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Abstract

The main aim of this research is to critically investigate the meaning of social exclusion in tourism and its influence on identity positions of individuals with a disability. Five research objectives, structured alongside theory building and empirical research, assist in accomplishing the overall aim. Key concepts that form the foundation of this research are disability, social exclusion and identity linked to power/knowledge.

Conceptually, this study proposes the application of a performative framework, which guides the entire research to analyse disability and social exclusion. At its core, performativity demands investigations into the meaning of certain phenomena, such as social exclusion. Second, moving beyond what social exclusion ‘is’, the effect of this meaning on identity positions is examined by focusing on what social exclusion ‘does’ to individuals with a disability. Guided by a dual-paradigmatic framework embracing interpretivism/constructivism and critical theory, a narrative strategy of inquiry is employed. Individuals with a mobility or sight restriction were interviewed to incorporate the voices of disabled people and their experiences of social exclusion.

Findings highlight that social exclusion in tourism can be re-conceptualised based on interactive aspects, norms and social relations of power by which individuals become categorised. These elements do not only affect disabled individuals but also other persons belonging to the wider collective realm. Further, the paradox of (in)dependence is an intrinsic feature of social exclusion which affects the employment of transformative or reproductive strategies of identity positions. However, a clear-cut dichotomy of transformation and reproduction does not exist and strategies occupying an ambiguous territory are discussed.

These findings have important practical implications for the tourism industry to reduce exclusionary practices. Central here are initiatives to enhance the independence of disabled people to increase expressions of self-identity and agency. Particularly specialist disability operators were found to work against principles of inclusion. For overcoming interactive elements of exclusion, the need for training and education is stressed. At a policy level, the focus on ‘Design for All’ principles needs to be carefully reconsidered due to conflicts over shared spaces.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Over the last ten years the European Parliament and the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) highlighted the role that tourism can play in contributing to inclusionary practices and supporting the social inclusion of disadvantaged groups (European Parliament, 2007, World Tourism Organization, 2008). This coincides with recent tourism research, emphasising the potential for developing ‘hopeful tourism’ (Pritchard et al., 2011) to create socially inclusive tourism inquiries by enhancing the voices of excluded individuals (Richards et al., 2010) and to promote justice in tourism policy and practice (Pritchard et al., 2011).

Social inclusion and its counterpart, social exclusion, can be deemed to reside at the heart of contemporary society. For example in the United Kingdom (UK) the Cabinet Office of Social Exclusion was established to overcome the problems related to deep-seated social exclusion (Cabinet Office, 2009). Furthermore, UK national newspapers, such as ‘The Guardian’, have a dedicated section on their website related to social exclusion, covering sub-categories like disability (The Guardian, 2009). The European Commission reports on coordinating policy efforts in relation to poverty and social exclusion (European Commission, 2008) and a particular emphasis is placed on combating social exclusion faced by people with a disability (Inclusion Europe, 2004). Specific to disability, the new disability strategy 2010-2020 outlines how barriers can be broken down to enable disabled people to participate more equally in society (European Commission, 2010a). At the international level, the need to conceptualise social exclusion as part of a programme of global ethics against human injustice is stressed (United Nations Development Programme, 2007).

While the concept of social exclusion has become prevalent in political discourses and social policy (Berghman, 1995, Byrne, 2005, Burchardt et al., 1999, Church et al., 2000, Miller, 2003, Barnes et al., 2002, Koller and Davidson, 2008), other academic disciplines, such as sociology, geography and economics, started to use the term (Byrne, 2005, Peace, 2001), with tourism scholars among those. However, while it can be argued that this move is vital, particularly in the quest to achieve greater justice, inclusion and social sustainability, few tourism scholars have
critically questioned the precise meaning of social exclusion and/or explored differences between tourism and social policy. Central here are questions related to what meanings do tourism studies attach to social exclusion? How was it constructed? Is there a general consensus among different people and/or institutions? What is the role of social relations of power when discussing social exclusion? Does tourism actually contribute to a socially inclusive society or reproduce exclusionary practices?

In the light of this, the aim of this chapter is to create an overview of this research by identifying the reasons behind the need for achieving an improved understanding of social exclusion in tourism. Further, an explanation with regard to the theoretical foundations of this study is provided, paying attention to the need for tourism studies to embrace greater criticality (Tribe, 2007, Tribe, 2008). Subsequent to establishing the conceptual basis, the main aim together with the research questions are introduced, followed by its theoretical and practical justifications. The chapter concludes by providing an overview of the structure of this research, linking together theoretical concepts, research questions, methodological elements and key findings.

1.1 Social Exclusion in Tourism

Social exclusion, as an organising concept, has not been used in the academic sphere of tourism until the late 1990s/ beginning of 2000. Representing the onset of a dialogue on the importance of social exclusion in tourism, the first tourism conference dedicated to social exclusion was held in 2003 by the International Association of Travel Behaviour Research (IATBR), entitled ‘Travel Chances and Social Exclusion’, mainly focusing on planning and policy (Lyons, 2003), which indicates that social exclusion in tourism is a relatively new concept. More recently, scholarship on social tourism emphasises the need to overcome social exclusion through the design of programmes and initiatives, which enable the part of the population on low income and other excluded groups to participate in tourism opportunities (McCabe, 2009, Minnaert et al., 2009).

Yet, it can be argued that the tourism literature has followed a rather uncritical acceptance of the term borrowed from social policy. Evidence for this lack of critical reasoning can be found in the absence of explanations with regard to the precise meaning of social exclusion. For example, social exclusion is claimed to form a core concept in research on youth subcultures and leisure (MacDonald and Shildrick, 2007). However, an explanation of the term is nonexistent. In social
policy, the concept of social exclusion remains contested and is still highly debated due to the existence of many different interpretations (Burchardt et al., 1999, Democratic Dialogue, 1995, Atkinson, 2000, Silver, 1994, Church et al., 2000, Agarwal and Brunt, 2006, Kenyon et al., 2002, Miller, 2003, Jermyn, 2001). Furthermore, there appears to be a reluctance to explore potential differences in understanding social exclusion between social policy and tourism. While some dimensions of exclusion can be used in a tourism context, these need to be analysed carefully. For example, similar to social policy, poverty can be one dimension leading to exclusion, but social exclusion is not necessarily poverty-based (Berghman, 1995, Peace, 2001, Kenyon et al., 2002) as individuals can be marginalised by other factors than income (Democratic Dialogue, 1995). Also, it can be argued that people might face exclusion while being on holiday, hence expanding the conceptual territory of social tourism moving beyond the focus on financial assistance. This leads to questioning who is actually considered to be socially excluded.

