with [TSTD-1] was a café in a hotel that has two steps at the main entrance, but there is a bell to call reception staff to put a ramp to enter the building; therefore, it actually is accessible to wheelchair users. What [TSTD-1] tends to say is that if the facilities are perceived as inaccessible by disabled people, in spite of the fact that they are accessible or can be accessible, disabled people do not try to use them, as they are unlikely to take a risk. This finding shows that the focal point is on how the facilities or services are interpreted by disabled people, no matter how accessible they actually are. It can be argued that facilities that 'can be accessible' are more likely to be perceived as inaccessible by disabled people. If the facilities or services are interpreted by disabled people as inaccessible, there can be a perceived lack of access to activities and resources, which is regarded as one form of social exclusion (Burchardt et al., 2002). Thus, it can be suggested that tourism businesses and organisations need not only provide accessible facilities or services, but also to learn how they are interpreted by disabled people.

[COMD-1] argued that one of the causes of disabled people's negative attitude toward participating in the design of tourism is that tourism businesses and organisations do not consult with disabled people directly; they might have consultation with their customer and user groups, but many of the consultations are open to everybody, and do not specifically target disabled people. In fact, respondents such as [REG-3], [ATT-3] and [TRA-3] mentioned that they would not necessarily pick up disabled people specifically to involve in
the design of tourism, as they target every customer or visitor. Therefore, it was suggested that there needs to be a specific consultation particularly with disabled people, in order to let disabled people know that it is for disabled people and is relevant to them, and to give them confidence to participate in the design of tourism. It can be said that the respondents who stated that they do not receive feedback from disabled people on the feedback forms open to all customers and visitors might not understand the real difficulties disabled people face in their daily lives.

Therefore, it might be questionable if tourism businesses and organisations really understand how disabled people feel in participating in the design of tourism, if they are not 100% sure that the service and facilities provided are accessible to them. [TRA-4] and [BUS-3] highlighted the true impact of the possible problems for disabled people when they travel.

‘Well inevitably, as I say, things will go wrong; wheelchairs have been damaged, um, people’s wheelchairs get left behind, you know, that sort of thing which has a huge impact on the person. So what we try and do in training is not just preach to our staff but trying to get them to understand the true impact that it has. So by the fact that somebody can’t... it’s like taking somebody’s legs away if you haven’t got the wheelchair, so trying to talk to them in emotive terms.’ [TRA-4]

‘...if you book a hotel for yourself and you don’t get air-conditioning or you don’t get a sea view if you’ve asked for one, you might be a bit angry but you’ll survive. If I ask for an adapted bedroom where I can access the toilet and I can’t get into the toilet I have a massive problem [laughs]... So, there’s a marked difference in providing essential adaptions for a disabled person, for which, if they don’t have, they won’t be able to function, compared to something that would be nice, that would enhance your travelling experience.’ [BUS-3]

Thus, providing accessibility should not be treated as something extra and discretionary. There should be a clear understanding among tourism businesses and organisations that accessibility for disabled people is not something nice to have, but is truly essential for disabled people. In this regard, what [LOC-2&TI-3] pointed out is understandable; disability is regarded as the most important issue among other equality issues in their council because people do not a have choice in being disabled.
It was found that although tourism businesses and organisations have the intention to involve disabled people in the design of tourism, there are some cases where disabled people do not have resources to offer, and the lack of disabled people’s resources can be a barrier toward inclusive design of tourism. The resources vary, such as disabled people’s time ([NPO-1], [NPO-3], [COMD-3] and [TSTD-2]), budget or expenses to participate in the design of tourism ([COMD-1] and [TSTD-2]), and disabled people’s health issues ([DORG-1], [TSTD-1] and [TSTD-2]). Moreover, disabled people sometimes do not have knowledge to offer advice to tourism businesses and organisations ([TRA-2], [NPO-3], [DORG-3b], [DORG-4], [COMD-1], [COMD-2] and [COMD-3]).

'The other issue is that disabled people are not experts, for example, in local government planning, you know, so you can ask them and then they’ll say stuff and go, we’d like this to happen, and then you’re like, the system doesn’t work like that, you haven’t understood the system, and it’s... a lot of the time the consultation is not that meaningful.' [NPO-3]

'And, it’s interesting that national bodies like English Nature and Scottish National Trust, and a whole range of the national bodies, providers, there’s a lot of them want to get involved, Forestry Commission, a whole range of people. But there’s usually only two or three of us there from disability organisations and we just can’t provide all the, you know... they want to, um, consult often on fairly technical things, and we haven’t got the resources really to answer their questions.' [DORG-3b]

In addition, the respondents ([NPO-2], [DORG-1], [DORG-3b] and [COMD-3]) suggested that some disabled people only consider their own needs and are not able to see the wider picture.

‘One is, if you’re talking to individuals, they will only be able to look at these issues from their own perspective, not from a general perspective, and that needs to be carefully considered, because one person’s advice would, may have, an effect which skews the information in one direction. ...some disabled people may not be experts even they wanted to give advice, and that could well be true. The person may not be familiar with that aspect. They will only know about their own requirements. ...I’ve been to listen to some disabled people speak about their experience and it very much is in their bubble. They can’t see off
from side to side. If they use a wheelchair, they’re not sure what people with hearing or sight loss might need. They haven’t got a clue, because that’s not their experience.’ [DORG-1]

In this regard, [NPO-2] and [COMD-3] said that it is difficult to find disabled people who can speak with wider eyes, representing the overall voice and views of disabled people. However, it was emphasised by the same respondents that disabled people’s lack of expert knowledge does not mean that disabled people do not need to be involved in the design of tourism.

On the other hand, since there are not many disability organisations that have special knowledge to give advice and that can represent the disabled community, tourism businesses and organisations want these disability organisations to participate in the design of tourism, which can result in a consultation burden on the disability organisations.

‘And also, one of the things we had back is when we try to engage or...is that they (disability organisations) getting asked all the time to help all sorts of people and industry, and that’s...therefore, they are there to work with their disabled communities, so they feel like they are being used as free consultancy really, rather than... So, it’s difficult.’ [REG-3]

‘...there is a problem with the fact that many organisations get called on by many different people to be asked their opinions. And especially, people with the experience of going out to the countryside and natural environment and having those skills and knowledge, they are called on quite a lot. And we do trying get...we send invitation and trying involve people in the consultation, but sometimes they are so over burdened with people coming and asking their opinion. And we don’t always get response...’ [NPO-2]

It was emphasised by [DORG-3b] that although many tourism businesses and organisations would like to involve disability organisations, disability organisations cannot provide everything that tourism businesses and organisations want. At the same time, a local disability organisation [COMD-1] pointed out that disabled people are already fed up with giving advice for free, as disabled people never see their advice being taken up, and there is always excuse for doing this.
6.7. Chapter conclusion and summary

This chapter presented the first part of the findings of the primary research. It was found that there are still forms of non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. The study identified various barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism, such as lack of awareness and knowledge of disability, lack of interest and low priority in involving disabled people, and organisational constraints and stakeholder conflicts. These barriers match with the intrapersonal, interpersonal, environmental and structural barriers for disabled people to travel that have been identified in the existing studies. Although these barriers are exclusively discussed from a guest-related perspective in past studies, the findings of this research show that they can also be identified from the host-side and other areas of the design of tourism. Moreover, it emerged from the findings that the barriers to involve disabled people found from tourism businesses and organisations were not related to disabled people's impairments. Therefore, it can be argued that the idea of the social model of disability is accepted among tourism businesses and organisations.

In terms of the barriers 'for disabled people' to participate in the design of tourism, one of the most important implications from these findings is that disabled people might face more problems and barriers in the design of tourism than non-disabled people assume. For instance, while tourism businesses and organisations have accessible products and services to offer, there are disabled people who do not participate in the design of tourism due to fear and lack of confidence. While tourism businesses and organisations have confidence in what they offer because they do not receive negative feedback from disabled people, some disabled people are not interested in participating in the design of tourism as they do not want to be seen as complainers or to take the risk of having problems due to inaccessible facilities. This finding indicates that tourism businesses and organisations might have disability awareness, but it is questionable if they truly understand the reality that disabled people face in their daily lives as well as in the design of tourism, and the true impact of the problems and barriers on disabled people in participating in the design of tourism.

Having identified the barriers in involving disabled people in the design of tourism, the next chapter discusses how those barriers can be overcome and how inclusive design of tourism can be achieved.
CHAPTER 7
WAYS TOWARD
INCLUSIVE DESIGN OF TOURISM

7.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the second part of the research findings: the possible ways to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism by incorporating the findings on the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and its reasons. The ways toward inclusive design of tourism are discussed, based on all the research findings including the barriers against involving disabled people in the design of tourism. Various ways to overcome the identified barriers were suggested by the respondents, and they are classified and discussed in the eight categories below:

1) Promotion of the value of the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism
2) The factors that encourage or force tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people in the design of tourism
3) Strategic techniques to deliver change
4) Training
5) Direct contact with disabled people
6) The involvement of disabled people
7) Link between tourism businesses and organisations and disabled people and disabled organisations
8) Encouraging disabled people to participate in the design of tourism

7.2. Promotion of the value of the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism

The first category deals with one of the possible answers to the question of how to encourage tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. It
was suggested that it is crucial to promote the benefit and value of involving disabled people to tourism businesses and organisations ([REG-2], [REG-3], [COMD-2] and [TSTD-2]), and this point accords with the approach taken by tourism organisations promoting the economic potential of disabled tourists, as identified by Shaw and Coles (2004).

'I think if they (businesses) understood more about how much it's worth, then definitely, yes. I think that's the only way to really convince people is, um, the bottom line... ...The easiest way to try and convince someone of the benefit is to say that it's going to save you money, and it could even make you profit.' [REG-2]

In order to make tourism businesses and organisations appreciate the benefit of involving disabled people, it was suggested by the majority of the respondents that the promotion of best practice and business cases would be useful. This is because best practice and business cases can inspire people and remove the fear of involving disabled people ([ATT-2]) and also help raise awareness and drive changes within the businesses and organisations ([BUS-4]). The good business cases can be also used as examples that tourism businesses and organisations can copy and follow ([REG-2]). [REG-3] explained that:

'Well, you have to... for tourism is, at the end of the day, it's about business and economics. So, you need to make sure that you can make good business case. So, one of the things I am working on at the moment is developing case studies for businesses who have... who do a good practice, and actually can show that it is benefited their business financially. So, you have to, sort of, influence people by persuasion in lots of different ways really.' [REG-3]

This statement shows that it is important for tourism businesses to see how much they can benefit from involving disabled people in the design of tourism. This finding supports one of the 'fundamental truths of tourism' (McKercher, 1993 cited by Hall and Brown, 2006:15) that tourism is fundamentally a private sector dominated industry, and investment decisions are based predominantly on profit maximisation. Therefore, if they do not see any benefit, they would not consider involving disabled people in their businesses. Thus, it is useful to have good business case studies that set out the actual increased number of customers or income, to show tourism businesses and organisations the benefit of involving disabled people in the design of tourism.
Actual business cases were introduced by the respondents. For example:

'Yeah, well, we did those (hoists) in five of our hotels and, um, we measure demand on a monthly basis and over the course of about three years – we've got them in five hotels, three years – um, we've generated over half a million pounds worth of revenue which is directly attributed to having the hoist. So that's just one user group that would need that facility so, you know, yeah, it's quite powerful.' [BUS-4]

'...we worked in Didcot to get taxis. We spoke to them and other companies, to get a taxi that would take wheelchairs. And they resisted and resisted and resisted and we put the weight of the Access Group behind it, and, because they're a family business, who, you know, in the area, they decided to have one vehicle, very reluctantly agreed. But they found it was so booked they got a second one and then a third one. And not only is it used by disabled people, but people, business people book it, families book it, because it's so useful. And they've increased their business and their business share, market share, because of it. So it's actually made, it is good business practice.' [TSTD-2]

In addition, the respondents ([BUS-3], [COMD-1] and [COMD-3]) suggested that the importance of the 'disability pound' should be more widely promoted. On the other hand, [DORG-3b] warned that in promoting the benefit of involving disabled people, the definition of disabled people needs to be carefully considered. This is because, in a wider definition of disability, for most of the people in that category, their disabilities do not really affect how they carry out tourism, and if tourism businesses and organisations think there is not a big market in spite of the number of disabled people, they will lose interest in involving disabled people ([DORG-3b]). This point contrasts with the approach taken by tourism organisations that use the information that gives relatively high estimates about the market potential of disabled tourists, in order to emphasise the business opportunities to the industry (Shaw and Coles, 2004). Therefore, in promoting the benefit of involving disabled people in the design of tourism, the statistics and definition of disabled people needs to be carefully used in a way that does not discourage tourism businesses from involving disabled people in the design of tourism.

In this sense, it was suggested by [TRA-1], [BUS-2], [COMD-1] and [COMD-3] that instead of focusing only on disabled people, it is better to promote the argument that involving
disabled people can also result in better products and services for other groups of people, such as elderly people and mothers with buggies. [BUS-2] and [DORG-3b] also suggested that it would be useful to highlight the aging population whose needs are similar to the needs of disabled people. In fact, it was found that most of the respondents acknowledge that working on disability issues can also be beneficial to other groups of people and that disability issues are related to the aging society. Thus, the argument that accessible products and services for disabled people can include a significant proportion of the population (Burnett and Bender-Baker, 2001; Card, 2003; Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005) has been accepted by most of the respondents.

In considering the benefit to business, [BUS-2] repeated that working on disability issues is an extension of providing good customer service, regardless of disability.

'Disability, you see, but really just tell everybody to just think of customers and every customer is different and every customer has different needs...' [BUS-2]

Therefore, involving disabled people and considering their needs is regarded as a part of improving their business in general, and this approach can give an important implication to tourism businesses and organisations in considering how to regard the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism.

It was urged that tourism businesses and organisations should also appreciate that disabled people are educated customers.

'...I think there is a misconception that people who are disabled are therefore less able to think and make good decisions. You know, somebody without arm is disabled, somebody who is deaf is disabled, but they can still think very clearly and make decision as consumers, as educated consumers. And they have access to the same information that you and I do. Even blind and partially sighted people can use the internet very well. So, they are very savvy as consumers, they are very educated consumers, so business that doesn’t engage with disabled people because they are afraid of what they might hear, ...non-sense...doesn’t make sense to me at all.' [DORG-4]
The interviews with the disabled respondents revealed that they have great knowledge on accessible and inaccessible products, services and companies. As [COMD-3] pointed out, tourism businesses and organisations should be aware of the significance of disabled people’s word-of-mouth advertising, since disabled people share their knowledge and experience with each other, and this affects the performance of tourism businesses and organisations in both positive and negative ways. In other words, if tourism businesses and organisations can offer a good experience to disabled people, it can be possible to bring other customers from the disabled community into the business.

7.3. The factors that encourage or force tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people in the design of tourism

Factors that would be useful for tourism businesses and organisations to have, in order to promote the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, emerged from the findings.

The majority of the respondents mentioned that more resources such as funding, grants, subsidies, statistics and a database of disability organisations would be useful to have in involving disabled people in the design of tourism. While there are respondents who said there need to be statistics and information to support the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, several respondents mentioned that there are already statistics available to support the importance of the disability pound and the involvement of disabled people. This might indicate that although the necessary statistics to support the involvement of disabled people do exist, tourism businesses and organisations are not sufficiently aware of this.

In terms of the factors that can ‘force’ tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people in the design of tourism, the adoption of stricter legislation was suggested. The respondents such as [ATT-1], [DORG-1] and [TSTD-2] mentioned that, in order to overcome the various barriers, and especially the ‘artificial’ barriers, stricter legislation is required.
However, [GOV-1] and [DORG-3a] argued that the DDA does not need to be stricter, but that it has to be enforced. [COMD-2] pointed out that the problem with the DDA is that it is not implemented: 'Nobody shows whether they are doing right thing or not'. Similarly, [GOV-1] indicated that tourism businesses do not really see the DDA as vital to deal with, since nobody is coming and checking. This finding indicates that the possibility of a legal action as a result of discriminatory practices (Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005) is not recognised by tourism businesses. Moreover, the DDA is not a 'hot' subject anymore ([REG-3], [DORG-1] and [COMD-3]), and it is regarded as something voluntary; therefore, tourism businesses and organisations do not have to work on disability issues. [REG-3] warned that the word 'reasonable adjustment' in the DDA can be misinterpreted by tourism businesses and organisations as being a voluntary scheme.

'...even though the Disability Discrimination Act is in place, businesses aren't really seeing it as vital to deal to, because it isn't enforced, there isn't someone going around, checking places and saying, 'oh, no, you need to do this because you are potentially breaking the law'. No one is doing that. So, even though we've got the law, I think it's not making a huge effect. ...if you think of Health inspector, for hygiene and health, you get inspector every year, going into restaurants checking if they are clean, and if they are not, then it gets closed down. That's because it's actual health issue. I know accessibility is not quite as detrimental, you know, it's actually having rats in kitchen, but still, if we are going to take the DDA seriously, I think it would certainly...businesses would do more, if they saw the law is enforced.' [GOV-1]

In addition to the legislation, [NPO-2] suggested it would be useful if the Equality Impact Assessment became compulsory for every tourism business and organisation so that they have to consider involving disabled people from the beginning. Moreover, [GOV-1] and [DORG-4] proposed that disability and accessibility issues should be incorporated into the criteria for applying for funding or into the quality of tourism agenda. The national Tourist Board [GOV-1] has a particularly clear idea on this approach:

'And we strongly believe that accessibility is embedded within quality. So, quality product is being the one fits the needs of consumers, so, no product really is quality product unless look at accessibility; otherwise, if a disabled person, if they can't have access to, say, hotel, then they realise it wouldn't be a quality product. So, we have that strong link, and that's why we
are looking at accessibility, because we are trying to improve visitor experience and quality, and accessibility is just one those areas that we need to be addressing.' [GOV-1]

The view that disability and accessibility provision should be incorporated in the criteria of quality of tourism is related to the discussion in the previous section that working on disability issues is an extension of providing good customer service, regardless of disability. It can be argued in relation to the discussion on disability and social exclusion that this approach is advantageous to promote the idea that the requirement of disabled people should not be treated as special, but they should be regarded as a mere part of the various needs of the diverse customers of tourism businesses and organisations.

7.4. Strategic techniques to deliver change

In considering the ways to make tourism businesses and organisations involve disabled people in the design of tourism, this section deals with the more practical issues concerning the kind of strategic techniques that would be needed to drive them toward inclusive design of tourism.

Firstly, it was suggested by [GOV-3] and [TRA-4] that it is crucial to find where an organisation’s priorities and interests are in order to persuade the organisation to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. [GOV-3] indicated that it is relatively easy to tap into the outcomes of organisations and find the right approach to persuade the organisations to involve disabled people, because disabled people have different attributes that can be used for the purposes of persuasion, such as representing a big economic market and being creative and competitive in art and sports. However, in order to persuade the organisations, it is crucial to understand where the organisations’ priorities are. For instance, [ATT-1] focuses on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a company, therefore, in linking disability issues to CSR, they can always have a budget available for disability and access issues.

In order to persuade tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people, a number of practical strategies were introduced. [GOV-3] suggested that it is crucial to use vocabulary wisely according to the organisation’s aim. [ATT-2] pointed out the importance
of focusing on the opportunities of involving disabled people in a positive way, rather than highlighting the barriers and difficulties.

[ATT-2] introduced how he actually brought the idea of involving disabled people into the organisation and how he has driven the movement forward:

'...the Disability Action Plan which is now Inclusive Strategy, which was carried out 8 years ago. And it was like an extensive audit from the cleaning rota through to the mission statement and trustees and directors and skilled audits, and looking across the organisation, so that gave me the biggest amount of power and authority to deliver change. But also we meant that every senior manager was accountable for different issues in disability access. So it drove change because what the audit was looking at wasn't in place. So it had given us like a time frame, when things need to be delivered by. And so, basically it underpins all about. ...But also before then, I wasn't a senior manager. I was underneath, as learning community...for the gallery. So I started as on a part-time post. I had to fight every into that journey to change the gallery. But my most important weapon was the Focus Group and the Action Plan. So I could just get everybody. ...Because people find very difficult to deal with these issues. I have my experience, I feel comfortable with any of those stuff, so I know from my life. It’s not...so you then have the power to have those information, and you can just say 'you need to be doing this', 'you need to be doing that'. And eventually, you know, you deliver change in your organisation. You can, think through many years hard work to change this place, and it’s completely different. It’s different from what it was 10 years ago.' [ATT-2]

This statement indicates that if they can have a case first, this can become a useful weapon in persuading senior people to involve disabled people because the importance of involving disabled people can be proven by showing the actual case and the outcome of their involvement.

Moreover, [TRA-4], [BUS-4] and [COMD-2] showed that having an internal disability group within the organisation is useful. Several respondents have their own internal disability groups, consisting of their disabled employees, visitors, customers, or disabled people from external disability organisations, which work on different areas of their businesses or activities to make sure the needs of disabled people are considered in every area. This approach is similarly recommended by Keates and Clarkson (2004), who state that having
internal user champions within an organisation is useful in involving them frequently throughout the design process.

In order to drive and sustain the movement toward inclusive design of tourism within the organisations, it became apparent from the findings ([ATT-2], [TRA-4], [NPO-2], [NPO-3] and [DORG-3b]) that it is critical to establish a process or mechanism that shows the responsibility within the organisation for involving disabled people in the design of tourism. The respondents such as [ATT-2], [TRA-4] and [NPO-3] argued that tourism businesses and organisations need to mainstream the disability issue into everyone’s responsibility and to make sure the issue is considered across the organisation. Regarding large businesses and organisations where it is difficult to ensure consistency in involving disabled people across their different sites or partners, [NPO-3] recommended that a standard be set among them through conducting access audit and training or developing an access guide and an access policy. [TRA-4] introduced the idea that they should give the right message and support to their partners that have disability champions within each organisation. The way they work with their partners can be described below:

Figure 7.1: [TRA-4]’s work with their partners

Moreover, [DORG-3b] emphasised that the disability issue has to be positively built in organisations, otherwise, if active individuals leave, the whole work on the involvement of disabled people would decline. As [ATT-2] and [DORG-3b] pointed out, disability issues tend to rely on individuals. In this sense, the majority of the respondents suggested that it is useful to have an appointed position in their businesses and organisations specifically for disability issues. It was indicated that it is necessary to have somebody in the organisation
who is committed to keeping and driving the initiatives forward ([LOC-1] and [BUS-4]). The appointed position can take any form such as an Access Officer ([TSTD-2]) or Corporate Social Responsibility department ([DORG-3b]). [LOC-2&TI-3] explained the benefit of having an appointed position:

'I think the reason why it works quite well locally is because we have, within the council, an Equality Team. We have a Sensory Team as well, whose role is to ensure that blind and deaf people can access services within the council. And their work is pushed out throughout the council officers including us. And then out to the stakeholders. So, actually it's quite holistic networks, because it means your officers understand the importance of inclusion. And they are more able to explain the message to people outside of the council. So, in terms of access, I don't see problems.' [LOC-2&TI-3]

It was argued that having an appointed position in an organisation can overcome various identified barriers. In fact, the respondents who are in appointed positions specifically working on disability issues such as [GOV-1] and [NPO-3] said that some of the barriers identified from the other interviews are not an issue for them, because this is their job. [TRA-4] and [NPO-2] who are also in appointed positions for disability issues within their organisations explained how they work to influence and make sure that the disability issue is considered in every department and in every stage of the design of tourism. The way they work can be explained in Figure 7.2 below:

![Figure 7.2: The influence of appointed position to the stages of the design of tourism](image)
Furthermore, it was identified that one of the important factors in making tourism businesses and organisations involve disabled people in the design of tourism is to have senior and managerial people within the organisation who have disability awareness. [DORG-1] pointed out the importance of having senior people who have disability awareness, and [ATT-2] argued further that senior managers need also to be responsible for disability issues. The reasons why it is useful to have senior people with disability awareness were explained as:

'...I think it always helps as well to have buy in at a higher level. So if one of the councillors at the county council or the chief executive saw it (disability issues) as a priority, then that would help us to make time and money.' [REG-2]

'I think there's a huge benefit because those people (senior managers) are the ones that hold the purse strings. So, um, at the end of the day, they're the ones that sign off the budgets and it's really important, if you're going to get anything done in an organisation it needs to be driven from the top level. I think that's why [BUS-4] has been successful because we have senior managers who are committed to driving it from the top and you really need to have that I think to be successful.' [BUS-4]

'I got involved in politics because I believed that the only way you can make changes is being at the top table. You know, being at the top table and making the decisions, rather than being out in the crowds just receiving it. You can moan as much as you like, but you very rarely make a difference, but if you go in there and you're part of decision-making, and you accept the different parts of that as, there's financial difficulties, there are some reasons why some things can't be done, you know, and I've been that since... for the last 25 years, 30 years. So that's why I got involved in it.' [COMD-1]

Therefore, the main reason why it is important for senior people to have disability awareness is due to their authority to make decisions and changes in the organisations. At this point, [DORG-3a] and [COMD-1] emphasised that disabled people need to be a part of the decision makers, and there need to be more disabled people at the senior level in tourism businesses and organisations.
Actual cases were introduced where the senior managers or CEOs developed disability awareness by actually meeting disabled people, and it became a great driving force for the organisations toward inclusive design of tourism.

‘...Ms A (the chief executive) met with Mr B who got the gold medal in the tennis in Beijing, wheelchair user, and he runs his own business and so she sat down and chatted to him for about half an hour about the problems of small business and they didn’t talk about his disability. ...So you can use those role models to introduce... and Ms A is a very influential person and if she hadn’t had that conversation with Mr B would she have agreed to £800,000 for Accentuate (a disability project)? I don’t know, but it certainly helps. ...we need to make sure that key decision makers are introduced to people with a disability, even if the key decision maker has no direct contact with disability in their normal life, because then they will understand and that’s why the Paralympics medallists, the artists and so on, are good people for that because you can introduce them and they can talk as equals.’ [GOV-3]

‘...we’re members of Employers Forum on Disability... And it was supported...it was called the President’s Club, so it’s for Chief Executives and really senior people in the business...so we got our Chair...our CEO Mr C, who, yes, is incredibly busy, but because it’s other CEO’s it appeals to them to go along and meet and network, so he went along to that event and that’s great commitment for us, because obviously, you know, if it’s coming in at the top of the company, it demonstrates real commitment, so that was really helpful.’ [TRA-4]

In addition, [BUS-4] and [NPO-2] try to make their senior people more aware of disability issues by involving them in their internal disability groups. Moreover, [COMD-1] stated that senior managers in tourism businesses and organisations should be given Disability Equality Training, which is delivered by disabled people, in order to raise their awareness of disability.

7.5. Training

Training, not only for the senior people, but also for tourism businesses and organisations in general, was repeatedly suggested by most of the respondents as an important factor to increase the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and overcome the various identified barriers. [DORG-4] argued that more tourism businesses and organisations
should take TSE’s Welcome All, and it should not be ‘nice to have’, but ‘need to have’. The need for disability awareness training has also been emphasised in the tourism literature (Takeda and Card, 2002: Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005: Hall and Brown, 2006). Respondents provided several reasons why their claims regarding the need for training were justified. Firstly, training can show tourism businesses and organisations the benefit of involving disabled people ([BUS-3]). [LOC-2&TI-3] pointed out that if people are informed in a right way, they would want to make a difference and involve disabled people in the design of tourism.

‘Training is the heart of everything. Training and education. It’s about understanding. You can’t understand some...you can’t do anything unless you understand why you are doing it and why it’s important, what the end user needs you to give them. It’s a starting point of everything, really.’ [LOC-2&TI-3]

Therefore, training has an important role to play in informing tourism businesses and organisations of the benefit and importance of involving disabled people. Secondly, training can change the bias and stereotypes that non-disabled people have against disabled people ([TRA-4]). Finally, [BUS-4] suggested that training can make tourism businesses and organisations feel comfortable and confident when talking and dealing with disabled people.

In terms of the style of training, [DORG-1] suggested that training can be online training for small tourism businesses that cannot attend training courses due to staff shortages. Moreover, although [TRA-2] used to have training with disabled people, they cannot invite disabled people anymore due to budget cuts, and they instead do training with simulations as a substitute, where members of staff actually use a wheelchair or wear special glasses to simulate blindness. [TRA-1] and [TRA-2] stressed the importance of having actual physical experience in training:

‘What we have done is, say, giving the drivers, you can get glasses that represent different sight problems... To experience what it is like, because some people, various sight things that, you can’t see that clearly or seeing blurring or you can put the glasses on, so it’s trying to give an appreciation of... ...Yes, it’s a lot easy to understand the problem. If you have kind of experienced it, it’s just a human nature, isn’t it? ...they are much more likely to remember that than just have a sheet of paper saying about it.’ [TRA-1]
'Put them in a wheelchair, put them on a scooter. Cover up their eyes with blind fold and say, 'now, you do it'. And some people have imagination to know what it must be like. But some people don't have the imagination. And you actually have to do it physically.' [COMD-2]

However, a disability organisation [COMD-1] argued that non-disabled people would never truly understand the difficulties that disabled people face in everyday situations from training with simulations. In discussing 'simulation' as one of the inclusive design approaches, Keats and Clarkson (2004:121) similarly argue that: '...it does not provide designers with an understanding of what it is like to have a functional impairment. Instead, it simply provides a feeling for the effects of the impairment'. Thus, it is suggested that simulation would never be perfectly able to replace the actual involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism.

'...what we disagree with a lot of Disability Awareness (training) by non-disabled people, I have to say, mainly, who think are great, is that if I stuck earplugs in your ears so that you couldn't hear, do you think that would make a difference to you, do you think you could understand what it would be like being deaf? ...If you're in a wheelchair trying to get around a place and you hit a curb that you can't get up, you pick the wheelchair up and put it on the curb and carry on, you know. You will not know what it's like being stuck in the middle of the road because you can't go anywhere, because you know that you can pick it up and put it on the pavement. And so, if you're in danger, that's what you will do. If I'm a wheelchair user and I'm in danger, I can't do that. So you'll never know what it's like, and that's why we don't use those kind of aids and adaptations (for the training they provide).' [COMD-1]

Therefore, [COMD-1] emphasised the importance of receiving training by disabled people, as disabled people can talk based on their knowledge of experiencing the barriers. In this regard, it was suggested that Disability Equality Training, which can only be delivered by disabled people, should be given to tourism businesses and organisations, instead of Disability Awareness Training which can be delivered by non-disabled people. Similarly, [LOC-2&TI-3] and [COMD-2] pointed out that, in order to raise disability awareness through training, it is crucial to be delivered by disabled people because:

'So I think it's about raising that level of awareness. And the only people who can do that is people who are living with disability. So if you have an able-bodied person standing up and
telling you 'This isn't good because...', they are not going to listen to this much. If somebody with disability can show you why, and then it's going to make more impact. So, I think it's good that people with disabilities should be involved in that training, either delivering it, or as part of it, to illustrate, if you like, why they have difficulties with it. I think it's really important.' [LOC-2&TI-3]

'That's why, as I said, training, because if staff have training with people with disabilities, for example, if they haven't got family members who have disability, or they have no actual personal experience or something, it gives them a first-hand, and it's amazing how changes perspectives.' [COMD-2]

It was also suggested that it is important to make face-to-face contact with disabled people in training, so that non-disabled people can become more comfortable and get used to seeing and dealing with disabled people ([NPO-2], [COMD-2] and [TSTD-2]). The effectiveness of direct contact with disabled people in training has similarly been identified by Daruwalla and Darcy (2005). According to the latter authors, training involving role-play and contact with disabled people is more effective in changing people's attitude than training involving only information provision. Thus, training that involves contact with disabled people is useful in raising awareness and consequently overcoming attitudinal barriers.

7.6. Direct contact with disabled people

The previous section presented the argument that training needs to ideally be delivered by disabled people where non-disabled people can have face-to-face contact with disabled people and learn the issues and gain first-hand knowledge directly from disabled people. This section develops this perspective further by focusing on the importance of having direct contact with disabled people, which emerged from the findings as an important factor to overcome the identified barriers.

It was found that people who have previous experience of having direct contact with disabled people have more disability awareness and intend to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. [DORG-1] pointed out that the most likely people to be interested in involving disabled people in the design of tourism are those who have personal experience of disability.
either themselves or through their friends and family. [BUS-3] also added that having personal experience of having direct contact with disabled people is the most common route to start working on the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism.