1.2 Who is Socially Excluded?

As part of investigations into social exclusion, various studies have begun to identify individuals and groups who are often deemed to be socially excluded. References can be found to children in poverty (Watt, 2001), homosexual individuals (Pritchard et al., 1998, Clift and Forrest, 1999), low-income families (McCabe, 2009, Minnaert et al., 2009), women, ethnic minorities (Holden, 2005), 'underclass' cultures (MacDonald and Shildrick, 2007) as well as disadvantaged adults, older people and individuals affected by frequently moving home (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004a). Individuals living with a disability have also been singled out as a group facing social exclusion (Morris, 2001, O'Grady et al., 2004, Allison, 2000, Imrie, 2001, Knight and Brent, 1998, Kitchin, 1998).

1.2.1 Individuals with a Disability

People with various types of disabilities represent a significant part of the world population and are conservatively estimated to comprise 500 to 800 million people (Fujiura and Rutkowskiikmita, 2001, Smith, 1987, Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005). Despite this significant number, disabled people are often marginalised in the tourism sector (Stumbo and Pegg, 2005) and their experiences remain a neglected area in tourism research (Darcy, 2002, Shaw and Coles, 2004), contrary to other areas where disability manifests itself as separate field.
In disability studies, different models for understanding disability are discussed. While the medical model defines disability as deviance, lack and personal tragedy (Shakespeare, 1993, Donoghue, 2003, Shelton and Tucker, 2005), the social model emphasises the political, cultural and social barriers that prevent disabled people from becoming fully integrated and accepted (Donoghue, 2003). Important in the shift from thinking of disability in medical terms to an emphasis on social barriers is the distinction between the concepts ‘impairment’ and ‘disability’. Whereas the former relates to physical or cognitive limitations, the latter is associated with socially imposed restrictions by society in terms of discriminatory practices faced by individuals who live with impairments (Burnett and Bender Baker 2001).

As disability is a multidimensional construct (Darcy and Buhalis, 2011a), types of disabling conditions come under a number of commonly used descriptive terms, ranging from mobility, sensory and communication restrictions to intellectual impairments and mental disorders as well as hidden impairments in the form of health problems (Darcy and Buhalis, 2011b). Within each type further variations exist and impairments range from those acquired at birth to those which arise as part of the ageing process or accidents (DEO, 2005). Outlining different dimensions of disability helps to establish different access requirements, which need to be addressed to create an enabling environment in line with the social model of disability (Darcy and Buhalis, 2011a).

As the social model has re-defined disability as inadequate support services to the particular needs of people with disabilities when compared with the whole society (Donoghue, 2003), the removal or minimisation of existing barriers to ensure full participation in life remains central to the social model. The emphasis placed on the external environment has led to a wide-spread acceptance of the social model in contemporary society as it changed society’s understanding of disability. It is particularly the notion of socially constructed constraints that led authors to equate ‘disability’ with social oppression and social exclusion (Dowse, 2001, Thomas, 2004, Branfield, 1999). In line with this development, a number of scholars have started to embrace disabled people as a socially excluded group (Kitchin, 1998, Knight and Brent, 1998, Allison, 2000, O'Grady et al., 2004, Thomas, 2004, Tregaskis, 2002, Freund, 2001, Imrie, 2001). However, specific to tourism, very few studies examine different, individual experiences of social exclusion, a shortcoming that tourism shares with social policy.
1.3 Towards Greater Criticality

Analysing social exclusion assists in revealing social and economic developments, changes in society and the resulting inequalities that individuals face (Byrne, 2005). As such, it facilitates a continuing dialogue of social and economic processes (Walker, 1995), making it relevant and important for discourses in academic social sciences (Byrne, 2005). It is stressed that exclusion needs to be examined in the context of the entire society (Lyons, 2003), hence the sphere of tourism should not be regarded as separate.

Specific to tourism, Urry (2002) argues that tourism relies on two separate poles: 'home' and 'away', with the latter usually associated with enjoyment, while the former often refers to inequalities and injustice in everyday life. In this context, tourism is held to provide individuals with the opportunity to escape from everyday life duties and pressures (Pritchard et al., 2011). However, travel can equally confirm prejudices (Harvey, 1989). In this light, tourism is regarded as a central component for identifying and understanding social (dis)organisations (Franklin and Crang, 2001). It might be assumed that exclusionary practices of society are (re)produced in tourism, triggering the need to explore inequalities and processes of marginalisation in tourism. Investigating conditions of governance that shape agendas in tourism research and tourism management practices, Hollinshead (1999) poses the question:

"... what do we repeatedly and systematically privilege in tourism representations, and what do we respectfully and systematically deny and frustrate?" (Hollinshead, 1999, p.15)

Given this provocative question, greater criticality in tourism studies is demanded (Tribe, 2007, Tribe, 2008, Chambers, 2007). According to Chambers (2007), tourism needs to identify crucial struggles within contemporary tourism and uncover the specific characteristics of these struggles. In a similar vein, Tribe (2007) argues that inequalities in tourism and the social world in general are very much taken for granted and are infrequently questioned. In the very few cases where inequalities are questioned or interrogated, limited effort is made to reach the foundation of these inequalities (Tribe, 2007). In line with Tribe’s (2007) argument, Colley and Hodkinson (2001) argue that increasing inequalities in relation to, for example, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation and disability, are “rendered invisible” (p.354).
By using the example of disability, previous research has stressed that disabled people are excluded because society has created disabling conditions for people with impairments (Darcy, 2002, Shaw and Coles, 2004), with activists in the disability movement going as far as equating disability with social exclusion and oppression (Dowse, 2001, Thomas, 2004, Branfield, 1999) (see 1 in Figure 1). Moreover, the social model of disability is based on a categorical, collective approach to identity (Dowse, 2001) (see 2 in Figure 1), which is used to create identity politics with the aim of removing macro-societal barriers. In general, identity politics derive from social movements, in which common interests related to a particular group are stressed and difference highlighted (Taylor, 1998). The collective identity is regarded as important to achieve solidarity and collective coherence (Crossley, 2005).

Figure 1: Key Initial Research Concepts

Questioning the benefits of the categorical identity approach, or differently expressed, an approach based on identity politics, leads to the identification of the following paradox that this study investigates. On the one hand, theorists use categories of different social identities such as class, gender, age, sexual identity, race and disability to capture multiple experiences (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004) related to the many and differentiated ways in which people participate in leisure and tourism (Coalter, 2000). Hence, different social identities are used to explain differences and have led to the recognition of varied experiences in tourism and society at large. However, on the other hand, paradoxically, the same markers of identity are said to exclude individuals from tourism opportunities, causing negative experiences of exclusion and marginalisation (see 3 in Figure 1). While some groups are excluded because of markers of
identity such as social class, others are marginalised by factors such as race, age, disability and gender (Botterill and Klemm, 2005, Collins and Kay, 2003), leading Taylor (1998) to argue that specific identity categories form the basis for either inclusion or exclusion.

Questioning that markers of social identity, such as disability, represent coherent entities with homogenous experiences when compared to other categories of social identity, it is argued that particularly these established categories (re)produce the construction of hegemonic identities, which in turn reinforce that some groups stay at the centre of social life while others remain at the edge of society (Kivel, 2000, Butler, 2007, Fine and Weis, 2005). In this context, Holt (2008) speaks about disability as an embodied location which acts as a key mechanism to reproduce disadvantage and exclusion. Furthermore, by critiquing categorical conceptualisations, McCabe (2005) calls for investigations into how experiences relate to "social identities at a deeper level" (p.103). Here, a performative analysis might be of assistance as it questions categorical approaches to identity and acknowledges multiple identity performances in different contexts.

It is the relationship between disability as a marker of social identity and social exclusion that this study addresses. As the social model focuses on the categorical identity approach, which ignores heterogeneity and multiplicity of existing identities (Shakespeare, 2008), it is questionable if disability can be equated with social exclusion without taking into account different personal and subjective experiences. Thus, it is anticipated that further investigations are needed to understand how identity constructs are linked to social exclusion and disability. Currently overlooked in the disability debate are processes related to knowledge and power. However, the production or development of any identity concept, such as disability, is guided by a complex matrix of power relations (Butler, 2007, Coles and Church, 2007).

Central for analysing this matrix are certain ideas of Michel Foucault as they offer a broad base for investigating power mechanisms. As social exclusion cannot be reduced to a lack of economic means, it is important to analyse power beyond economic aspects based on social and cultural power relations. Supporting this argument, social exclusion is referred to as being based on social relations of power (United Nations Development Programme, 2007), emphasising its relational focus (Room, 1995a, Kenyon et al., 2002). A Foucauldian approach stresses that power is a relational phenomenon and occurs everywhere, hence covering the whole system of social
networks (Foucault, 1982). Foucault also states that power and knowledge formations are intrinsically bound to each other (Mills, 2003). This power/ knowledge dyad is useful and important for this study to explain the development of individual identities and exclusionary practices, as it could be argued that tourism should not underestimate the role of the symbolic discourses of social exclusion and disability, which are guided by mechanisms of power.

1.4 Aim and Scope of Study

Given the preceding discussion, the main aim of this research is to critically investigate the meaning of social exclusion in tourism and its influence on identity positions of individuals with a disability. It is anticipated that this investigation reveals means of reducing exclusionary practices in tourism. Key concepts that form the foundation of this research are disability, social exclusion and power/ knowledge through which individuals become tied to a certain identity. Five research questions, structured alongside theory building and empirical research, assist in accomplishing the overall aim (Figure 2).

The first three research questions aim at reaching a conceptual understanding of the core terms used in this study:
Theory Building => Understanding

RQ 1: What is the current understanding of disability and what are the inherent limitations?
RQ 2: Which conceptual framework can be used to overcome limitations?
RQ 3: How can a performative framework assist the disability debate for re-conceptualising social exclusion?

The conceptual analysis starts by offering a debate on society’s current understanding of disability and discusses existing limitations (RQ1/ Figure 2). As these limitations are related to a shortcoming in accounting for multiple identities linked to processes of power and knowledge, an investigation into theoretical frameworks is needed with the aim to identify the most appropriate framework that can potentially reduce current limitations (RQ2/ Figure 2). At this point, power and knowledge constructs are added to the conceptual analysis. Resulting from the discussions, a performative framework is held to offer the greatest potential to reduce limitations, allowing for a multifaceted understanding of disability. However, this conceptualisation has not only implications for disability but also for social exclusion as it questions the use of categorical approaches in general. Drawing on subjective lived experiences, a performative framework provides the base for what social exclusion ‘is’ and by incorporating power/ knowledge constructs it can be used to investigate what social exclusion ‘does’ to people with a disability, particularly with regard to identity positions (RQ3/ Figure 2). As a result, the performative framework serves as a theoretical model, guiding the analysis throughout the empirical research:

Empirical Research => Application

RQ 4: Using a performative framework, how can social exclusion in tourism be re-conceptualised?
RQ 5: Using a performative framework, do individuals with a disability reproduce or transform identity positions in tourism?

Central to applying a performative analysis to disability is reaching an understanding of what social exclusion means to different disabled individuals by using narratives to capture lived experiences and subjectivities (RQ4/ Figure 2). Furthermore, given the context-specific underpinnings of the performative framework, the identity category of disability is also regarded
as produced. As this allows for the recognition of multiple identities linked to social relations of power, an investigation is offered to identify if individuals reproduce or contrarily transform marginalised identity positions in tourism (RQ5/ Figure 2).

While articulating the research aim and its related objectives clarifies the conceptualisation of this research, it also highlights its complexity, with numerous associated concepts to be considered. Although it is acknowledged that handling these concepts brings challenges to the analytical process, a reduction of concepts would jeopardise a key element of the main research aim, which is reaching a better understanding of the complexity of social exclusion related to disability in tourism. Hence, reducing the theoretical debate to fewer constructs would lead to a treatment which would not only diminish the aim of the research but would also lack criticality, failing to advance current debates and stimulate new discussions in the area of exclusionary practices in tourism. With this in mind, the next section addresses the importance of this study.

1.5 Importance of Study

Explaining the conceptual landscape together with its research questions requires further insights into theoretical and practical justifications. It involves the development of a rationale of why the current literature deals insufficiently with the subject of social exclusion, disability and identity linked to power and knowledge, highlighting the unique problem in this field. Additionally, outlining the practical rationale assists in underlining its contemporary relevance.