The respondents explained the reasons why the personal experience of having direct contact with disabled people matters. Firstly, personal experience with disabled people allows non-disabled people to appreciate disabled people’s needs ([TRA-4], [BUS-1] and [BUS-3]), because non-disabled people can get a different ‘feel’ from the face-to-face communication with disabled people. [BUS-1], [NPO-2] and [COMD-1] argued that people who do not have awareness of disability will notice and understand the issue when they actually talk and work with disabled people. [DORG-3a] mentioned that direct contact with disabled people becomes a whole different experience when compared to just reading access guidelines or manuals. In the design context, Keates and Clarkson (2004) also suggest that spending time with different types of users is important, as the interaction with them can help to obtain a deeper understanding of the users and develop greater empathy for the users. [BUS-2] emphasised that people can only learn and really understand something from experience: ‘...I remember that experience, and I learnt from the experience. ...that is the way you learn anything, isn’t it?’ As a result, as [ATT-3] pointed out, people become more aware of the needs of disabled people and look at things in slightly different ways compared to before. Examples of the impact of having direct contact with disabled people were found:

'I've got...my sister's mother in law in a wheelchair. And I had an experience we gone out for dinner. And she...we phoned to make sure they've got a ramp or they've got... And she had been left at the back door through the kitchen, and we've come around to the front. And just she was so upset and it was just terrible to think that they took her around the back and the service entrance, when all the rest was gone through the front door for family. So that certainly made me think more the way that she gets treated and how awful that is, because, you know, why she should get to the back door, because she sit on the wheelchair.' [ATT-3]

'I mean, all my friends, since I've been in a wheelchair, when they go out and look around, when they go to places, and 'umm, Mr A (the respondent) won’t be able to get in', if you know what I mean? And you tend to do that. You tend to look at things in different eye, see where the barriers are.' [COMD-3]
Secondly, direct contact and interaction with disabled people can give tourism businesses and organisations confidence to work with disabled people by overcoming fear and anxiety to deal with them ([BUS-1] and [NPO-3]). This argument can also be found in existing studies of design; in working together with disabled people, designers can become relaxed about the differences from each other, since the direct exposure to disabled people’s experience can help to overcome misconceptions about their ability and to build confidence to work with disabled people (Tregaskis, 2004). In this sense, [ATT-2] stressed: ‘some of the direct personal experience is the most powerful tool to change’.

It should be mentioned that the experience of direct contact with disabled people can provoke a belief that disabled people should be involved in the design of tourism. This point, personal belief, emerged as one of the reasons for the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. People who have personal experience with disabled people are likely to become active persons within their organisations to promote the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. The idea ‘the personal is political’ was introduced in Chapter 2 as a slogan in feminist discourse, which has an important implication for understanding disability. While this idea is used in terms of considering women’s and disabled people’s voices and personal experiences to understand the issues surrounding the people, it can also be used in explaining the issue discussed here. That is to say, if tourism businesses’ and organisations’ personal experience of having direct contact with disabled people can raise disability awareness or give them confidence to work with disabled people, it can be said that this is another type of ‘the personal becomes political’. The findings suggest that direct contact and interaction with disabled people can bring about positive changes in the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism.

However, it should be noted that while there are tourism businesses that involve disabled people based on their personal beliefs, rather than for profit-making purposes, there are tourism businesses and organisations that need to see the benefit to justify the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. It is encouraging that there are people who have a personal belief that disabled people need to be involved in the design of tourism. However, there is a danger in relying only on those who have personal belief to involve disabled people, as there is a need to motivate tourism businesses and organisations that do not particularly have these personal beliefs, in order to promote inclusive design of tourism. Furthermore, there can be a possibility that the initiatives would decline once the active individuals leave.
the organisation. Although the personal experience of direct contact with disabled people can be a stimulus to involve disabled people in the design of tourism, there is a danger for tourism businesses and organisations in relying only on the active individuals. Thus, again, it is crucial to establish a mechanism in the organisation to sustain the involvement of disabled people, as discussed earlier.

In terms of how to increase direct contact with disabled people among tourism businesses and organisations, it is crucial to get more disabled people using various services ([COMD-3]). For example, if more disabled people use a range of services every day, it becomes a part of the norm in the society, and people acquire more understanding of disability. The actual case of this argument is that non-disabled customers at [DORG-4]'s hotels learn more about the impact of sight loss, because both disabled and non-disabled customers are interacting at the hotels; therefore, [DORG-4] has witnessed the positive change in people's attitude toward blind and partially sighted people. Moreover, [DORG-3b] and [COMD-1] argued that having more disabled people in the workplace is useful to increase direct contact with disabled people, which leads to raising awareness and understanding of disability within the organisations.

Having disabled people in the workplace was regarded as a useful approach toward inclusive design of tourism. Disability organisations [DORG-3b] and [COMD-3] suggested that it is important to promote the employment of disabled people and to have more disabled staff involved in every stage of the design of tourism, in order to make things happen to meet the needs of disabled people. For the same reason, [DORG-3b] added that disabled people need to be encouraged to take leadership roles in different areas. Moreover, [NPO-3] said that it is useful to have disabled staff, as the organisation can have disabled people involved in what they are doing in a long-term relationship.

However, several respondents cautioned against using disabled staff just for consultation purposes. [ATT-3] has disabled staff in their gallery, but [ATT-3] sometimes finds it difficult to ask their disabled staff for advice purely on the basis that they are disabled. It was also added from disabled people's perspective that disabled people do not want to be employed just because they are disabled and do not want to be asked about disability issues all the time ([NPO-3] and [COMD-2]). Disabled people want to be and need to be employed because they are the best person for the job, but, at the same time, tourism businesses and
organisations would like to have some input from the perspective of disabled people; therefore, there needs to be a careful balance, and disabled people's input to the organisation has to be voluntary rather than forced.

To sum up, it was suggested that it is essential to have disabled people in every sector and every stage of the design of tourism, so that it becomes a part of everybody's lives, and people will have more understanding and awareness of disability ([NPO-2] and [DORG-3a]).

7.7. The involvement of disabled people

This section deals with the involvement of disabled people as one of the suggested ways to overcome the identified barriers. This might sound like a chicken or egg issue, because it was identified from the interviews that the involvement of disabled people can overcome the barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. However, it actually emerged that the involvement of disabled people can overcome many of the identified barriers and difficulties.

The benefit of involving disabled people is that it can enable tourism businesses and organisations to have direct contact with disabled people as introduced in the previous section. Tourism businesses and organisations can have a better understanding of the needs of disabled people and gain confidence to work with them by actually interacting with them. Tregaskis (2004) argues that problematic and inaccessible products, services or an environment result from a design process in which disabled people are not consulted. Thus, in the design context, the involvement of the primary users in the design process is essential in order to minimise the gap between the designers and users and maximise the functionality of the product, service or environment (Ferguson, 1997), and this point can similarly be applied to the context of the design of tourism.

It was suggested by [COMD-2] that the involvement of disabled people, particularly in the planning stage, is effective in order to save time and money. If disabled people are involved in the planning stage, it is possible to plan and develop products or services that meet the needs of disabled people from the beginning, and tourism businesses and organisations will not need to make changes after development. Therefore, the involvement of disabled people
can be a cost effective approach. In this sense, [COMD-1] and [DORG-2] argued that the involvement of disabled people in the sales or feedback stages is too late, and disabled people need to be involved in the very first stage.

'It's not you saying right, okay, we've built this lovely venue, come and have a look at an open day... Let's get disabled people's feedback once we built. Yes, it's not too late, but it would have saved money by getting us involved from stage one. ...So, yes, and certain people who want to..., they'll say, it's okay, we'll get involved in feedback, but me myself, I like to be involved from stage one.' [DORG-2]

It was found that disabled people are invited by tourism businesses and organisations when they plan a new product or service or intend to improve their facilities or service. One of the identified reasons for involving disabled people in the planning stage matches with the primary focus of the inclusive design approach; listening to users’ opinion, perspectives and ideas in order to make sure the views of disabled people are incorporated into the planning. Thus, it emerged from the findings that the involvement of disabled people is regarded by tourism businesses and organisations as a user involvement approach in product and service development. By involving disabled people in the design of tourism process, it becomes possible to minimise the gap between tourism businesses and organisations and disabled people and maximise the functionality of the tourism products and services, as was addressed in Chapter 4.

Moreover, it emerged from the findings that the involvement of disabled people was used as a stakeholder management approach. [LOC-1] and [TRA-4] who had difficulties in dealing with different disabled people with different needs said that it is crucial to incorporate disabled people into the process of discussing, planning and deciding anything with other stakeholders. [DORG-1] suggested that the difficulties of dealing with different stakeholders with different needs can only be resolved through discussion. In order to have discussion, it is essential to bring disabled people to the same table with other stakeholders to get a broader picture ([BUS-4] and [DORG-1]), and allow all of the stakeholders to hear other points of view and become aware of other groups' issues ([TRA-2] and [COMD-3]). As a result, it becomes possible to find a middle ground among other stakeholders ([GOV-3]), and it becomes easier for them to accept the compromise ([ATT-2]). Moreover, it is also important to involve as many different disabled people as possible, since there are various types and
levels of disabilities, and their needs are all different ([GOV-3], [NPO-3], [COMD-2] and [COMD-3]).

It emerged from the findings that there are two distinct groups of respondents in terms of the approach to decide which disabled people to involve in the design of tourism. Namely, there are respondents who try to involve disability organisations, while there are respondents who prefer to involve individual disabled persons. The first group attempt to obtain an overall view of the opinions of disabled people by involving disability organisations. Particularly big national or regional organisations such as [GOV-1] and [LOC-2&TI-3] try to look at disabled people as one group and see their views in a collective way, because they are aware that they cannot deal with every need of different disabled people and that it takes time to deal with the individual disabled persons. Rather, in order to consult with disabled people effectively, they need disability organisations to give them an overall view of disabled people. [NPO-2] and [DORG-2] suggested that holding a forum with representatives from different disability organisations would be useful to get representative views and opinions of disabled people. From disabled people's point of view, [TSTD-1] suggested that disability organisations can have more influence on tourism organisations than disabled individuals. The latter group tries to involve disabled individuals in the design of tourism. This is particularly the case for small or local organisations that involve local disabled individuals in the design of tourism. For instance, [ATT-2] and [NPO-1] stated that they involve local disabled individuals because their tourism resources are more relevant to the local people. They regard the involvement of disabled people as a way to empower disabled people and develop a sense of ownership among them toward the tourism destination or attraction. This point is addressed in more detail in the discussion of locality in the next section.

It can be discussed that the difference between the two approaches in choosing disabled people is related to their target groups. National or regional organisations and businesses inevitably need to consider the entire disabled population in the area. Therefore, they need to involve disability organisations that can represent the overall views of different disabled people. On the other hand, if the target users are local disabled people, there is no need to consult with disability organisations that represent a spread across the disabled population. Rather, it becomes important to include local disabled people regardless of the types of the disabilities they have. An example of this approach can be found in the interview quotation of [ATT-2] in the following section 7.8.
Despite the usefulness of the involvement of disabled people in the discussion process to overcome the conflicts among different stakeholders, it should be noted that it is not always possible to reach consultation outcomes that can please everyone ([BUS-3] and [DORG-1]).

'And you'll never find something that suits all. Everybody has all got their own, very individual, specific characteristics, and so on, which we fully appreciate.' [BUS-3]

'There are conflicts. They're difficult to resolve and, I guess, will only be resolved through discussion and through flexibility on both sides to come to an agreement that everyone's happy with, if that's possible. I'm sure it won't please everyone. There's one thing you'll learn that...I've learned in life, is that you'll never please everyone. It doesn't matter how much you do. You could dance on your head and still not please everybody.' [DORG-1]

This point is related to Imrie’s (2004) claim that it is not possible to develop a ‘universal’ design for ‘all’, as discussed in Chapter 4, since the requirements of people with different disabilities can be contradictory to each other, and a design which is accessible to one group of people might not be accessible to other groups of people. In this regard, it was found that the respondents are aware of the difficulty of developing products or services that please every customer or visitor, and this finding supports the argument presented in Chapter 4 that the idea of universal design is not relevant to this study in considering the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism.

7.8. Link between tourism businesses and organisations and disabled people and disability organisations

One of the identified barriers was the lack of knowledge among tourism businesses and organisations in terms of not knowing the existence of the available statistics, training and disability organisations offering help, and where to find them. But the respondents who already knew of these resources found them very useful. Thus, it was emphasised that it is important to inform tourism businesses and organisations of the existing resources, programmes and organisations that are useful when they involve disabled people in the design of tourism.
'Information and knowledge, there's a lot of it out there already. There's a lot of it online and a lot of it free of charge. It's knowing where that is. I think Tourism South East and other organisations do, spend a lot of time trying to get their members aware of what's available to them, and resources.' [DORG-1]

In order to make a link between tourism businesses and organisations and the existing resources and programmes, [REG-2], [BUS-1] and [DORG-3b] argued that it is useful to have a network among tourism businesses and organisations to share the information and to discuss disability issues.

Making a link and network between tourism businesses and organisations, and disabled people and disability organisations, was also suggested as a useful way to overcome some of the identified barriers. As introduced in the previous chapter, it emerged that although tourism businesses and organisations have the intention to involve disabled people, some of them do not know where to find disabled people. At the same time, although disabled people and disability organisations are willing to get involved in the design of tourism, they do not know where and when tourism businesses and organisations would like disabled people to participate. Therefore, there is a need for the development of a link or network between tourism businesses and organisations and disabled people and disability organisations ([BUS-1], [BUS-4], [DORG-2] and [COMD-2]). [NPO-1] introduced the fact that they actually participate in trade shows and disability events to develop networks with disabled people and disability organisations. [TRA-2] mentioned how they actually benefited from the network they have developed with disabled people and disability organisations.

'...what we can do...where we, Mr A (the predecessor) built up a lot of good contacts that...a guy from an organisation for deaf people, he used to do our deaf training. I met with him when I started the job. So he was quite happy to come to have a chat with me. And because it is often two-way process, he might need information from me, and I quite like to get information from him. So, I met him independently, and spoke about how's the process of training and what's the benefit worth him, so it just gave me an insight. ...it just helps my perspective on it and trying to make training as real as we can. It's been good in a lot of ways over the years where the network has built up.' [TRA-2]
As a means to develop the network, [COMD-3] advised that it would be useful for tourism businesses and organisations to have a database of disability organisations, in order to enable them to contact disability organisations and to check if the organisations can offer help or the service that they require. Moreover, [DORG-4], [COMD-1] and [COMD-2] argued that it should be local authorities' role to make the link between tourism businesses and organisations and disabled people and disability organisations, and to make tourism businesses and organisations aware of the existing resources and services. This is because:

'I think that...public sector group...because they are...set policy standards, because they implement legislations, and because they tend to lead at the local level on tourism related issues through either governments or regional development agencies, umm...because they usually have access to funding, which the others don't. They usually have access to funding for training for tourism businesses. I think it's got to come from them. That's the sensible place where the responsibility for initiatives would sit, in my opinion.' [DORG-4]

Moreover, when the respondents talked about contacting and involving disabled people in the design of tourism, the majority of them recommended working locally. It was pointed out that involving local disabled people is a useful approach to overcome some of the identified barriers ([GOV-2b], [LOC-1], [ATT-3], [NPO-1], [COMD-3] and [TSTD-2]). The respondents ([NPO-1] and [NPO-3]) actually encourage their partners and properties to work with local disabled people in their areas.

'...I would also like every site to have a good relationship with disabled community groups, their own local disabled community groups, so yeah, they can actually have...disabled people can have their events on our sites, you know, but then, we can go and ask them if we're making some changes, I would like each site to build up its own relationships with these local groups.' [NPO-3]

The reasons why local initiative is important were explained in different ways: local disabled people understand the area better than national disability organisations do ([COMD-2]); it is more simple and quick to involve local disabled people because they can physically be there, as they are living in the area ([REG-3], [ATT-3] and [COMD-2]); and the relationship between tourism businesses and organisations and local disabled people can be more personal ([COMD-2]).
I know Tourism South East is doing the whole DDA issues. They had a specialist in disabled tourism that we could then go to, for advice and contact and everything. And Tourism for All play a function, but it would be nice to have some more local level really. ...Because...you know, if people know there is somebody that they can talk to, then more likely to have things happen, whereas if it's more like national body like Tourism for All, it's bit more distance, really.' [REG-3]

"...due to simplicity that we know that they are living in the same area and we know that they are local. And I would thought it's just easier just to contact local groups than big national ones. And if they need to come back, quite simple to get them back.' [ATT-3]

'I think bigger any organisation gets less personal becomes, so when you talk about these national organisations. Tourism is such a localised thing, so that I think, the key may be to dealing with local organisations that understand the local problems. ...Yeah, I think the key is to deal with more...with smaller organisations within your own area. I'm not knocking big organisations, because my point of view, if we are the one want to have information from them, they are very very helpful. ...But I think, bigger organisations gets the less personally become. So it's inevitable. It is just inevitable. ...people living in the area understand the area. They can be there. ...much more personal. And I think that's the key.' [COMD-2]

In this regard, the respondents [LOC-2&TI-3], [ATT-2] and [NPO-3] suggested that the involvement of local disabled people in the design of tourism can provoke them to have a sense of ownership of the design of tourism in which they are involved.

'People that come into sites regularly that you would recognise, you know, that they feel like they have some ownership. I want disabled people to feel that it's their site, you know. I want them to be able to go any site they want to go to around the country and to have a good, good experience, but would also like people to feel connected their local sites.' [NPO-3]

[ATT-2] showed the relationship they have with local disabled people at their gallery:

'First we started the Focus Group,...it quite soon became apparently more important to have people with direct experience rather than having organisations. We wanted local people with
disabilities in the Focus Group, because they have very different buy into the projects. That sense of their empowerment and their inclusion, they have been such strong ambassadors for the gallery afterwards. And what you want to do is everyone to share the aspiration, it shouldn’t be like we are doing this because ‘the government says’ or ‘the Art Council says’ which is ticking boxes. ...And people know by name, come to the gallery all the time. ...It’s kind of everybody own it.’ [ATT-2]

Therefore, localisation of the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism emerged as one of the useful ways toward inclusive design of tourism.

7.9. Encouraging disabled people to participate in the design of tourism

The last section of the ways to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism deals with the disabled people’s side; the identified factors that can encourage disabled people to participate in the design of tourism.

Firstly, in order to overcome the barrier of disabled people’s limited resources to participate in the design of tourism, it was suggested that the input of disabled people should be paid. In particular, the disabled respondents ([COMD-1], [COMD-2], [COMD-3] and [TSTD-2]) argued that disabled people’s service needs to be paid for, rather than providing support and advice to tourism businesses and organisations for free, so that disabled people do not need to worry about travel expenses involved in travelling to the meeting venues or have to spare time for free, and they would become more willing to get involved in the design of tourism. This suggestion indicates that the input of disabled people has not been paid, despite the fact that many disabled people do not have much disposable income (Haywood, et al., 1995; Shaw and Coles, 2004). Thus, in order to increase the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, the tourism businesses and organisations need to understand disabled people’s economic situation.

Secondly, it emerged from the findings that it is crucial to build disabled people’s confidence in order for them to participate in the design of tourism ([GOV-2b], [NPO-2] and [COMD-2]). In order to raise disabled people’s confidence, [GOV-2b] suggested organised familiarisation trips for old and disabled people. [COMD-2] also suggested that disability organisations
could arrange and organise events or shopping to give disabled people opportunities to go out with other disabled people, and the members of the disability organisations could show what they can do; it would also give disabled people a little ‘boost’ and would lead to developing disabled people’s confidence to go out and get involved in the design of tourism. This strategy accords with the suggestion of Yau et al. (2004) in the guest-related perspective that support and company by family or friends can give disabled people confidence to become travel active. Once they gain the experience of going out, as found in Murray and Sproats’ (1990) research, the previous experience can induce (more) interest in going out in disabled people.

Thirdly, it was suggested that developing disabled people’s skills would be useful to increase the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. As introduced in the previous chapter, it was found that some disabled people do not have the expertise or knowledge to provide input when they participate in the design of tourism. However, skills and knowledge are required when disabled people plan and develop anything with tourism businesses and organisations ([COMD-3]). [NPO-3] and [COMD-1] suggested that training for disabled people is useful to build disabled people’s skills. [DORG-2] stated that there is training available for disabled people to develop skills, particularly for the planning stage of the design of tourism.

‘They have to have skills to be... have... skills and knowledge... You know, it’s not just calling disabled person, because they are disabled so that they are clarified, but they are not really, you need to have average knowledge behind them, and then understanding to be able to advise to that sort of particular service provider what is best to do.’ [COMD-3]

Furthermore, the disabled respondents [BUS-3], [COMD-2] and [TSTD-1] suggested that disabled people should develop negotiation techniques to complain in a polite way and to give constructive advice to tourism businesses and organisations.

‘...we give sensible, constructive opinions. We try not to be destructive. You can always become critical, but it’s always better to be constructive. You know, say, ‘yeah, that’s not quite right, but ‘if’ you do so and so, that would make it better’... ’ [COMD-2]
So you have to complain, but nicely. And I always found, personally, and it's interesting when I go to meetings and meet other people, if you complain nicely, in fact, you achieve great deal more than if you complain in a nasty way. And a lot of people at the meetings I go to are very straighten, very aggressive, and complaining all the time. And they seem to achieve legal minimum what the law says they must have they achieve. But if you are nice to people, and you smile and are friendly, you seem to achieve a lot lot more.' [TSTD-1]

Fourthly, it became apparent from the findings that good physical accessibility of the products, services and venues at tourism businesses and organisations is an important factor to encourage disabled people to participate in the design of tourism. [TRA-2] and [TSTD-2] suggested that it is important that tourism businesses and organisations have accessible venues for meetings when they invite disabled people to participate in the planning or feedback stages. In terms of the sales stage, [COMD-1] stated that if the venue or service that tourism businesses and organisations offer is accessible, disabled people will use it. This finding exactly matches with the existing studies (Murray and Sproats, 1990; Card, 2003) that identify the importance of physical accessibility for disabled people to participate in tourism. As repeated in Chapter 3, social exclusion can take the form of a lack of access to resources, activities or decision-making. In this regard, it can be said that physical accessibility can provide disabled people access to the resources or activities in the main spheres of the social word, such as the economic and political arenas, and, as a result, it can help to diminish the social exclusion of disabled people. Therefore, in any stage of the design of tourism, accessible facilities allow and encourage disabled people to participate in the design of tourism ([COMD-3]). [BUS-2] introduced an example of the consequence of having good physical accessibility:

'...obviously she (customer who used to come three times a year for three nights) did not have a bath and we had no shower units. But for three days they would come. So when we bought the extra land, we were able to convert the old restaurant into a bedroom, and in the bedroom, it was a small room, and we put a shower with the best form of seat that you can sit on in the shower, with rails everywhere. There are rails in every room, by the toilet, by the bathroom and so on, by the bath. And so this lady immediately, once they could have that room, immediately they extended their booking for three times for four nights.' [BUS-2]
The fifth factor to encourage disabled people to participate in the design of tourism concerns the provision of information. The previous chapter introduced a problem with the definition of accessibility, which is not clearly defined in many cases, and the difficulty for disabled people to trust the information of accessibility. As discussed in Chapter 3 on social exclusion, information plays an important role in allowing disabled people to make the most of their rights and resources; therefore, it is crucial to ensure access to correct information (Christie, 1999). [NPO-3] and [DORG-3b] suggested that it is crucial that tourism businesses and organisations provide information in more detail, including negative information, and that they need to be honest in terms of what they provide. [BUS-3] and [NPO-3] said that it is important to let disabled people know any possible limitations in advance when participating in the design of tourism.

'Which (their Access Guide) is...basically tells people whether things are accessible or not, and who they’re accessible to because I think one of the key things is being honest about access, so if something’s not accessible we’re telling people so they don’t go and visit it and then can’t get round and are disappointed, so.' [NPO-3]

If tourism businesses and organisations provide correct and honest information in advance, disabled people can make an informed choice about whether they participate in the design of tourism or not ([NPO-2] and [COMD-2]). In order to make it happen, it was suggested that there needs to be a grading system for accessibility which should be developed by tourist boards or an organisation like Tourism for All ([BUS-3]). In addition, [BUS-2] stated that making and presenting an access statement is a useful way to provide information of accessibility to disabled people. Furthermore, as disabled people tend to attach greater importance to information that is provided and tested by other disabled people (Tregaskis, 2004), it can be advantageous to involve disabled people in the information provision procedure in order to overcome disabled people’s distrust toward the information of accessibility.

The sixth identified way to encourage disabled people to participate in the design of tourism is through the promotion of the products and services offered to disabled people by tourism businesses and organisations. This is because it was found that tourism businesses and organisations do not have disabled customers, visitors or staff in the design of tourism, although they offer accessible products and services. At the same time, there are disabled
people who have money and would like to spend it if there are accessible products and services ([TSTD-2]). This gap indicates that disabled people might not have a broad knowledge of the existing accessible tourism products and services. The lack of knowledge on the existing accessible tourism resources is one of the intrapersonal barriers (Hall and Brown, 2006) discussed in Chapter 2, and it is regarded as influential in deciding whether to participate in tourism. Campbell (2000) and Goodall et al. (2004) argue that disabled people are unable to plan their participation in tourism without knowledge and information of the accessibility of the existing tourism resources. Therefore, there is a need for promotion in order to let disabled people know that accessible products and services exist ([TRA-2], [DORG-3b] and [TSTD-2]). [NPO-1] showed that the promotion they did on their services and programmes for disabled people actually increased the number of disabled visitors.

[TRA-4], [DORG-3a] and [COMD-3] pointed out that promotion is necessary in terms of providing information of accessibility to disabled people, and also in giving disabled people confidence to participate in the design of tourism. Moreover, it was found that promotion is regarded as a useful means to deliver a message to disabled people that they consider disability issues ([TI-1] and [ATT-3]).

In terms of the methods of promotion, several respondents have or have suggested promoting accessibility through publications including disability magazines ([REG-2], [NPO-2], [DORG-3a] and [COMD-1]), and a number of the respondents have produced their own access guides that can be used for promotion. Furthermore, different ways of promotion were introduced by the respondents: [NPO-1] introduced disability pass schemes to encourage disabled people to visit; [TRA-4] presents a two tick symbol on their website, which represents a standard that is applied to employers who are serious about disability, to give disabled people confidence to apply for jobs; and [ATT-2] actually went to a disability conference to experience direct contact with disabled people.

It was also pointed out that the format of promotional materials needs to be carefully considered in order for them to be accessible to disabled people. For example, use of appropriate communication methods, format, photos, simple language, and careful wording were suggested by [ATT-1], [ATT-2], [NPO-2] and [DORG-2]. This approach could be useful, as the careful consideration to the format in promotional materials can promote
inclusion of disabled people in the cultural arena, which is one of the arenas of the social world (Madanipour, 1998) in which social exclusion takes place.

Finally, it was stressed by the respondents that in order to encourage disabled people's participation in the design of tourism, tourism needs to be regarded as a whole and holistic process and journey.

"...we felt that it's important to look at the destination as a whole. It's pointless having hotels or attractions or venues that are accessible, if a disabled person can't actually cross the road to get to it. ...if the city isn't accessible, and we don't have any accessible businesses, disabled visitors won't come." [LOC-2&TI-3]

This statement shows that tourism businesses and organisations need to consider not only the individual venue or service, but also the whole environment and process that disabled people experience. Therefore, there is a need for an integrated approach to tourism ([REG-2], [LOC-2&TI-3], [TRA-4], [BUS-2], [NPO-2], [COMD-1] and [TSTD-1]). In this sense, [BUS-2] argued that tourism businesses and organisations should hold information and knowledge of accessibility in their whole local areas.

7.10. Chapter conclusion and summary

This chapter presented the second part of the findings of the primary research: the ways toward inclusive design of tourism. Among the identified ways toward inclusive design of tourism, one of the most significant findings was the importance of having direct contact and interaction with disabled people. It was found that by interacting with disabled people, tourism businesses and organisations can overcome a range of the identified barriers, including: attitudinal barriers toward disabled people; lack of awareness and knowledge of disability; lack of confidence in working with disabled people; lack of interest; and the low prioritisation attached to the issue of involving disabled people in the design of tourism. Furthermore, a range of practical matters was also identified. For example, making a link between the organisational priority and the involvement of disabled people, having an internal disability group within organisations, having an appointed position for disability issues within organisations, and raising disability awareness among senior managers, were
suggested as useful approaches toward inclusive design of tourism. It can be said that these suggestions were obtained because most of the respondents are practitioners working in the area of tourism and disability. Finally, as pointed out by the respondents, no matter how difficult it is to overcome the identified barriers toward inclusive design of tourism, the important thing is to continue trying to involve disabled people in the design of tourism.

To conclude the findings of the barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism and the ways to overcome these barriers, it can be summarised that although there are various barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism, they can be overcome with the identified approaches toward inclusive design of tourism. Thus, it can be said that it is possible to achieve inclusive design of tourism. All of the findings and discussion presented in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 will be incorporated in the summary of the research in the following and concluding chapter.
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSION

8.1. Introduction

This study was conducted to answer two research questions: (1) Are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism? (2) How can the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism be overcome? Throughout Chapters 2, 3 and 4, it was argued that disability is a socially constructed notion, and disabled people have been excluded from a range of dimensions of social life, including tourism. As the various forms of exclusion are indispensable to any social relationship (Madanipour, 1998), what is necessary in overcoming social exclusion is to increase inclusive practices. In this regard, the possibility of inclusive design is highlighted in involving socially excluded groups of people such as disabled people in the design of tourism. Thus, the ultimate research aim was to explore the ways toward inclusive design of tourism. The final chapter of this thesis concludes the study by evaluating if the aim of the study was achieved. Firstly, the key findings and conclusion of the research are reviewed, and the key recommendations are made. Secondly, this study’s potential contribution to theory and knowledge is suggested. Thirdly, the possible limitations of the study are discussed, and recommendations for future research are addressed. Finally, the thesis is concluded with reflection on the PhD research and final remarks.

8.2. Key findings and conclusion of the study

It was found from the data analysis that both inclusionary and exclusionary practices exist in the design of tourism. The data shows that disabled people are involved in the different stages of the design of tourism, but, at the same time, exclusionary practices still exist where disabled people are not involved in the design of tourism. This section presents the summary of the key findings and addresses the important issues from the findings.

8.2.1. Overview of the key findings
In terms of the findings on the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, it emerged that disabled people are involved in the different stages of the design of tourism, and various reasons for this involvement were identified from the data. Among the stages of the design of tourism, the planning, training, sales, feedback, and evaluation stages more frequently involved disabled people in the experience of many of the interview participants. On the other hand, disabled people appear to be less involved in the research and development stages. There seems to be a tendency whereby tourism businesses and organisations that consider disability issues have involved or try to involve disabled people thoroughly in different stages of the design of tourism, while others who do not focus on disability issues have not involved disabled people much in the design of tourism. Therefore, a gap among the tourism stakeholders can be identified in terms of how much they involve disabled people.

The primary reason for the involvement of disabled people was to obtain disabled people’s views and opinions regarding tourism products or services, in order to meet the needs of disabled people. In this regard, it can be said that the involvement of disabled people is regarded as user involvement method in the design process. The other reasons for the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism were: the benefit for business, legal obligations and the personal belief that disabled people should be involved in the design of tourism. It becomes apparent from the findings that the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism is inevitably based on the intention of tourism businesses and organisations to cater for disabled people.

On the other hand, in terms of the non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and the reasons for this, it was found that there are still forms of non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. One of the most significant reasons for the non-involvement was the confidence of tourism businesses and organisations in their products, services or facilities when catering for disabled people. Since tourism businesses and organisations are confident with the external sources they use or their experience of working with disabled people, they feel that they do not need to involve disabled people any more in the design of tourism to meet their needs. However, as the literature suggests (Shaw, 2007) this confidence in terms of their disability provision does not necessarily reflect their awareness and understanding of disability, and what they offer might not meet the needs of disabled people. As a consequence, the assumption made by the tourism businesses and
organisations can deny disabled people’s access to the design of tourism. This is to say, there is a possibility that tourism businesses and organisations unintentionally exclude disabled people from the design of tourism. The other identified reasons for the non-involvement of disabled people were: lack of resources, organisational and job constraints, and the belief that it is enough to involve disabled people only in one stage.

It was found that the reasons for the non-involvement of disabled people are not simply the opposite of the reasons for the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. Rather, the reasons for non-involvement of disabled people vary extensively owing to different factors such as organisational constraints or resource limitations. In identifying the reasons for the involvement and non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, the findings answered the first research question: are disabled people included/excluded from the design of tourism?

The barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism were also revealed from the findings, such as a lack of awareness and knowledge of disability, lack of interest and low priority in involving disabled people, and organisational constraints and stakeholder conflicts. These barriers match with the intrapersonal, interpersonal, environmental and structural barriers for disabled people to travel that have been identified in the existing studies. Although these barriers have been exclusively discussed from the guest-related perspective in the literature, the findings of the research show that they can also be identified from the host-side and in other areas involved in the design of tourism.