1.5.1 Theoretical Rationale

In general, this research aims at closing three gaps identified in the literature. The first gap relates to tourism studies’ lack of engagement with wider issues of the disability discourse. While disability is a well-researched field with specialist journals such as ‘Disability & Society’ and ‘Disability, Handicap and Society’, in tourism, it is argued that these subject areas are not researched together, resulting in two isolated subjects of investigation (Darcy, 2002, Aitchison, 2003, McKercher et al., 2003). This is supported by Horgan-Jones and Ringaert (2001) stating that very limited research investigates disability in a tourism context, with Richards et al. (2010) calling for greater engagement from tourism academics to research disability with the aim to bring positive change to disabled people.
Currently, a lack of research is evident in areas related to the relationships between people with a disability and the tourism industry (Shaw and Coles, 2004) and the tourism experiences of disabled individuals (Darcy, 2002). Important here is moving beyond categorical approaches to identity and a focus to be placed on individual identity (Richards et al., 2010). Furthermore, the examination of travel constraints of people with a disability in tourism is said to be at the very early stages of research (Daniels et al., 2005). Hence, more intensified research is needed to reveal the constraints and negotiation strategies of marginalised groups, such as disabled people (Herrera and Scott, 2005). By referring to individuals with specialized needs, Daniels (2005) talks about a tourism research gap while at the same time questioning what is actually meant by “specialised needs” (p.165). This leads to challenging the general understanding of what represents a specialised need (Daniels, 2005) and in a much broader sense what constitutes disability. All the above support Shelton and Tucker (2005) who state that tourism fails to engage with wider aspects of the disability discourse as only few social constructs of disability have entered the tourism literature.

Second, by engaging more critically with wider issues of the disability discourse, this research draws attention to often submerged aspects of power and knowledge in tourism studies (Cheong and Miller, 2000, Tribe, 2008, Hollinshead, 1999). Ignoring power perspectives would lead to incomplete representations of tourism experiences (Uriely, 2005), and Coles and Church (2007) call for intensified engagement in aspects of power. While researchers have started to explore the power context of tourism by the end of the 1990s, much of the work remains at the periphery (Morgan and Pritchard, 1998). Although Hannam (2002) points out that there is a shift in tourism from economic aspects of power to social and cultural power relations, power mechanisms related to disability and social exclusion can still be regarded as an under-researched subject area in tourism.

In line with feminist researchers who have documented geographies of inequality and exclusion following poststructuralist debates regarding unequal power structures (Mountz, 2002), this study engages with power/ knowledge aspects guided by Foucauldian thinking. This entails a focus on analysing social relations of power, which is deemed necessary to achieve a better understanding of disability and social exclusion. This is important as Aitchison (2001) stresses
that power relations marginalise ‘other’ voices. A similar argument is that power relations are informed by the generalised ‘other’, in which the ‘other’ is regarded as a social category (Sibley, 1995). Taylor (1998) advances these lines of reasoning by arguing that an in-depth awareness of discourses of power is necessary to understand how subjects are constructed and negative characteristics ascribed to them. It is this particular process that creates a totalised identity, which assumes that one specific difference stands for everyone within that group, therefore denying heterogeneity or subjectivities (Taylor, 1998).

Third, based on preceding arguments, the general lack of understanding of processes of social exclusion is addressed. This is important as a clear understanding of the concept of social exclusion in tourism has not yet been achieved (Botterill and Klemm, 2005) and the precise meaning of exclusion and inclusion remains elusive (Slee, 2002). Instead, tourism studies have rather uncritically accepted the concept deriving from social policy and political discourses. Given the lack of research, a variety of authors call for more research to understand the meaning of social inclusion/exclusion in tourism (Botterill and Klemm, 2005, Coalter, 2000, Lyons, 2003). Lyons (2003) stresses that “considerations of social exclusion as an extreme of sorts has and will continue to highlight issues that must be mainstreamed into travel behaviour research” (p.342). In addition, Room (1995b) states that research on social exclusion is likely to expand remarkably and this will necessitate the creation of a conceptual framework of what is meant by social exclusion at different levels (Cars et al., 1999, Kenyon et al., 2002, Room, 1995a).

It is suggested that such a framework would assist tourism studies to come closer to reaching an understanding of the core of social exclusion. Specific to disability, it is argued that a more critical approach is needed as current research predominantly highlights physical access barriers. While this can be one factor that prevents individuals with a disability from participating in tourism opportunities (Shaw and Coles, 2004, Daniels et al., 2005, Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999, Sen and Mayfield, 2004, Darcy, 1998), a focus on environmental barriers neglects to account for multiple perspectives of social exclusion. Furthermore, limited concerns have been raised that question if disability can be equated with social exclusion, which reinforces a categorical approach to identity. This research aims to not only advance current discussions within the social exclusion debate in tourism but also stimulate new discussions in other related areas of research.
1.5.2 Practical Rationale

Achieving an improved understanding of social exclusion by critically investigating conditions of inequality is also important for practical motives, leading to the identification of the practical rationale for this research. This embraces the fulfilment of ethical responsibilities, political action and policy intervention as well as accruing benefits for tourism practice and management deriving from a business case argument.

First, the fulfilment of ethical responsibilities requires not only the representation but also the protection of all individuals. Specific to tourism, Higgins-Desbiolles (2006) emphasises that the UN Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 encourages the concept of 'social tourism' to promote access to tourism for disadvantaged groups. Hence, although contested, travel and tourism can be regarded as a social right and ethical responsibilities should aim at ensuring the fulfilment of this right. Furthermore, the European Action Plan of 2003 emphasises that equal opportunities and enhanced integration structures for people with disabilities have to be pursued (European Communities, 2003). By arguing that society has an ethical responsibility and moral obligation to minimise processes of exclusion, social inclusion can be regarded as central to human survival (MacDonald and Leary, 2005). However, without fully understanding exclusion, the process of reframing inclusion as an ethical project (Allan, 2005) cannot be achieved. Similar to investigations into ageing and tourism (Sedgley et al., 2011), research needs to bring positive impacts for disabled people and challenge existing stereotypes.

Second, and deriving from the first argument, the non-fulfilment of ethical obligations hinders concrete processes of political action to redress inequalities. Prerequisites for practical action include allowing for individual perceptions of social exclusion, which would acknowledge multiple perspectives. Currently, there is a strong tendency towards quantification and categorisation neglecting individuals' perceptions and needs. In addition, interrogations are required that determine who actually defines which groups are excluded, possibly leading to reflecting on the role of social relations of power. Furthermore, the tight structural policy framework based on 'normalisation' principles leads to only limited success (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). This indicates that the moral agenda of concrete policy interventions (Percy-Smith, 2000) has fallen short. As both exclusion and inclusion have been criticised as organising concepts because they characterise social policy negatively (Peace, 2001), an improved
understanding of social exclusion could potentially offer new opportunities to frame policy more positively and provide the base for developing solutions and beneficial initiatives to overcome exclusionary processes.

Reducing exclusionary practices in tourism also contains a business case argument. A more inclusive approach to tourism would widen the customer base, resulting in more people travelling. With this opportunity in mind, research began to highlight commercial aspects of welcoming people with a disability as potentially lucrative target segment of the market (Horgan-Jones and Ringaert, 2001, Card et al., 2006, McKercher et al., 2003). Hence, benefits to tourism suppliers encompass the possibility of increasing revenues and repeat visitation. However, also institutions with a coordinating role in tourism, such as Destination Marketing Organisations (DMOs) could benefit as this might offer the opportunity to overcome the criticism these organisations face in terms of neglecting coordination, management and development functions (Gretzel et al., 2006) and their responsibility towards society at large. In this context, DMOs are given the opportunity to move away from a promotion-centric status and the emphasis placed on ‘making tourism experiences’ towards ‘enabling tourism experiences’.

1.6 Structure of Study

The introduction of this research (Chapter 1) outlines the overall aim and the relevant research questions of this study and offers insights into the conceptual basis of this thesis. Whilst discussing the relevance of these concepts, research gaps are singled out along with the establishment of theoretical justifications for the research. The importance of this study was further substantiated by providing explanations with regard to its practical rationale.

Chapter 2 starts by offering a discussion on how to understand disability. After outlining the historical context of disability, the medical and social models are discussed. As the social model has led to revised understanding of disability in contemporary society, important spin-offs are examined before investigating the applicability of the social model in tourism. This leads into a critique of the social model, outlining a number of limitations, which prevent the development of a comprehensive understanding of disability. These limitations can be summarised as the failure to account for multiple identities linked to power and knowledge.
Based on these limitations, Chapter 3 investigates existing theoretical frameworks that deal with the power/ knowledge dyad linked to identity formations with the aim to overcome existing shortcomings. The investigated perspectives include the 'gaze', embodiment and performativity. These frameworks, which have already been discussed in a tourism context, are chosen because of their potential to deal with the complexities of identity, power and knowledge constructs. Particularly with regard to power, these various perspectives are regarded as relevant for moving away from economic and juridical forms of power, which cannot account for all dimensions of disability, and focus instead on social aspects of power linked to knowledge, through which individuals become tied to a certain identity. Due to limitations of the gaze and incompleteness of embodiment approaches, the study highlights that the use of a performative framework holds the greatest potential to overcome existing shortcomings of the social model and to offer a multifaceted understanding of disability. While the social model equates disability with social exclusion, the use of a performative perspective is likely to bring changes to this conceptualisation in favour of moving beyond the categorical approach of social identity.

As a performative approach requires investigations into all kinds of phenomena, particularly with regard to their precise meaning and the effect that these have on individuals, social exclusion as a contemporary phenomenon is discussed in Chapter 4. The chapter starts by outlining the historical origin of social exclusion and examines its understanding in social policy. The knowledge gained is subsequently related to tourism and disability to draw attention to a number of impediments resulting from adopting the term in tourism uncritically from social policy. Central here is the limited attention given to situating self-identity and agency. Resulting from this debate, the chapter concludes by outlining the reasons why a performative framework is deemed appropriate for investigating the social exclusion faced by disabled individuals. First, it assists to derive meaning for how social exclusion 'is' understood by disabled individuals and second, it helps to reveal what this understanding 'does' to people and their identity positions. Chapters 2 to 4, elaborating on the conceptual part of the research, form a crucial part of the overall research rationale and process.

As a performative approach entails specific methodological considerations and implications, different paradigmatic approaches are discussed in Chapter 5 related to the aims of and concepts used in this study. Resulting from the analysis of different paradigms, justifications are provided
for adopting a dual-paradigmatic framework embracing interpretivism/ constructivism and critical theory. While interpretivism/ constructivism assists in revealing what social exclusion ‘is’ by focusing on lived experiences of disabled people, critical theory emphasises aspects of power, while acknowledging potential for transformation and emancipation, contributing to what social exclusion ‘does’ to individuals. The chapter concludes by highlighting narratives as strategy of inquiry. Narratives are found to be the most opportune approach to investigate processes of identity formation and experiences in relation to social exclusion because of their potential to identify existing constraints and to provide opportunities for the elicitation of alternative meanings, hence demonstrating forms on how to resist dominant discourses (Bryant and Schofield, 2007, Oakes, 1999, Tulloch, 1999).

Deriving from the methodological foundation and the adopted strategy of inquiry is the specific approach to methods, discussed in Chapter 6. Personal interviews form the heart of this research and the specific research design, approaches to data collection as well as data analysis and interpretation techniques are delineated. The chapter concludes by critically engaging in considerations of quality, with a focus placed on the practical implementation of ethics.

Chapter 7 presents the first part of the study’s findings in terms of re-conceptualising social exclusion in tourism. Building on the lived experiences of individuals with a disability, findings highlight that social exclusion is entrenched in interactive elements. Central here are normative ideals and social relations of power, highlighting social exclusion as a site of power, in which individuals become categorised. It is also found that exclusion does not only affect disabled individuals but manifests itself across the entire collective arena, incorporating friends and family members leading to the phenomenon of collective exclusion. Particularly by considering the collective perspective, the paradox of (in)dependence is identified.

Having provided insights into what social exclusion ‘is’, Chapter 8 deals with what social exclusion ‘does’, particularly with regard to transformative or reproductive elements of identity positions, acknowledging multiple experiences of and responses to social exclusion. This leads to the identification of alternative meanings, counter-discourses and resistance strategies, which in turn provide an indication into possibilities of agency. While overall it was found that a clear-cut dichotomy of either reproduction or transformation does not exist, tourism can be seen as an area
where individuals with a disability seek greater transformation. This is evident by the rejection to make use of specialist tourism operators catering for the disability market with the aim to demonstrate features of self-identity. Nonetheless, the quest for the recognition of self-identity is severely hampered by the dependency on other individuals. It is anticipated that these insights can be used to devise strategies to reduce exclusionary practices in tourism.

The above structure of this research is illustrated in Figure 3, which brings together the core concepts used in this study, the research objectives, methodological aspects and main findings.

---

**Figure 3: Synopsis of Overall Research Process**

- **RO1**: What is the current understanding of disability and what are the inherent limitations?

- **RO2**: Which conceptual framework can be used to overcome limitations?

- **RO3**: How can a performative framework assist the disability debate for re-conceptualising social exclusion?

- **RO4**: Using a performative framework, how can social exclusion in tourism be re-conceptualised?

- **RO5**: Using a performative framework, do individuals with a disability reproduce or transform identity positions in tourism?

The overall conclusion to this research is provided in Chapter 9, revisiting the main research aim and related questions. Deriving from this comprehensive overview is a discussion of the contribution to knowledge of this research, which leads into the practical implications.
Furthermore, critically reviewing the limitations of this research assists in establishing future research avenues. The thesis concludes by reflecting on the research process as a whole.