In terms of the ways and hints to overcome the identified barriers toward inclusive design of tourism, one of the most significant findings was the importance of having direct contact and interaction with disabled people. It was found that by interacting with disabled people, tourism businesses and organisations can overcome a range of the identified barriers, such as attitudinal barriers toward disabled people, lack of awareness and knowledge of disability, lack of confidence to work with disabled people, lack of interest and the low priority issue in involving disabled people in the design of tourism. Furthermore, a range of practical suggestions was made as ways to overcome the identified barriers. For example, making a link between the organisational priority and the involvement of disabled people, having an internal disability group within organisations, having an appointed position for disability
issues within organisations, and raising disability awareness among senior managers, were suggested as useful approaches toward inclusive design of tourism.

8.2.2. Acceptance of inclusive design of tourism and the social model of disability

From the findings above, it emerged that the importance of making the design of tourism inclusive to disabled people is well recognised by the respondents. The idea that disabled people should not be excluded from the design of tourism is shared among tourism businesses and organisations. Moreover, it should be noted that the identified barriers to involve disabled people found from tourism businesses and organisations were not related to disabled people’s impairment. This indicates that the respondents understand that the problems or barriers toward inclusive design of tourism do not result from the individual’s impairment; rather, the problems exist in society. Thus, it is acknowledged that society or the social environment should be changed in order to meet the needs of disabled people. Therefore, it can be argued that the idea of the social model of disability penetrates through tourism businesses and organisations.

8.2.3. Unintentional exclusion

It was revealed from the findings that there are cases where tourism businesses and organisations unintentionally exclude disabled people from the design of tourism. For instance, while tourism businesses and organisations support the idea of the social model of disability and are willing to involve disabled people in the design of tourism, they do not have many disabled people involved in the design of tourism. Furthermore, although tourism businesses and organisations have confidence in their accessible products and services, they do not receive many disabled customers. As Shaw (2007) suggests, the confidence in their disability provision does not necessarily reflect their awareness and understanding of disability, and what they offer might not match with the needs of disabled people. As a consequence, the assumption made by the tourism businesses and organisations can deny disabled people’s access to the design of tourism. This is to say, there is a possibility that tourism businesses and organisations unintentionally exclude disabled people from the design of tourism. The practices of unintentional exclusion match with the argument discussed in Chapter 3, according to which social exclusion is an institutionalised mechanism to control people’s access to places, activities, resources, or the design of tourism in the context of this
study. Since social exclusion is constructed through structural changes in a society, it becomes an institutionalised mechanism embedded in the society that is often exercised unintentionally and is not recognised by people.

8.2.4. Disabled people's reality

Based on the argument above, it is questionable whether social exclusion and other factors preventing disabled people from participating in the design of tourism are considered enough by the tourism businesses and organisations. In order to encourage disabled people to participate in the design of tourism, it becomes increasingly important for tourism businesses and organisations to attempt to appreciate the issues of social exclusion and the reality disabled people face in participating in the design of tourism. For example, it was found that disabled people are often afraid to participate in the design of tourism due to the way disabled people have been treated in society and the problems and exclusion they have experienced. Furthermore, in the findings of the barriers ‘for disabled people’ to participate in the design of tourism, one of the most important implications is that disabled people might face more problems and barriers in the design of tourism than non-disabled people assume. For instance, although tourism businesses and organisations offer accessible products or services, there are disabled people who do not participate in the design of tourism due to fear and lack of confidence, or because they do not want to take the risk of having problems due to the possibility of inaccessible facilities.

In considering disabled people’s fear and lack of confidence to participate in the design of tourism, a close relationship between disabled people’s participation and accessibility emerged. Disabled people do not participate in the design of tourism if they perceive that the facilities or services are not accessible to them, as lack of accessibility can be a massive problem for them. As introduced in the findings chapter, if a wheelchair is lost at an airport, it means taking the wheelchair user's legs away, or if an adapted bedroom with an accessible toilet is not provided to a disabled person in a hotel, he or she will have a tremendous problem. In this regard, ensuring accessibility is certainly a requisite for disabled people to participate in the design of tourism. Therefore, tourism businesses and organisations need to acknowledge the impact and importance of accessibility for disabled people to participate in the design of tourism. It can be argued that disabled people do not actively participate in the design of tourism until they overcome the fear and gain confidence to participate in it.
Furthermore, it is crucial for tourism businesses and organisations to remember that there are not only ‘active’ disabled people. When the interviewees talked about the involvement of disabled people, in some cases only active and ‘glamorous’ disabled people were highlighted, such as Paralympics’ medallists or disabled people who have continuously been involved in a range of consultation works. However, it is crucial to remember that there are not only these active disabled people. As one of the respondents showed, there are disabled people who can be housebound without having local transport services to go out. The literature on social exclusion and disability reveals that many disabled people have faced prejudice in society (Christie, 1999) and are not economically fortunate and are often at the bottom of the income hierarchy or out of work (Barton, 1993), and the truly marginalised, poor and uneducated disabled people are not well represented in official dialogues. It should be noted that these difficult situations for disabled people were not highlighted so much in the data. Moreover, the economic situation of many disabled people who are unemployed or have lower status jobs with lower salaries (Shaw, 2007) and less disposable income (Haywood, et al., 1995; Shaw and Coles, 2004) was not described by the respondents. This is probably because tourism businesses and organisations tend to focus on the size of the disabled people’s market when they promote the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, and intentionally or unintentionally they do not spotlight the negative side of the reality that disabled people face. In order to encourage the tourism businesses to involve more disabled people in the design of tourism, it is crucial to show them the market potential and benefit of involving disabled people. However, in attempting to involve any disabled person, not only the glamorous disabled people, in the stages of the design of tourism, it is crucial to understand the reality that disabled people face in their daily lives: how they are excluded from a range of dimensions of social life and what it is like to experience the myriad barriers in their lives.

If tourism businesses and organisations truly try to involve disabled people in the design of tourism, they should not just wait until disabled people come to participate in their services that are open to all. Rather, it is crucial that tourism businesses and organisations actively try to involve disabled people, starting with the creation of services specifically targeting disabled people. As Murray and Sproats (1990) argue, disabled people would like to participate in tourism, but the existing barriers must first be removed. For instance, [TRA-2] actively visits local Access Groups to give presentations on their accessible service and
facilities, and holds events that encourage disabled people to try the accessible trains. In order to give disabled people the confidence to participate in the design of tourism, tourism businesses and organisations need to start by offering specific services, or consultations particularly targeting disabled people. As Yau, et al. (2004) state, disabled people need to be specifically empowered to use accessible tourism resources, as, otherwise, disabled people may still not have access to tourism opportunities. Thus, it is important to make disabled people feel that they are empowered to participate in the design of tourism. Once disabled people overcome their fear and gain confidence, then it becomes easier for tourism businesses and organisations to incorporate disabled people into the services that are open to all, and disabled people would become more active in participating in the design of tourism by themselves. Hence, it can be argued that disabled people do not actively participate in the design of tourism, which is designed for the general public, until they overcome their fear and gain confidence to participate in it.

8.2.5. Dualism

It should be critically noted that a dualism between disabled people and non-disabled people was made and used in the data collection and analysis process. This issue is mentioned at this point because the dualism was recognised by the researcher during the data analysis process. Since disability is an issue not only for disabled people, but also for any person as anyone has a chance to be disabled, this study’s standpoint is that disability issues should be considered by all human beings as a society. Thus, making the dualism between disabled and non-disabled people is not theoretically acceptable in this study. However, the distinction between disabled and non-disabled people was made in collecting and analysing the data, since in order to study exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism, it was useful to distinguish people who are excluded from the design of tourism from people who exclude them.

8.2.6. The issue of subject and object

Based on the dualism between disabled and non-disabled people, it should also be noted that the findings show that disabled people are regarded as objects in the design of tourism. Namely, tourism businesses and organisations are regarded as subjects who involve disabled people in the design of tourism, whereas disabled people are the objects who are involved in
the design of tourism by the tourism businesses and organisations. Although emancipative practices have increased in the disability movement, the findings of the study show that disabled people are still regarded as objects to be included in the dimensions of social life. Thus, there needs to be more emancipatory practices, and active participation in the design of tourism from the disabled people’s side is required in the future, by overcoming the barriers and problems that disabled people face in participating in the design of tourism.

8.2.7. The shared beliefs

It should be considered that during the interviews the researcher and respondents shared some common beliefs, such as the social model of disability and the ideas that disabled people should be involved in the design of tourism and that the social environment needs to be changed to meet the needs of disabled people. Thus, epistemologically speaking from the constructivism-interpretivism position, it can be argued that the data was generated as an outcome of the interaction between the interviewees and researcher who share a common belief and ideology. It can axiologically be argued that the findings of this research are entirely the findings generated by the researcher. Therefore, it is useful to consider the personal background of the researcher (in 1.1.) and the reflexivity consideration (in 5.4.) in order to understand how and why the researcher included or excluded particular data in generating the findings.

In reviewing the key findings of the study above together with the comprehensive findings in Chapters 6 and 7, it can be said at this point that the two research questions have been answered, and the research objectives have been achieved with the findings. It is not necessary to repeat the findings in detail to show which findings answered the research questions, but the key findings in relation to the research questions and objectives are presented in Table 8.1 in the following section, with the key recommendations to achieve inclusive design of tourism.

8.3. Key Recommendations

Based on the findings of the research, particularly the findings on the reasons for involving disabled people in the design of tourism and the ways to overcome the barriers toward
inclusive design of tourism, several recommendations to achieve inclusive design of tourism can be made. As the ways toward inclusive design of tourism were discussed in detail in Chapter 7, the key recommendations are presented here. The key recommendations and their relation to the key findings are presented in Table 8.1 below, which also shows which findings answered the research questions and achieved the research objectives.
Table 8.1: Key findings and recommendations in relation to the research questions and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Research objectives</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th>Key recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) Are disabled people included or excluded from the design of tourism? | (a) To examine if there is inclusion/exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism (c) To explore how disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism (d) To consider why disabled people are included/excluded from the design of tourism *(b) To develop the concept of inclusive design of tourism: achieved in Chapter 4. | Involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and its reasons | [Strategic techniques]  
• Establishment of a process, mechanism or standard within organisations in involving disabled people  
• Internal disability group  
• Appointed position for disability issues  
• Senior people with disability awareness |
| | | User participation method | |
| | | Business sense | |
| | | Meeting customer/user's needs | |
| | | Legal obligation | |
| | | Personal belief | |
| | | [Non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and its reasons] | |
| | | Excuses? | |
| | | Organisational and job constraints | |
| | | Already have confidence | |
| | | Enough to involve disabled people in one stage | |
| | | Reasons for disabled people's non-participation in the design of tourism | |
| | | Answered research question (1) and achieved objectives (a, c, d) | |
| | (e) To explore the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism | Barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism | [Raise awareness]  
• Disability awareness training for tourism businesses and organisations  
• Face-to-face direct contact and interaction with disabled people  
• The involvement of disabled people as a mean to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism |
| | | Lack of awareness and knowledge | |
| | | Lack of interest and low priority issues | |
| | | Organisational constraints and stakeholder conflicts | |
| | | Barriers toward inclusive design of tourism on disabled people's side | |
| | | Answered research question (1) and achieved objective (e) | |
| | (f) To discuss how the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism can be overcome | Ways to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism | [Promotion]  
• Promotion of the value and benefit of the involvement of disabled people  
• Promotion of the existing resources (Link between tourism businesses and organisations and the existing resources)  
• Link between tourism businesses and organisations and disabled people and disability organisations |
| | | Promotion of the value of the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism | |
| | | The factors that encourage or force tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people in the design of tourism | |
| | | Strategic techniques to deliver change | |
| | | Direct contact with disabled people | |
| | | The involvement of disabled people | |
| | | Link between tourism businesses and organisations and disabled people and disability organisations | |
| | | The factors that encourage disabled people to participate in the design of tourism | |
| | | Answered research question (2) and achieved objective (f) |  

Answered research questions and achieved objectives:

1. Answered research question (1) and achieved objectives (a, c, d)  
2. Answered research question (2) and achieved objective (e)
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Firstly, in considering the various barriers toward inclusive design of tourism related to the organisational constraints, a range of strategic techniques are recommended for tourism businesses and organisations. For instance, having internal disability groups and appointed positions for disability issues within an organisation is useful to promote the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. It is also advantageous to set a process or mechanism within the organisation to ensure that disabled people are continually involved in what they are doing. Tourism businesses and organisations need to mainstream the disability issue into everyone’s responsibility and to make sure the issue is considered across the organisation. Moreover, the disability issue has to be positively built in organisations, also because if active individuals leave, the whole work on the involvement of disabled people would decline. In this sense, the majority of the respondents suggested that it is useful to have an appointed position in their businesses and organisations specifically for disability issues. It indicates that it is necessary to have somebody in the organisation who is committed to keeping and driving the initiatives forward. In addition, if senior people in the organisation have disability awareness, it can have a huge effect on the promotion of inclusive design of tourism. The main reason why it is important for senior people to have disability awareness is due to their authority to make decisions and changes in the organisations. In fact, several respondents showed actual cases where the senior managers or CEOs developed disability awareness through training or actually meeting disabled people, and it became a great driving force for the organisations toward inclusive design of tourism.

Secondly, in order to raise disability awareness among tourism businesses and organisations, it is suggested that training is crucial. Training has an important role in informing tourism businesses and organisations of the benefit and importance of involving disabled people, and it can change the bias and stereotypes that non-disabled people have against disabled people. In particular, training in which direct contact with disabled people is made can have a beneficial influence on raising disability awareness, as disabled people can talk based on their experience of the existing barriers. Additionally, face-to-face contact with disabled people in training can make non-disabled people more comfortable to work with disabled people. Face-to-face contact and interaction with disabled people are regarded as significant in changing people’s awareness and attitude toward disabled people and eventually changing the culture of tourism businesses and organisations toward disability. It was found that people who have previous experience of having direct contact with disabled people have more disability awareness and intend to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. Personal experience
with disabled people allows non-disabled people to appreciate disabled people’s needs and gain confidence to work with disabled people. It is crucial to have disabled people in every sector and every stage of the design of tourism, in order to increase the direct contact with disabled people among tourism businesses and organisations.

Thirdly, in terms of promotion, the value and benefit of involving disabled people in the design of tourism should be actively promoted to tourism businesses and organisations. This is because it is important for tourism businesses to see how much they can benefit from involving disabled people in the design of tourism. In order to make tourism businesses and organisations appreciate the benefit of involving disabled people, it is useful to have good business case studies that outline the increase in the number of customers or income, to show tourism businesses and organisations the benefit of involving disabled people in the design of tourism. The good business cases can be also used as examples that tourism businesses and organisations can follow. Promotion is also necessary in letting tourism businesses and organisations know the existing resources that are useful in involving disabled people, as it was found that the available resources are often not known by them, such as statistics, training courses and disability organisations that offer help. Moreover, making a link between tourism businesses and organisations that would like to involve disabled people and disabled people or disability organisations that are willing to participate in the design of tourism, would be useful in order to let them know of their existence. It emerged from the findings that although tourism businesses and organisations intend to involve disabled people, some of them do not know where to find disabled people. At the same time, although disabled people and disability organisations are willing to get involved in the design of tourism, they do not know where and when tourism businesses and organisations would like them to participate. Therefore, there is a need for the development of a link or network between tourism businesses and organisations and disabled people and disability organisations.

Finally, it is recommended that it is crucial to build disabled people’s confidence to participate in the design of tourism, as lack of confidence emerged as a significant factor in disabled people’s non-participation in the design of tourism. In order to build disabled people’s confidence, having good physical accessibility and information provision is essential. The findings show that good physical accessibility of the products, services and venues at tourism businesses and organisations is an important factor to encourage disabled people to participate in the design of tourism. Thus, it is crucial to have physical accessibility when
tourism businesses and organisations involve disabled people in the design of tourism. In terms of information provision, it is crucial to provide correct and honest information, in order for disabled people to make an informed choice about whether they participate in the design of tourism or not. It is also suggested to promote the existing accessible products and services to disabled people. It was found that tourism businesses and organisations do not have disabled customers, visitors or staff, although they offer accessible services and facilities. At the same time, there are disabled people who have money and would like to spend it if there are accessible products and services. This gap indicates that disabled people might not have a broad knowledge of the existing accessible tourism products and services. Thus, there is a need for promotion in order to let disabled people know that accessible products and services exist. Lastly, in considering the reality disabled people face, as discussed earlier, it is recommended that providing services specifically targeting disabled people can be a good starting point in giving disabled people the confidence to participate in the design of tourism.