1.7 Summary

This chapter outlined the key concepts used in this study, which comprise disability, identity and social exclusion. By arguing for greater criticality in tourism studies, power and knowledge constructs were added to the research domain leading to the identification of the main aim of this study and the related research questions. These were backed-up by theoretical justifications encompassing the need of tourism studies to engage with wider issues of the disability discourse, to avoid sidestepping aspects of power and knowledge and to reach an improved understanding of the concept of social exclusion in tourism. Particularly with regard to the latter, practical implications can be drawn with regard to fulfilling ethical responsibilities, improving political action and policy intervention as well as reaping benefits deriving from a business case argument. The chapter concluded by offering an insight into the overall research process.
Chapter 2: Disability

2.1 Introduction

Knight and Brent (1998) argue that while some people do not know about disability, others do not ‘want’ to know about it. This statement centres on the understanding of and responses to disability. Historical, theoretical, political and cultural characteristics influence the understanding of disability and their respective societal reactions (Albrecht et al., 2001). While some authors argue that depictions of disability, deriving from historical disenfranchisement and media representations, are always negative (Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999, Donoghue, 2003, Knight and Brent, 1998), Burnett and Bender Baker (2001) note that current portrayals of disabled people move away from emphasising limitations towards highlighting inspirations. Nonetheless, society’s understanding of disability is still superficial (Burnett and Bender Baker, 2001).

According to Darcy (2002), the term ‘people with a disability’ is accepted in most Western countries. It stands in contrast to ‘disabled people’ in that the former stresses the individual as being most important, after stating disability. This highlights that disability is not central to a person’s self-concept (Darcy, 1998, Darcy, 2002) and emphasises that people with impairments are foremost human beings in their own rights, regardless of their impairment, race, religion or sexuality that exist alongside their individuality. However, disability activists prefer to speak about ‘disabled people’ to politicise the social discrimination faced by people with impairments, stressing the disabling nature of society (Gleeson, 1997). Although acknowledging these respective positions and their differences, both terms will be used interchangeably.

This chapter starts by reviewing the historical context of disability. Evolving from this account are two main models, the medical and social model to disability, which are used to provide further explanations about disability. The social perspective currently shapes society’s understanding of disability and is often referred to as representing the foundation of the Disability Movement which triggered several offshoots. These are outlined before investigating the relevance of the social model and its applicability to tourism. For this purpose, barriers to tourism participation faced by disabled people are debated, with the aim to offer a preliminary
critique and controversies inherent in the social model. It is highlighted that the social model pays only limited attention to intrapersonal constraints and over-relies on macro-environmental barriers. The chapter concludes by bringing shortcomings of the social model together, emphasising the negligence to account for multiple, different and subjective experiences.

2.2 An Historical Account of Disability

Providing an account of the history of disability is difficult as published historical accounts describe various approaches from the view of the professionals controlling services (Braddock and Parish, 2001). This requires an understanding of the underlying beliefs at any given time (Kroll, 1973). Furthermore, evidence deriving from primary sources is not available prior to the 19th century and cross-disability perspectives across the full spectrum of physical, visual, hearing and mental impairments are hard to derive at (Braddock and Parish, 2001). Given these limitations, the main aim of this section is to highlight paradoxes (Table 1) (Edwards, 1997, Braddock and Parish, 2001, Stiker, 1997, Garland, 1995, Black, 1996, Russell, 1980, Kroll, 1973, Kanner, 1964). These competing aspects highlight that attitudes towards disabled people have been ambivalent and complex since society’s historical beginnings (Berkson, 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>• Impairment as punishment by God</td>
<td>• Society is generous towards impaired people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Greek &amp; Roman Times</td>
<td>• Infanticides of children with congenital anomalies</td>
<td>• Provision of public support for people with non-congenital disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impairment as sign of anger of the Gods</td>
<td>• Integration of and rights for people according to different types of disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>• Impairments are caused by sins</td>
<td>• Healing impairments show the power of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Ages</td>
<td>• Types of disability have demonological origins - valuation of soul over body</td>
<td>• Disabled persons are part of the natural order, situated alongside poor people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Persecution of disabled people as witches - magic to cure disability</td>
<td>• Plaques de-emphasised difference/ impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Disable people use community support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance &amp; Scientific Method</td>
<td>• Persons with mental disabilities were created by Satan - further persecution</td>
<td>• Significant advances in understanding hearing, vision and the human body - causes of disability are not supernatural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amplified social stigma due to segregated institutions</td>
<td>• Introduction of public welfare institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Braddock and Parish, 2001; Stiker, 1997; Garland, 1995; Edwards, 1997; Black, 1996; Russell, 1980; Kroll, 1973; Kanner, 1964
Continuing with the seventeenth century and moving nearer to present day history, Enlightenment thinking focused on experience and reason as a source of knowledge and a growing emphasis was placed on the qualities of natural sciences for the treatment of disability. These beliefs did not only lead to the creation of new institutions (Braddock and Parish, 2001) but also paved the way for the medical model of disability, which stresses that individuals are expected to seek medical advice to ‘recover’ from their disability (Donoghue, 2003).

With regard to the creation of new institutions, schools for deaf and blind individuals proliferated in the eighteenth century (Braddock and Parish, 2001) due to the prevailing belief that all people can benefit from education (Berkson, 1993). Systematic differentiation continued throughout the eighteenth century (Braddock and Parish, 2001) and persisted further during the nineteenth century (Berkson, 1993). The focus on treatments and educational schemes for different types of impairments led to the full acceptance of the medical model of disability. While the emphasis of the medical model on segregation is highly contested (Gleeson, 1997), Braddock and Parish (2001) highlight the benefit in terms of developing group identities. Especially deaf people developed a strong sense of community which may be regarded as the first disability political action group, advocating for control over their own schools.

Campaigns for greater self-organisation increased in the 20th century, with charitable organisations developing the first surveys in 1910, which included the voices of disabled individuals, highlighting harassment by other people on the basis of impairment (Braddock and Parish, 2001). These surveys represented a dramatic change, as historically, images of disability were generated by able-bodied individuals rather than accounting for the reality experienced by disabled people (Barnes and Mercer, 2001). In the 1960s and 1970s, issues on self-advocacy gained further strengths, and particularly the independent living movement emphasised that not the impairment but the structure of society creates barriers for individuals. This led to a change in understanding disability as it was argued that impairment is not a problem but the social and physical environment (Braddock and Parish, 2001), leading to the social model of disability.
2.3 The Medical Model vs. the Social Model of Disability

The review of the history of disability has shown that the understanding of disability changed over time, with contradicting interpretations often co-existing. Many paradigms to define disability have been rejected due to their narrow-mindedness and prejudicial character (Donoghue, 2003). One of these paradigms is the meta-narrative of the medical model, with its origin in the Enlightenment period, which focuses on a functional approach and characterises disability as deviance, lack and personal tragedy (Shakespeare, 1993, Donoghue, 2003, Shelton and Tucker, 2005). People with disabilities are expected to seek professional, medical advice to 'normalise' their situation (Donoghue, 2003) as disadvantages are believed to be rectified by cure or treatment (Crow, 1996). Thus, the medical model, or alternatively labelled the individual model (Darcy, 2002), relies heavily on 'expert knowledge'. Due to its overly reductive nature and strong bias to medical institutions, individuals, who cannot be modified by professional intervention, remain deficient (Gilson and Depoy, 2000). They are therefore excused from common obligations and excluded from normal pleasures of society (Donoghue, 2003).

As one of the aims of modernity was to establish a “normalising culture” (Hughes, 2002, p.572), the medical model upholds the belief that disability is the outcome of an ‘abnormal’ body (Charlton, 1998). At its core, aspects of an individual’s body are highlighted that deviate from the ‘ideal’ (Shelton and Tucker, 2005). Hence, the medical approach fails to incorporate impairment as one of the aspects of human diversity (Darcy, 2002) and neglects that individuals are characterised by different needs and not on the basis of norms. As a result, disabled people do not wish to comply with standards of ‘normality’, but desire a fuller participation in social life (Gleeson, 1997).

Due to its reductive nature, the medical model was heavily criticised in the 1970s and 1980s (Donoghue, 2003). While medical intervention can be required by individuals at times, it is simplistic to regard the medical system as an appropriate focus, as it ignores external factors such as political, cultural and social barriers that prevent disabled people to become fully integrated in society (Donoghue, 2003). The critic of the biomedical dominance marked a shift away from internal factors, such as individual impairments or personal deficiencies, towards the consideration of external factors. Crucial for this shift was a rethinking of what disability means. Disability activists such as Vic Finkelstein and Paul Hunt, who established the Union of the
Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS), argued that not the individual’s impairment causes disability, but the way society responds to impaired citizens as an oppressed minority (Oliver, 1990, Race et al., 2005, UPIAS, 1976). Central to this claim is the separation of the terms impairment and disability, leading to a revised understanding of disability (Darcy, 2002):

"An impairment is lacking part of or all of a limb, or having a defective limb, organism or mechanism of the body" (UPIAS, 1976, pp.3-4).

"Disability is the disadvantage or restriction of activity caused by contemporary social organisation which takes no or little account of people who have physical impairments and thus excludes them from the mainstream of social activities" (UPIAS, 1976, pp.3-4).

Building on these definitions, impairment refers to physical or cognitive limitations that an individual may have, such as the inability to walk. In contrast, disability refers to socially imposed restrictions, that is, the system of social constraints that are imposed on those with impairments by discriminatory practices of society (Burnett and Bender Baker 2001). The causes of disability can hence be found in the economic, political and cultural structures of society (Race et al., 2005).

As the social model challenges society to look beyond the indications of impairment and regard it as a “diverse human condition” (Stumbo and Pegg, 2005, p.196), many definitions on impairment and disability were adjusted. For example, whereas the World Health Organisation (WHO) previously defined impairment on phenomenological grounds, leading to the assumption that bodily deviations are the cause for disability (Shelton and Tucker, 2005), the revised international classification on functioning, disability and health (ICF), provides a universal application for individuals to identify facilitating or impeding components in the physical, social or attitudinal world (World Health Organization, 2001). Given that the ICF accounts for contextual factors, it is argued that key elements of the social model are incorporated (Shelton and Tucker, 2005) and barriers or facilitators are placed at the level of societal responsibility (McKercher et al., 2003).
In this context, disability is redefined as inadequate support services to the particular needs of people with disabilities when compared to the whole society (Donoghue, 2003). As a social problem, it has to be eradicated by a reconstruction of current systems (Goodley, 2001) through the removal or minimisation of all existing barriers that exclude or segregate disabled people (Darcy, 2002). In line with these thoughts, academic writings started to embrace disabled people as a socially excluded group (Kitchin, 1998, Knight and Brent, 1998, Allison, 2000, O'Grady et al., 2004, Thomas, 2004, Tregaskis, 2002, Freund, 2001, Shaw and Coles, 2004, Darcy and Buhalis, 2011b) and equate disability with oppression and social exclusion (Thomas, 2004, Branfield, 1999, Dowse, 2001). However, different interpretations of the social model exist, which provide different explanations for the origins of social exclusion faced by disabled people.

The social-constructionist approach to the social model views disability as an ideological construct which is rooted in negative attitudes towards people with impairments (Gleeson, 1997). Related to this, disability refers to stigma, a negative attribute attached to impaired people, which arises out of interaction between members of society. Hence, a social-constructionist approach explains exclusion on the basis of cultural practice (Tregaskis, 2002) and views society as the creator of a negative social identity for people with disabilities (Donoghue, 2003).

Although the social constructionist perspective has significantly contributed to the current understanding of disability, Shakespeare (1993) states that although dismantling prejudices and discrimination is important, issues related to the formation of disabled people's own identity are equally important. These aspects are yet not fully explained within the social model perspective. Moreover, it is highlighted that both concepts, impairment and disability, central to the social model perspective, assume the prior existence of identity regardless of whether experience is captured from an internal or external perspective (Corker, 1999). As a result, these authors call for a new understanding of disability incorporating many different identities.

In contrast to a social constructionist approach, by viewing the social model through a materialist lens, disability is regarded as a by-product of capitalist economies and of "the central values of the society concerned" (Oliver, 1990, p.23). A material perspective links perceptions of disability to the mode of production and the social organisation of work (Barnes, 2000). At its core, it places an emphasis on material structures and values that marginalise impaired people. Material
aspects include housing, finance, employment and the built environment. Hence, disability, as a form of social oppression, has its roots in concrete practices that define a particular mode of life (Gleeson, 1997).

The ability to work, as one important characteristic of society, represents a major structural barrier for disabled people (Oliver, 1990). If a person is not able to work, he/she will become in need of state aid. Hence, it is argued that capitalism characterises disabled people as dependent with their lives and choices (Oliver, 1990). As disabled people are bound to the value system of the capitalist system, proponents of a materialist approach stress that exclusion can only be overcome through a replacement of exclusionary capitalist systems in favour of a more equitable social system (Finkelstein, 1980, Gleeson, 1997, Oliver, 1990).