8.4. Contribution to theory

The two anticipated contributions of this study to theory are: the development of the idea of inclusive design of tourism, and the disclosure of new understanding in the research area of tourism and disability.

The first and principal contribution to theory is the introduction of the concepts of design and inclusive design to tourism and the development of the idea of inclusive design of tourism. The study first introduced the concept of design to tourism. Design is defined as ‘the thought process comprising the creation of an entity’ (Miller, 2004), entailing a series of decision-making and activities. It addresses a range of key issues, not only the functions of design but also a range of activities within the design process. It is argued that the concept of design is useful in discussing the involvement of disabled people in different areas of tourism. The issues of exclusion of disabled people from tourism should be studied in a comprehensive way, not exclusively from the perspective based on the simple distinction between host and guest. There are various stages and areas of tourism in which disabled people can be included and various roles they can take toward the creation of tourism, not only as customers or visitors but also as planners, developers, trainers, employers, employees, auditors, and more.
To increase inclusive practices in tourism, the inclusion of disabled people in tourism needs to be discussed from these various perspectives. In order to do so, the use of the concept of design has a potential in the context of tourism, as it can address the various steps toward the creation of an entity that represents a series of thoughts and actions in the design process. Applying the concept of design to tourism, based on Miller’s (2004) definition of design, ‘the design of tourism’ can be understood as a continuous process toward the creation of tourism comprising a sequence of steps with various thoughts and actions.

The circular figure representing the design of tourism (Figure 4.2 and 6.1) includes a range of stages such as: user research and marketing; planning products and services; developing and constructing; promotion; staff training; sales and service delivery; user and customer feedback; and evaluation. The significance of the concept of the design of tourism is that it shows tourism as a dynamic design process in which tourism is planned, developed, distributed and evaluated, and each of the steps is understood as a part of the design process. The existing concepts such as tourism development and tourism planning only represent some parts of the design of tourism process and are not able to address the range of dynamic tourism activities. The idea of the design process would also be useful in other fields in creating any entity to understand that any activity is a part of the iterative process.

In considering the issue of the exclusion of disabled people from tourism, the concept of inclusive design was introduced. Inclusive design is defined as ‘an intentional project that sets out to include significant sectors of society that are all too frequently ignored or overlooked’ (Coleman, 2006:13). The main feature of inclusive design is that socially excluded people, such as disabled people in this research context, participate in different stages of the design process (Shiose, et al., 2009). Therefore, by increasing the involvement of disabled people in the various areas of tourism and making the design of tourism inclusive to disabled people, inclusive design of tourism can be achieved. Although the idea of inclusive design originally emerged from the area of design and product development, it can have meaningful implications for tourism studies. Inclusive design’s focus is particularly on those who have traditionally been excluded from society. Namely, there is the consideration of the issue of social exclusion behind the idea of inclusive design. Simamura-Willcocks (2006) suggests that the ultimate goal of inclusive design is social inclusion. In this regard, the idea of inclusive design of tourism can be used in highlighting the involvement of socially excluded people in the design of tourism.
In considering the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism, this study gave a critique of the existing public participation approaches such as CBT and stakeholder theory, in addressing the issue of social exclusion. For instance, the term 'community' does not represent a group of homogeneous people, but comprises the diversified nature of members which can be found in various ways in tourism, such as in terms of their needs, wills, power, and priorities in the design of tourism (Lindberg, et al., 2001). Among the members of the community, it is suggested that particular groups of people's voice, the voice of people who are socially excluded and often regarded as minority groups in a community including disabled people, has not been often embodied in the community's voice. Thus, it was argued that the relationship among the members of community or various stakeholders and the mechanism of inequality and social exclusion are not adequately addressed by the existing public participation approaches in tourism. In this regard, inclusive design of tourism is an advantageous approach to address the issue of social exclusion and the involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism. The development of the idea of inclusive design and its implications for tourism studies are the main possible contribution to theory this study can make.

The findings of the study offer important implications for how to overcome the barriers of disabled people being excluded from the design of tourism. For instance, the findings on the reasons for the involvement and non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism were used to produce the suggestions for disabled people and tourism businesses and organisations to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism, as presented in Table 8.1. Many of the suggestions and recommendations were made by taking account of a managerial or operational viewpoint, therefore, can be useful to overcome the barriers of disabled people being excluded from the design of tourism in practice.

The second contribution of this study to theory is that it offers a new understanding of the research area of tourism and disability. Research on tourism and disabled people itself is a relatively new study area, and until recently tourism did not pay much attention to disability issues (Takeda and Card, 2002). Nevertheless, there has been a growing interest in tourism and disability, and a number of studies have been conducted and published on the topic. However, it can be said that the focus of most of the studies is very limited and they lack comprehensiveness as the focus is mostly placed on the perspectives of tourists with
disabilities. As has been presented in Chapter 2, most of the existing studies can be classified in several categories such as: a wide variety of barriers to tourism participation experienced by disabled people; the issue of disability access and heritage sites; the impact of anti-discrimination legislation on the tourism industry; the ability of the tourism industry to cater for disabled tourists; employment of disabled people in the tourism and hospitality industry; the market potential of disabled people’s segmentation in the tourism industry; and informational needs of disabled tourists. It can be argued that the previous studies on tourism and disability see disabled people mainly from the guest-perspective, and there is an absence of a perspective from other areas of tourism that is what the design of tourism represents. There are various stages and areas of tourism where disabled people can be included, and various roles they can take toward the creation of tourism, not only as customers or visitors, but also as planners, developers, trainers, employers, employees and auditors. In this sense, disability research in tourism is not well established and not comprehensive enough, and there is a need for further studies on tourism and disability from different perspectives. The potential contribution of this study to theory could be found in this blank area. In establishing the idea of inclusive design of tourism, this study examined the involvement of disabled people not only in the sales stage as disabled tourists, but also other stages of the design of tourism such as the planning and feedback stages that have not been revealed in the existing tourism studies. Thus, this study added new insights into tourism and disability, and it leads to the promotion of the understanding of disability issues in tourism in a comprehensive way.

8.5. Contribution to knowledge

The potential contribution of this study to knowledge can be found in three ways. Firstly, in terms of the research context of this study where the data was collected, the cases and findings from South East England can also have relevance for other areas, regions and countries. The implications and lessons from the South East would be particularly useful for the areas that have similar social, economic and cultural situations to those of South East England. It can be said that South East England is one of the foremost regions in the UK due to Tourism South East’s range of support and programmes to promote accessible tourism and the well-known disability training programme by TSE, Welcome All, which has been taken by tourism businesses and organisations from different parts of the country. In this sense, the findings of this study can have meaningful implications to other areas, as the findings are
based on the data from the interviewees from the South East, which is a leading region in accessible tourism, and they might have more opportunities to consider the issue of tourism and disability. The identified barriers and difficulties to involve disabled people in the design of tourism might be commonly experienced in other regions; however, the ways to overcome the barriers suggested by the interviewees from the South East can be something that some regions would not think of. Therefore, the findings of this study extracted from the experience and knowledge of the South East can have meaningful implications for other areas.

Secondly, it was found that the barriers for disabled people to travel identified in the existing studies can also be adapted in the host-side and different areas of the design of tourism. Intrapersonal, interpersonal, environmental and structural barriers for disabled people to travel, discussed in 2.3.3., were also experienced by tourism businesses and organisations. For example: lack of confidence in involving disabled people in the design of tourism and lack of knowledge of the needs of disabled people (intrapersonal barriers); negative attitude toward disabled people (interpersonal barriers); lack of physical accessibility in involving disabled people in the design of tourism (environmental barriers); and lack of time and funding (structural barriers) were also identified as the barriers for tourism businesses and organisations to involve disabled people in the design of tourism.

The final contribution of this study to knowledge is that it can provide an opportunity to examine the application of the existing theories on disability, social exclusion and inclusive design in the context of tourism. For instance, this study might be significant for researchers on disability in terms of knowing how the theories of disability are used in the area of tourism. It was found in this study that the idea of the social model of disability has been appreciated by tourism businesses and organisations. Furthermore, from this study, the researchers on social exclusion can see a new case where social exclusion exists and operates in the design of tourism. Finally, in the field of inclusive design, the existing case studies have appeared from the areas of product development, environmental design and architecture. If they can be categorised as manufacturing (or something tangible), cases from tourism would be able to add new experiences and examples of inclusive design of something intangible from the service perspective. From the perspective of the service sector, inclusive design practices in educational and health service fields have been reported. However, few studies on inclusive design have been presented so far from the tourism field. Reporting this study on inclusive design from the tourism area can contribute to adding new insight to the discipline of
inclusive design. To sum up, the topic of this research can provide a new case to different disciplines such as disability, social exclusion and inclusive design, giving an opportunity to see if and how the existing theories in the disciplines work in the context of tourism.

8.6. Limitations

The limitations of this study should be critically addressed in order to appraise the study properly. Firstly, it should be noted that the findings from the disabled respondents might not have reflected the view of the 'truly marginalised' disabled people, as explained in 5.7.2. Secondly, in terms of the interview as an instrument, it has to be mentioned that the responses to the interview questions on the non-involvement and reasons for the non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism could not be obtained in as much detail as in the other interview questions. This might partly be because it might have been easier for the respondents to answer what the 'barriers' or 'difficulties' are for them, rather than talking about 'what they have not done'. In fact, 'not involving disabled people' might sound like they are doing something bad, although the researcher explained at the beginning of each interview that this research does not intend to blame people who have not involved disabled people in what they are doing. Therefore, it might make sense that they gave more responses to the question asking about the barriers to involve disabled people than the non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism and the reasons for the non-involvement. It needs to also be added that the interviewer focused more on the questions on barriers and difficulties than the ones on non-involvement and the reasons for the non-involvement, because the interviewer found during the interviews that the respondents looked hesitant to answer the questions on non-involvement, but happy to talk about their difficulties and barriers in involving disabled people in the design of tourism. Thus, this could be another reason why more responses were obtained on the barriers and difficulties questions than the non-involvement questions. Therefore, it can be said that the findings on the barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism might include some hidden reasons for non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism.
8.7. Future research

Based on the key findings and limitations of the study, possible future research can be recommended. Firstly, this study, or any study dealing with disability, also needs to be conducted by disabled researchers. This is because disabled researchers might have different perspectives and interpretation of the data from what those of the current researcher, since they might have more sensitivity toward an exclusionary statement or practice, as they experience the exclusionary practices in their daily life. In case the exclusionary practice is embedded in society naturally, the researcher would not be able to notice it thoroughly from the data, as she is not disabled. Disability research by disabled researchers is required also in terms of emancipation of disabled people in research. Traditionally, most of the disability research was based on the medical model of disability by non-disabled professionals who did not have sensitivity to the experience of disabled people; therefore, they have often been oppressive and irrelevant to the reality disabled people are facing (Oliver, 1996a). Disabled people have not been involved in the research process, except as a passive object for the research. In this regard, there is a need for disability research conducted by disabled researchers to add new, subjective insights into the topic.

Secondly, it would be beneficial to conduct this research in different contexts. This study was conducted in the region of South East England in the UK; therefore, the findings inevitably reflect the South East’s social, economic and cultural situations. While the findings of this research would be useful in other areas in the UK and some of the developed countries, the implications and lessons from South East England might be pointless in some of the countries that have different social, economic and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, further research on inclusive design of tourism in other locations is required to examine disabled people’s participation in the design of tourism, and the applicability of the idea of inclusive design of tourism in different contexts.

Thirdly, further research on the effect of the direct contact and interaction with disabled people in achieving inclusive design of tourism is required. One of the main findings of this study is that having direct contact and interaction with disabled people can potentially overcome many of the identified barriers toward inclusive design of tourism. Although this point gained attention and interest from the researcher, it was not the aim of this research to examine the effect of the interaction with disabled people in detail. Therefore, it would be
worthwhile to investigate in the future to what extent the direct contact and interaction with disabled people can have an influence in overcoming the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism. Finding out its mechanism and any effective form of interaction with disabled people might also be of value in order to contribute to the promotion of inclusive design of tourism.

Fourthly, more detailed research is needed to investigate the barriers and difficulties for disabled people including ‘truly marginalised’ disabled people to participate in the design of tourism. This is because the findings of this research might not have included the voice of those who are most marginalised among the disabled community, as discussed in the previous section. The findings suggested that tourism businesses and organisations tend to focus on active disabled people in discussing inclusive design of tourism. However, there might be an ethical challenge in conducting the suggested research with ‘truly marginalised’ disabled people, as they are regarded by ethics committees as ‘vulnerable’ people who should be protected in research practices. Questions such as how to define ‘truly marginalised’ disabled people, how to approach them, how to recruit them, and how to assess their ability to give an informed consent need to be answered in order to obtain ethical approval from a university, and this can be a considerable challenge before going to the field. Moreover, the findings of this study indicate there is a gap between the needs of disabled people that tourism businesses and organisations assume, and what disabled people really need in participating in the design of tourism. Therefore, it is crucial to get more input from disabled people and listen to their voice in order to explore and understand the real situation of disabled people from their perspective in participating in the design of tourism.

Finally, further research is required to examine if this study’s identified ways to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism would really work in practice. Conducting such a study might be challenging, since the effectiveness of many of the suggested ways toward inclusive design of tourism would most suitably be examined in the field and real situations where it is possible to observe the changes occurred as a result of implementing the identified approaches toward inclusive design of tourism. Participatory action research would be one of the most suitable research strategies for the topic. It is inevitable that such research requires a lot of time and strong connections and contacts with potential participants to gain their support. Thus, it can be challenging to conduct this recommended future research. Nevertheless, the importance and value of the recommended research in promoting inclusive
design of tourism should not be neglected. This future research was recommended due to the methodological position of this study, which is not only the constructivist-interpretivist paradigm, but is also informed by the critical-ideological paradigm. The ultimate goal of the critical-ideological paradigm is to empower the participants and to emancipate them from oppression (Ponterotto, 2005). Thus, criticalists are researchers who attempt to employ their studies for social or cultural criticism and regard their work as the first step toward political action, which can remedy inequality (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). Therefore, examining if the suggested ways toward inclusive design of tourism would really work in practice would be a meaningful step forward to achieving and promoting inclusive design of tourism in the future.

8.8. Final remarks – the end of the PhD journey

The very final part of the thesis presents the reflection of the PhD journey and the final remarks to conclude the thesis. Taking a PhD has been a real challenge for the researcher. There have been a lot of ups and downs through the PhD process, and the researcher has encountered financial difficulties and mental health problems. It can be said that this study is the result of a ten-year process since 2000 when the researcher became interested in the area of tourism and disability. She has had a clear aim to be an expert in tourism and disability in academia since she decided to come to England, but it has been difficult to keep the motivation to accomplish the aim and study. However, the academic experience and the network gained in England has encouraged the researcher and developed her interest further in tourism and disability. The main academic activities include:

- Developed network with tourism businesses, organisations and disabled people who work on the area of tourism and disability, through the research in the MSc and PhD courses.
- Attended the meetings of Guildford Access Group to observe the issues for the local disabled people.
- Attended conferences on disability in general to learn the current issues for disabled people in the UK.
- Received the Mayor's Award for Access in 2006 for a restaurant where the researcher provided advice about access improvements for disabled people.
It can be said that these experiences were mainly obtained in the real field with practitioners. Through the experience above, the researcher has developed the idea that the outcome of this study needs to be something useful for practitioners.

This is one of the reasons why the final chapter addressed the future research to examine if this study’s identified ways toward inclusive design of tourism would really work in practice. One of the interview respondents introduced his experience at a conference:

‘I attended a conference last week... A lot of talk, not much action...there’s a distinct lack of doers. There’s lots of academics. There’s lots of professors. There’s lots of doctors. And what came through from that, very much so, was, there’s lots of conceptual work discussed. And, oh, we should do this and we should do that. Yeah, but how many of you have actually physically talked with disabled people and understand what their needs are, and so forth?’ [BUS-3]

When the researcher had the dilemma of the role of academic, the advice from her supervisor was very helpful in resolving the dilemma; an academic researcher is like a fashion designer. The designer clothes in fashion shows sometimes look too eccentric, and it seems that no one would wear them in daily life. However, the essence of the designer clothes at the fashion shows can soon be found in clothes in high street shops. This example indicates that the role of the academic does not necessarily mean producing something that can immediately be used by practitioners in the field. While what the academic researchers produce might be criticised as extreme, impracticable or armchair theory, it can be argued that evolving and developing theories, concepts and ideas in academia is itself of value in influencing the practical world. In this regard, the researcher hopes that this study can make contribution to the promotion of inclusive design of tourism in both academic and practical terms.

This study explored disabled people’s involvement in the design of tourism. The idea of inclusive design of tourism was developed to address the involvement of socially excluded people in the design of tourism. The forms of and reasons for the involvement and non-involvement of disabled people in the design of tourism were identified and incorporated into the findings of the barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism. Based on all the findings, the ways to overcome the identified barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism were suggested in order to achieve and promote inclusive design of tourism.
To conclude this study, in this chapter, the possible contribution to theory and knowledge and limitations of the study were critically examined. Furthermore, the key recommendations to tourism businesses and organisations were made, and suggestions for future research were provided. As the final statement, it can be said that although there are various barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism, they can be overcome with the identified approaches toward inclusive design of tourism. Hence, it can be concluded that it is possible to achieve inclusive design of tourism.
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### Appendix 1: International convention and Bills relating to tourism and disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Conventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN, 1948)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 13: Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 24: Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons (UN, 1975)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 3: Disabled persons have the inherent right to respect for their human dignity. Disabled persons, whatever the origin, nature and seriousness of their handicaps and disabilities, have the same fundamental rights as their fellow-citizens for the same age, which implies first and foremost the right to enjoy a decent life, as normal and full as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 8: Disabled persons are entitled to have their special needs taken into consideration at all stages of economic and social planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convention on the Right of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2006)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 30: Participation in cultural life, recreation, leisure and sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. States Parties recognize the right of persons with disabilities to take part on an equal basis with others in cultural life, and shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that persons with disabilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Enjoy access to places for cultural performances or services, such as theatres, museums, cinemas, libraries and tourism services, and, as far as possible, enjoy access to monuments and sites of national cultural importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. With a view to enabling persons with disabilities to participate on an equal basis with others in recreational, leisure and sporting activities, States Parties shall take appropriate measures:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) To ensure that persons with disabilities have access to sporting, recreational and tourism venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) To ensure that persons with disabilities have access to services from those involved in the organization of recreational, tourism, leisure and sporting activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism Bill of Rights (UNWTO, 1985)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The right of everyone to rest and leisure, reasonable limitation of working hours, periodic leave with pay and freedom of movement without limitation, within the bounds of the law, is universally recognised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article III</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To this end the States should:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) encourage the adoption of measures enabling everyone to participate in domestic and international tourism, especially by a better allocation of work and leisure time, the establishment or improvement of systems of annual leave with pay and the staggering of holiday dates and by particular attention to tourism for the young, elderly and disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article V</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The States should lastly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) not allow any discriminatory measures in regard to tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article IX</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement should be given to tourism professionals and suppliers of tourism and travel services by granting them, through appropriate national and international legislation, the necessary facilities to encourage them to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) exercise their activities in favourable conditions, free from any particular impediment or discrimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (UNWTO, 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tourism activities should respect the equality of men and women; they should promote human rights and, more particularly, the individual rights of the most vulnerable groups, notably children, the elderly, the handicapped, ethnic minorities and indigenous peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The prospect of direct and personal access to the discovery and enjoyment of the planet’s resources constitutes a right equally open to all the world’s inhabitants…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family, youth, student and senior tourism and tourism for people with disabilities, should be encouraged and facilitated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9) Source of the participants to be studied: Interviewees will be identified through a combination of approaches. Contacts and internet sources will be utilised to generate interviewees. Snowball sampling approach will identify additional interviewees. Whilst the research is interested in barriers to the inclusive design of tourism, the vast majority of participants are unlikely to have any disability at all. In order to achieve the goals of the research, disabled residents of the South East and tourists with disabilities will be interviewed. These people will be identified through the help of ‘Tourism for All’ (a national charity supporting accessible tourism) and local Access Groups. These groups work to help disabled people and the research will be guided by their experience as to who to speak with.

10) Estimated number of participants: 23-35 participants.

11) Details of payments to participants: No payments.

12) Investigators are asked to note that research proposals involving the following must be submitted to an NHS Research Ethics Committee for ethical review. Please indicate which of the categories below, if any, applies to your research, and provide details of your NHS REC application. The Ethics Committee will not consider research proposals which meet any of these criteria until a favourable ethical opinion from the NHS REC has been obtained. None of the categories below apply to the research.

a. patients and users of the NHS. This includes all potential research participants recruited by virtue of the patient or user’s past or present treatment by, or use of, the NHS. It includes NHS patients treated under contract with private sector institutions.
b. individuals identified as potential research participants because of their status as relatives or carers of patients and users of the NHS, as defined above.

c. access to data, organs or other bodily material of past and present NHS patients.

d. fetal material and IVF involving NHS patients.

e. the recently dead in NHS premises.

f. the use of, or potential access to, NHS premises or facilities.

g. NHS staff – recruited as research participants by virtue of their professional role.

13) Has a risk assessment been carried out in respect of this research, either for potential participants or the researchers? If yes, please attach a summary document of the issues considered. If no, please explain why it has not been done.

All interviews will be conducted in public spaces, and the 'interviewer safety plan' in Appendix will be followed. The interviewer considers there to be minimal risk of the questions upsetting participants. (see 'Topic guide of the interview questions')

14) What are the potential adverse effects, risks or hazards for (a) research participants? (b) researchers?
(a) The researcher's previous experience in discussing social exclusion and tourism with disabled people showed respondents to take pleasure from the opportunity to discuss the issues. The researcher is sensitive to the minimal risk of causing upset and will stop immediately any such questions.

(b) N/A

15) What are the potential benefits for research participants?
There will be no benefits for participants above and beyond any satisfaction and interest derived from the interview itself.

16) Please provide details of arrangements for the collection, retention, use and disposal of research data:
All interviews will be digitally recorded with the prior permission of interviewees. Anonymity will be promised to respondents. All data will be stored on a private laptop with password protection, as well as on a password...
protected PC at the University. Excerpts from interviews will be used anonymously in PhD dissertation, academic articles and conference presentations. All data will be destroyed after 10 years.

17) Has a Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) check been carried out in relation to this research? (This will be required for research activity which will bring staff and/or students into contact with children or vulnerable adults). If yes, please attach copies of the relevant documentation.

N/A

All participants will be competent to consent to interviews. The disability charities used as gatekeepers to disabled residents and tourists will be asked to only suggest people for interview who are capable to give fully informed consent. The researcher does not need to speak with people who have any diminished ability to give consent. As such, the disabled people to be interviewed will be no less able to give informed consent than any other population group.

18) For Drugs Trials N/A

a. Please state Phase:

b. If a new drug, does it have a Clinical Trials Exemption Certificate or Product Licence Number?

c. If a new drug, give details of toxic/side effects so far reported:

d. In addition to the recorded toxic/side effects, state any potential risks to the subjects and the precautions taken to deal with the situation:
19) Checklist of Accompanying Documents (Please tick the appropriate boxes)

Please ensure that, where appropriate, the following documents are submitted along with your application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>A summary of the project, (approximately 500 words), including its principal aims and objectives; this should provide a clear description of who is doing what, to whom, to how many, where, when and why in non-technical, lay terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>The detailed protocol for the project</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Evidence of agreement of other collaborators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Copy of the Information Sheet for participants</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>Copy of the Consent Form</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Copy of questionnaire/interview Schedule</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi</td>
<td>Copies of standard letters related to the project</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Copy of risk assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lx</td>
<td>Protocol Submission Proforma: Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Confirmation that CRB (Criminal Records Bureau) checks have been carried out – this will be required if there is contact with children and vulnerable adults for significant periods of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi</td>
<td>Evidence of insurance cover/indemnity, particularly for drugs trials (Please refer to the Insurance Guidelines)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii</td>
<td>Copy of the Clinical Trials Exemption Certificate or Product Licence Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii</td>
<td>Information concerning any other Ethical Committee to which an application for ethical opinion is being made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20) Names and signatures of all Investigators:
   Tomomi Wakiya
   Dr Graham Miller
   Prof. John Tribe

21) Date of Application: 18/05/09

Risk assessment: Interviewer Safety Plan

All interviews will be conducted in public spaces. The Interviewer Safety Plan will be followed.

- A detailed schedule of interviews including day, time, duration and location of each interview will be informed to someone who knows that the research is in the process of data collection, such as supervisors and PhD colleagues. A contact number of the researcher during the interviews will also be informed to them. The interviewer's safety will be monitored by the contact person.
- The researcher will call the contact person before and after the interviews in order to let her/him know the interviewer's safety. A mobile phone needs to be placed beside the interviewer during the interviews in case of receiving a call from the contact person.
Appendix 3: Information Sheets for the interviewees

(1) Information Sheet for the interview participants in the 1st and 2nd phases

(Available in large print and audio formats)

- About the project

This study aims to examine the idea of inclusive design of tourism, namely, to explore why disabled people are excluded/included in the design of tourism, and if the exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism exists, how it can be overcome. The study is undertaken as a part of the interviewer's PhD study. This research has been reviewed and given a favourable ethical opinion by the University of Surrey Ethics Committee. This interview is intended to explore the reasons of exclusion/inclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism, as well as possible ways to overcome the barriers.

- What you will be asked during the study

You will be asked to participate in one interview. There will be no following interviews. During the interview, you will be asked questions by the interviewer. The questions will be related to the following topics: have disabled people been involved in your activities or businesses; what are the reasons for and against involving disabled people; what are the barriers to involving disabled people in the design of tourism; why do the barriers exist; how do we overcome the barriers towards inclusive design of tourism; and what do we need to do to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism.

- The rights of the participants

You are not obliged to take part in the interview and have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without having to give a reason.

- The use of the data

All the data collected will be anonymised and treated as confidential. The data collected will be used only for the purposes of the interviewer's PhD research and related papers for journals and conference presentations.

- Complaints and concerns

Any complaint or concerns about any aspects of the way you have been dealt with during the course of the study will be addressed. Please contact Dr Graham Miller, the principal investigator on 01483....
Information Sheet for the interview participants in the 2nd phases only

(Available in large print and audio formats)

- About the project

This study aims to examine the idea of inclusive design of tourism, namely, to explore why disabled people are excluded/included in the design of tourism, and if the exclusion of disabled people from the design of tourism exists, how it can be overcome. The study is undertaken as a part of the interviewer's PhD study. This research has been reviewed and given a favourable ethical opinion by the University of Surrey Ethics Committee. Based on the investigation on why disabled people are excluded/included from the design of tourism, this interview is intended to explore how the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism can be overcome.

- What you will be asked during the study

You will be asked to participate in one interview. There will be no following interviews. During the interview, you will be asked questions by the interviewer. The questions will be related to the following topics: how do we overcome the barriers towards inclusive design of tourism; and what do we need to do to overcome the barriers toward inclusive design of tourism.

- The rights of the participants

You are not obliged to take part in the interview and have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without having to give a reason.

- The use of the data

All the data collected will be anonymised and treated as confidential. The data collected will be used only for the purposes of the interviewer's PhD research and related papers for journals and conference presentations.

- Complaints and concerns

Any complaint or concerns about any aspects of the way you have been dealt with during the course of the study will be addressed. Please contact Dr Graham Miller, the principal investigator on 01483....
Appendix 4: Consent form

Consent Form

- I, the undersigned, voluntarily agree to take part in the study on the examination of the idea of inclusive design of tourism, exploring how the barriers towards inclusive design of tourism can be overcome.

- I have read and understood the Information Sheet provided. I have been given a full explanation by the investigators of the nature, purpose, location and likely duration of the study, and of what I will be expected to do. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions on all aspects of the study and have understood the advice and information given as a result.

- I agree to comply with any instruction given to me during the study and to co-operate fully with the investigators. I shall inform them immediately if I suffer any deterioration of any kind in my health or well-being, or experience any unexpected or unusual symptoms.

- I consent to my personal data, as outlined in the accompanying information sheet, being used for the research project detailed in the information sheet, and agree that anonymised data collected may be shared with other researchers or interested parties. I understand that all personal data relating to volunteers is held and processed in the strictest confidence, and in accordance with the Data Protection Act (1998).

- I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without needing to justify my decision and without prejudice.

- I understand that in the event of my suffering a significant and enduring injury (including illness or disease) as a direct result of my participation in the study, compensation will be paid to me by the University, subject to certain provisos and limitations. The amount of compensation will be appropriate to the nature, severity and persistence of the injury and will, in general terms, be consistent with the amount of damages commonly awarded for similar injury by an English court in cases where the liability has been admitted.

- I confirm that I have read and understood the above and freely consent to participating in this study. I have been given adequate time to consider my participation and agree to comply with the instructions and restrictions of the study.

Name of volunteer (BLOCK CAPITALS) ........................................................
Signed ........................................................................................................
Date ...........................................................................................................

Name of researcher/person taking consent (BLOCK CAPITALS) ........ Tomomi Wakiya
Signed ........................................................................................................
Date ...........................................................................................................
Appendix 5: Topic guide to interview questions

### Before the interview

1. Provide information sheet.
2. Consent form needs to be signed.
3. Ask if the participant does not mind the interview being recorded.
4. Promise confidentiality of the data.
5. Introducing the researcher's background and research under study.
6. Explain the research questions and the aim of the interview.
7. Clarify the main key concepts of the research.
   - Tourism – explained by using the tourism components map.
   - The design of tourism – explained by using the design of tourism process model.

### Interview questions

1. **General questions / Identify the participant's role**
   - Describe their facilities and services briefly in relation to disability issues.
   - Ask general questions.
     E.g. Do you receive disabled customers/visitors? Do they come for travelling, attending conferences, or business purposes?
   - Ask the role of the participant in the organisation.
     E.g. What is your role in your organisation in terms of disability provision? When you make a decision on disability provision, do you talk with other members of staff, or do you make a decision on your own?

2. **What have you done for your organisation in terms of disability provision?**
   - Ask 'what' they have done for disability provision.
     E.g. Developing accessible rooms or toilets, conducting access audit, large print menu for restaurant, clear signage for toilets, promotion, staff training, accepting customer feedback, etc.

3. **Have you involved disabled people in the process?**
   - Ask if they have involved disabled people in the design of tourism by showing the design of tourism model. Ask for each stage of the design of tourism process.
     E.g. Developing accessible rooms or toilets, conducting access audit, large print menu for the restaurant, clear signage for toilets, promotion, staff training, accepting customer feedback, etc. → In which stage of the design of tourism process?
     - Access Statement → How did you make it?
     - Accessible facilities (rooms, lift, restaurant, conference rooms) → How and who designed them?
     - Staff training → Any disability awareness training? Any involvement of disabled people?
     - Customer/visitor feedback → Any feedback from disabled people?
4. What are the reasons for involving/not involving disabled people?

- Ask the reasons why they have involved/not involved disabled people in the stages of the design of tourism process. Ask for each stage of the design of tourism process. Is there any particular reason for the involvement/non-involvement?
  E.g. Do you have contact with disabled people? Do you feel you need to involve disabled people?

5. Do you see any benefit of involving disabled people in the design of tourism within your organisation?

- What is the benefit for you to involve disabled people in the design of tourism?
- If you do not see any benefit of involving disabled people, why is that?

6. Do you see any barrier or difficulty to involve disabled people in the design of tourism process?

- What are the barriers for you to involve disabled people in the design of tourism?
  E.g. No time? No funding? Don’t feel you need to involve disabled people? Don’t know the needs of disabled people? Feel worried to get feedback? Or get ‘attacked’?
- Why do you think the barriers exist?
  E.g. Lack of understanding/awareness of disability? Commercial reason?

7. What do you think could be done to overcome the barriers?

- What would be useful for you to have, in order to overcome the barriers to involve disabled people in the design of tourism?
  E.g. Better partnership with local disabled groups? Stricter regulation? Consulting organisation? Education/training?

8. What would you like to do for disability provision in the future?

- Ask if they have an intention to involve disabled people.
  - Would you like to involve disabled people in the design of tourism process?
  - If so, what would be barriers to involve disabled people?

After the interviews

1. Ask for any questions and comments.
2. Ask if the participant does not mind being contacted again in case the researcher would like to listen to them more or check something with them.
3. Ask if the participant knows someone whom the researcher should talk to.
Dear Ms/Mr..........................

My name is Tomomi Wakiya, a current PhD student in tourism at the University of Surrey. I am writing to you to ask if you could be of some assistance in my research by participating in an interview.

The aim of my research is to examine the idea of inclusive design of tourism, namely, to explore why disabled people are excluded/included in the design of tourism, and, if the exclusion of disabled people from tourism exists, how this can be overcome.

I would like to ask your opinion and thoughts on this topic from your perspective, as...(explain the reason for selecting this person/organisation and the significance of hearing their opinion)..., therefore, I would very much value the chance to talk with you. I am particularly interested to hear how you have developed...(show the researcher has knowledge on what they are doing)... and if you have involved disabled people in any area of your business/activity.

I would greatly appreciate it if you could find time to meet me anytime in September or October. The face-to-face interview will only take about 30 minutes. I am happy to speak with you anywhere that is convenient for you. This research has been reviewed and given a favourable ethical opinion by the University of Surrey Ethics Committee. The data will strictly be confidential and anonymous and be used only for my research.

Finally, I am very happy to be contacted anytime if you have any queries regarding this research by using the details below.

Would it be convenient if I called you sometime next week to arrange a time to meet?

Yours sincerely,

Tomomi Wakiya

---

Tomomi Wakiya
School of Management
University of Surrey
Guildford
Surrey, GU2 7XH
Mobile: 077....
Email: t.wakiya@surrey.ac.uk
Appendix 7: An extract from the interview transcripts

*ATT-3: the interviewee
TW: the researcher

> Introduced the interviewer
> Explained the aim of the interview
> Clarified the key concepts of the research

TW Can I ask you some general questions first? What is your role in [ATT-3]?

ATT-3 I have two roles. I am a Duty Manager, so in front of the House Duty Manager. I am also an Event Officer, so two days a week I organise events. So bit of both.

TW What about your role in terms of disability provision?

ATT-3 Umm, nothing specifically. All front of house where we are very much in to accessibility for all. So, I did the Welcome All course, and we’ve done a few other things with deaf awareness, just to make sure that if any visitor is coming and have got any special particular needs, we know how to treat them, and we do it with the legislation.

TW I see. I’ve seen your website and learned what you have done and what you have got for accessibility. You’ve got a range of facilities, including induction loops, toilets, lifts, magnifying glasses, and seating.

ATT-3 Yeah. We also offer two wheelchairs, wheelchairs used in parking.

TW For visitors?

ATT-3 For visitors, yes.

TW And you provide information on accessibility for disabled visitors on the website, and what else you have done?

ATT-3 Umm, I think... we’ve got some audio guides for visitors, which are really big ones design for people with visual impairment, so you can easily press the buttons, which are quite new. We’ve just got some funding for that. So they are quite new feature. I think that’s everything, though.

TW Have you done any access audit?

ATT-3 We haven’t. When the building was being designed and built, it was a part of that, it had to be completely 100% all flat levels, and big lift and toilet maybe floor, that kind of things. So in the design stage, the building was very much a part of it.

TW So it was opened in 2007.

ATT-3 Yes, September 2007. So, it’s just two years we’ve been open now.

TW And do you have any information in different format?

ATT-3 I think all in our website. Most of it is on our website.

TW Do you work with any local organisation?

ATT-3 We have [the name of organisation] coming quite often, and they are like a day centre for children with special needs, and a lot of them are in wheelchair, so they come in quite often, because
they can come in, and go around so freely. So they are good one, we use them quite often. We don't have any partnerships, so formal partnership. But a lot of groups and schools do come in.

TW You mean, local...

ATT-3 Yes, local groups, yes.

TW Do you have any feedback from...

ATT-3 Umm, nothing in particular. I think they all enjoy and they do actually always say that they get warm welcome. I don’t feel that… A lady, few months ago, saying that sometimes when I go to places there they treat her with hassle and hard work, because just 10 or 11 children have been wheelchair. So sometimes they get…you are causing a problem, whereas…she said that we don’t treat them like a problem. We just treat like any other visitors, which is what we are always trying to do front door to treat everyone the same.

TW I am not sure if you have any statistics, but please don’t worry, if you don’t. But in general, do you receive many visitors with disability, in general?

ATT-3 We do. We don’t have statistics for it, though. So I couldn’t even take a guess, but I would say, you know, fair enough, because we are so accessible, we have a lot of visitors that are disabled. But I don’t have statistics.

TW So, your target is basically all...

ATT-3 Everyone. Everyone and anyone. Our target coming…generally it's people living in [their town] and [their county], but everyone and anyone. Yes, we target as many people as possible.

TW And can I ask…when you plan something new, or in the very beginning of the [ATT-3], did you have any consultation with disabled people?

ATT-3 Well, we did. I don’t know the name of the people that we used, but it was… I can’t think they are local group, but yeah, the architect did consult people. We also when we first opened, we invited three or four wheelchair users. They came in and went around and kind of said that that would work, or that’s bit too high, to make sure that everything was suitable. We know a gentleman, volunteering here, comes quite often, and he is in a wheelchair. He always comes suddenly near the exhibition and he will point out. Something is bit high, or something is bit… So, Mr A helps us quite a lot.

TW Can I ask why you have consulted with disabled people?

ATT-3 Umm, just because it’s very easy not to notice things if you are… If I walk into the exhibition, obviously, I am 5 feet 10, so I see things in a certain way, whereas if you are in a wheelchair, you are further, you sat low down. And you notice things that I wouldn’t notice just because I am taller. The thing is I take for granted of non-step hills or…, I wouldn’t think of it, because I am not in a wheelchair. Whereas Mr A in a wheelchair obviously straight away to go that doesn’t work. So, it’s always useful to use people who are..., and we are trying to make it suitable for.

TW In terms of promotion, do you involve disabled people in this stage?

ATT-3 We haven’t done…no, I am not aware…we haven’t done not specifically targeting disabled visitors. I think it’s just because we kind of think them as…we make sure that when we are planning exhibition, it’s suitable for disabled visitors. But then after that stage, it's just anyone…I mean, we wouldn’t necessarily pick up a group of disabled people to target specifically, because we would target everyone. So, it's not something really comes into it.

TW And obviously you have done Welcome All staff training.

ATT-3 Yes, we have done staff training.

TW Is it for...everyone goes to the training, or...
ATT-3 No, for that occasion, we didn't have...not all staff could do it. So I went alone, and I came back and sort of fed things what I have learned back to our staff, ...and I kind of told people what I learned. But we do train our staff...we have a staff meeting once a month, where someone will talk about different things. So, that's I guess discuss in those sort of meeting, so I did talk about it to staff, so hopefully...

TW How did you know Welcome All training?

ATT-3 Umm, we learned about it, I think it was Tourism South East sent me email about it. And I've done, we thought it would be good one, some from front house to go on. We since use them for other customer care courses as well, so we use them bit more. It was a quite good course.

TW Umm, sorry I come back to here, but...in the process of actual developing or constructing, did you consult with disabled people, or you talked them only in the planning stage?

ATT-3 I would thought it would be in a planning, but they want the building was up and running. I think that's why we did have some groups coming, I don't know the name of the group, but...I would thought it was the consulted group, just look in reality if it works and how it works.

TW I see. Do you have any employee with disability?

ATT-3 Umm, we've got one...one of our staff members has got a hearing impairment. And one of them is quite visually impaired. We have one, two, three volunteers, two volunteers use wheelchairs, and we have another volunteer that is very visually impaired. So, quite a few, yeah. Quite a few. But we wouldn't...you know, we used to have a front house assistant that had quite sever disability. She only had one arm. So when we interviewed her, she can do the job very well. So she was hired and she was on the front desk, and...she could do the job perfectly well.

TW What's the benefit of having staff with disability in your workplace?

ATT-3 Well, I think, you kind of...they will notice the things you that people that might have disability do notice which is helpful.

TW Yes.

ATT-3 I think it's just...they can still do the job perfectly well, so it's not really issue. So, that's fine.

TW You mentioned that you don't get many complaints or feedback from disabled people.

ATT-3 No. I know one we had, is that we made a donation box, and to the money in is too high. It's by the door. The box is still too high, and it should be lower. Umm, other than that, I don't think we had any...about anything. We did have an exhibition that, once it's been built, we realised there was a small only few inches a gap, a height, upwards, to going to a very small area. So we bought a ramp, a wheelchair ramp the next day.

TW Next day. So quick.

ATT-3 Yeah, we went straight out and bought one. And that came...therefore, we can just put the ramp out and go straight up. But other than that, no, I don't think we had any issues.

TW And you made action straightaway after you found the gap.

ATT-3 Yeah, we are lucky in a sense that...because we are, I guess, a private company, the director is always in the building. And if it is a case of...it's not like some companies where you need to fill in a paperwork and go head office, and get... The director is like a...'now'. So, if we need something, we could actually say, 'we need this, can we get it?'. She says yes or no, and we order it. So, it's very quick. Whereas I know some companies, I remember in the course (Welcome All) there were people from a hotel chain, and they have to go to head office and it takes months, whereas we don't have to do that. If we need something, we can generally get it, because we sell ourselves, we
market ourselves as being 100% accessible. So, therefore, if we are not... We need to take that quickly. So it needs to be done so quick, I mean, we've done there and there, so we are lucky that we don't need to go to the head office.

TW It's your advantage.

ATT-3 Yeah, definitely.

TW And in the evaluation stage, you mentioned that when you opened the [ATT-3], you had someone to check accessibility.

ATT-3 Yeah. I don't know if we've done that since, we are going to join... I don't know what is called again... but, it's a booklet you can get which tells you about local businesses, how accessible they are, and it's like Welcome All type magazine work. We are going to join that, and we've actually asked... and assessors come and do themselves because they take photographs, and they kind of tell about you the lighting and how to get into the..., and also those things. So we are hoping that they will come along and do that for us. But we are lucky in a sense because we've got purpose made building. So, it's not like we've got a building and have to convert. It's 100% accessible already. So, it's easy... to do the rest.

TW What's the reason for you to work on accessibility so hard?

ATT-3 Umm, well, I think it came from really that a part of the [ATT-3] is equal to those... we are not gallery, but we are not kind of snobbier gallery, anyone is welcome. We want people that would never come to art gallery to come in. The whole part of the building is designed, so it's not kind of exclusive to people that got a lot of money, or we are really keen with... to anyone. Anyone walking by there, can come in, and have a nice time. And it doesn't matter if they don't know anything about art, it doesn't matter to come in. And I think disability is just part of that, and just ANYBODY is welcome, and it doesn't matter. Anything else and anyone.

TW I see. And do you have any contact with local disabled people?

ATT-3 Not currently, on name-to-name basis. We've got a lot of local visitors coming in are disabled. And I know them to say hello, but I'm not... not their names, no.

TW You mentioned that the reason why you involve disabled people in those stages is to get advice from people who actually have experience of being disabled.

ATT-3 Yes.

TW Do you have any other reasons?

ATT-3 Umm, I think that's the main reason, just because that they might be able to point out things that we wouldn't necessarily notice. I think we've all become, I mean, I certainly have become a lot more aware of people with disabilities and kind of thinking.

TW Compared to before...?

ATT-3 Compared to before I was, yes. Thinking right... would that work, if there is a step, could they trip on that, can I see clearly, being much more looking at something in slightly different ways how it was before.

TW Do you think it's only you, or also...?

ATT-3 No, a lot of people are, I think, yes, staff in general, everyone does that, and looks at things slightly different ways, because of it, which is actually good thing. And if I go to other galleries or museums, I see things and think ‘that...’. (Laugh) I just see things how they've got away with that. Because I'm so used here, not have any issues. To go other places and think... it's better, you think..., 'why you put that there'. You know, you can't get... And it's not just people in a wheelchair, people with buggies, people with children, and other things that you think that's common sense, but it's not.
And if you don’t think about it, it’s not common sense. It’s just the way they do it. It’s surprising what people get wrong in another place, anyway.

TW I am very interested to hear what has changed you and your colleagues in the [ATT-3] in terms of looking at things in a different way.

ATT-3 Yeah, I mean, I do as well. I’ve got… my sister’s mother in law in a wheelchair. And I had an experience we went out for dinner. And she... we phoned to make sure they’ve got a ramp or they’ve got... And she had been left at the back door through the kitchen, and we’ve come around to the front. And just she was so upset and it was just terrible to think that they took her around the back and the service entrance, when all the rest was gone through the front door for family. So that certainly made me think more the way that she gets treated and how awful that is, because, you know, why she should get to the back door, because she sit on the wheelchair. I’ve also done… I did a sign language course last… yeah, I finished it in June. So I did a level one, …class for sign language, just because something I wanted to do.

TW Why?

ATT-3 Well, (Laugh), I often… when I see people sign, I just think that it looks so interesting and I like to know the sign, really. So I went to on that, and again, it made me more aware of people who do have hearing difficulties, and again, because you take for granted alarm and noises and sound, that if you are deaf, you won’t obviously be able to hear. So, that made me more aware of those things.

TW For you, what’s the difficulty to involve disabled people in those stages? Do you see any difficulty or barrier?

ATT-3 Umm, sometimes I think barrier is because I don’t know, I might tell you wrong, but I think sometimes people that have got disability might think that they can’t come to something because they can’t hear, they can’t… you know. If they think it’s a barrier, therefore they won’t come in to start with, I think it can be difficult. It’s kind of bit of message across that we are 100% accessible, and we… if somebody ask and want us to do, we will go out and wait for you, which sometimes people don’t realise until they are being in. Once they come in, they would say, ‘oh it’s fine’. So I think sometimes that can be an issue. That’s why we have so much amount on our website. People can look at our website, and know that there is a lift and know there is a toilet and things, so it makes bit easier. I think that can be difficult, get down and... the barrier.

TW You mean… it might be difficult for people to come into the gallery for the first time?

ATT-3 Yeah, for the first time they come in. And once they’ve been here, that’s fine. But, to get them to the door for the first place, that can be difficult sometimes.

TW How do you think, how that barrier can be overcome?

ATT-3 Oh, I think just to do enough marketing and promotion that tells people that we are accessible and that they can come in. I think it is helpful to do that as much as possible.

TW Promotion… Do you see any other barriers?

ATT-3 It can be a barrier, yeah. It can be… trying to get the information out to people that don’t know about us. So that’s why all marketing is, you know, quite difficult to do.

TW On the other hand, what would be useful for you to have, in order to involve disabled people in those stages?

ATT-3 Umm, I think maybe… because we do know some local people that we do or talk to, but in an informal kind of basis, whereas sometimes I think it would be good if we could have, if I have a name and number of… you know, ‘Mr B living in C street, he is in a wheelchair, he would happily come out to kind of advise us on procedures’. Because it’s bit difficult to approach… say, one of our volunteers is in a wheelchair. So, it’s bit difficult to kind of pick them out and say ‘we want and need to do this’, because only he is in a wheelchair. Whereas if there is someone… it’s like taboo and that sort
of thing. Because we treat them like me and you, but at the same time, you know, we want that information, so it's bit difficult to...

TW I see.

ATT-3 So, whether there was a...not necessarily directly, but people that will happen to do that, might be quite useful to have...information to have.

TW Have you tried like local Access Group in the council?

ATT-3 Yeah, there is one in [the town] that we do use. But we use them widely opened...which I think it's fine. And generally for the exhibitions, we kind of know what to look at for now. Because of what they told us, we know now what to do. But other than that, I think it's enough just to do ourselves.

TW What's the reason why you would contact local people rather than national disability organisations?

ATT-3 Umm, due to simplicity that we know that they are living in [the town] and we know that they are local. And I would thought it's just easier just to contact local groups than big national ones. And if they need to come back, quite simple to get them back. Just that kind of thing.

TW Can I ask you the last question? In the future, would you like to involve more...or continue involving disabled people in different stages?

ATT-3 Yeah, definitely. Umm, definitely, I think as many opportunities we are giving to anyone with any kind of disability, it's a good thing. And I wish more venues did it. Because a lot of venues, they don't even think about it, which I found quite surprising that you don't even think about it. So, yeah, more...if we can do more to help people than we will, it's just time and money that sometimes it's bit difficult. But yeah, we continue what we are doing now.

TW Compared to other galleries you mentioned, the reason why you are looking at all people, everyone is because...because you...

ATT-3 Umm, I think it's just a part of belief that we are completely, you know, inclusive, any...anyone, and that involves anyone with disability. Whereas a lot of galleries, we are quite into it, I think a lot of our galleries are... We are very friendly. And it's not about art, it's about coming in and enjoy the place and looking and learning...and enjoy the time you've been here. Which some of the galleries I go to are bit stuffy and bit...kind of not nice place to be in.

TW I see. That's great. Thank you very much.

ATT-3 You are welcome.