The materialist approach has been criticised because it does not account for multiple or simultaneous oppressions of gender, sex and race (Crow, 1996). Although structural barriers generate exclusionary practices (Gleeson, 1997), it could be argued that people might also be excluded while being an active part of, for example, the labour market. Negative attitudes may play a major role for excluding individuals, not necessarily from the workplace but from other forms of social interaction and participation in life. As such, materialists devalue the role of culture, values and prejudice in explaining the social exclusion (Shakespeare, 1994). In countering this critique, Gleeson (1997) argues that in particular a ‘historical’ materialist approach acknowledges the importance of attitudes but emphasises that these are the product of social practices that are pursued to meet basic needs such as food and shelter. Hence, all social relations and historical experiences are embedded within material structures and tied to ideological frameworks of socialist societies that devalue people with impairments (Gleeson, 1997). Barnes (2000) supports this view by emphasising that all bodily perceptions and differences are ‘materially’ shaped.

While social constructionists emphasise the removal of social barriers to overcome exclusion, materialists call for eradicating structural barriers. However, the failure to account for the heterogeneity of multiple forms of oppression and identities can be regarded as a common point of critique for both approaches. Furthermore, overlapping dimensions between these approaches emerge. Barnes (2000), who follows a materialist approach and investigates disability and
employment opportunities, argues that in order to overcome employment discrimination, a reconceptualisation of the meaning of work is needed. Work, as he states, is “a social creation” (Barnes, 2000, p.451). By acknowledging that work is a social construct, the boundaries between materialist and social constructionist approaches are becoming increasingly blurred. Despite different approaches to the social model of disability, their associated critiques and overlapping dimensions, it is the social framework that currently shapes the understanding of disability.

2.4 The Disability Rights Movement

The social model also formed the basis for the disability movement (Price, 2007), stressing that society is culpable for creating disability (Shakespeare, 1993). Hence, the aim of the movement is to dismantle all physical and social barriers that disabled people face (Branfield, 1999). Similar to other social movements, the disability movement builds on identity politics (Mitchell and Snyder, 2001), in which common interests related to a particular group are stressed and difference highlighted (Taylor, 1998). As identity politics relies on membership of a marginalised or oppressed group, a sense of common or collective identity is regarded as crucial to achieve solidarity and collective coherence (Barnes and Mercer, 2001, Crossley, 2005). In this context, all voluntary organisations, charities and the entire disability movement, should be governed by people with a disability (Branfield, 1999, Shakespeare, 1993). However, Drake (1994) found a clear absence of disabled people in governing positions. In addition, the few organisations run by disabled individuals had far fewer resources compared with disability organisations managed by able-bodied persons. Hence, disabled people appear to be subordinates, reflecting the medical model in terms of creating dependency. This in turn reinforces the social exclusion of people with a disability through organisations which have been originally set up to improve the situation (Drake, 1994).

Central to identity politics is the emphasis placed on rights (Davis, 2001a) and the creation of anti-discrimination legislation was regarded as major victory by the disability movement, particularly for assuring that people with disabilities are granted civil rights (Donoghue, 2003). By eradicating discrimination, disabled people should be able to fully participate in everyday life as equal citizens (Goodall et al., 2005). A number of legislative forces have been set up over the last two decades, among these the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 (Cavinato and Cuckovich, 1992), the UK Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) of 1995 (Phillips, 2002, Shaw et
al., 2005), the Australian Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act (DDA Comm) of 1992 (Darcy and Harris, 2003, Darcy, 2002) and later in 2003, the anti-discrimination legislation of the Netherlands (Van Houten and Jacobs, 2005). Other countries have made similar amendments to their legislative framework (Braddock and Parish, 2001). Specific to the UK, the DDA outlines that service providers have to make the necessary amendments to their facilities to accommodate people with disabilities (Shaw and Coles, 2004).

Despite the belief that legislative forces are necessary to ensure fundamental civil rights (Stumbo and Pegg, 2005), criticism was raised, questioning whether rights are sufficient to fully eliminate the barriers that disabled people face (Miller and Kirk, 2002). Darcy and Daruwalla (1999) state that removing physical barriers is not just a matter of proving a legal base, instead, “it is in the broadest sense, an attack on the legal, political, social and economic structures that underpin and perpetuate their existence” (p.45).

Research has shown that the industry does not yet comply with legal requirements (Takeda and Card, 2002). One reason for noncompliance is related to the specific wording of the legal acts. Cavinato and Cuckovich (1992) indicate that expressions, such as ‘readily achievable’, might lead to excuses on behalf of service providers. Referring to the DDA, Imrie and Kumar (1998) argue that the vague and ambiguous wording in terms of access ‘where reasonable’ (Part III of the 1995 Act) prevents individuals to attain their access rights. A number of service providers face difficulties in interpreting what ‘reasonable adjustments’ are, as the expression is very subjective (Shaw et al., 2005). The absence of instructions often leads to ‘reasonableness’ being interpreted in terms of cost implications on behalf of the service provider (Phillips, 2002). When compared to other legal acts, it is contended that whereas Afro-Americans and women were granted unconditional civil rights, disabled peoples’ legal base appears to be conditional. They are granted civil rights only under the condition that it is not too costly for employers and/ or service providers (Donoghue, 2003).

The arguments above have important implications for identifying types of discrimination that were previously hidden. Donogue (2003) and Reeve (2002) argue that the medical model continuous to be the pertinent basis for the ADA. Its over-emphasis in claiming that disabled people are unable to “perform a normal life activity” does not only reinforce the medical model
but also signalises that less attention is paid to the language and social structure that define identity and meaning (Donogue, 2003, p.203). With regard to the DDA, it is also argued that the legal act follows the medical framework in which impairment is regarded as cause for disabling conditions (Imrie and Kumar, 1998, Barnes, 2000). Barnes (2000), reviewing the social model in relation to work and disability politics, concludes that only limited legal protection from discrimination in employment situations is noticeable. Furthermore, by critically analysing the International Symbol of Access (ISA), it is contended that the symbol focuses on impairment instead of humanity (Ben-Moche and Powell, 2007), which indicates that the design is based on the medical model.

Deriving from these arguments, an important paradox can be identified. As part of the disability rights movement, the operation of disability organisations and the enforcement of legislative acts are theoretically based on the social model perspective. However, a deeper investigation revealed that they seem to follow the medical model. The examples above also highlight the negligence to account for a type of discrimination that is of societal nature as institutional instances decide on special meanings and definitions, which consequently allows service providers to get away with non-compliance. With this outlined contradiction in mind, the following section examines the social model related to tourism with the aim to highlight additional areas of concern.

2.5 The Social Model of Disability and its Relevance to Tourism

It is often argued that tourism opportunities can enhance the quality of life of people living with a disability (Card et al., 2006, Yau et al., 2004). However, numerous studies highlight that disabled people are not adequately served by the tourism industry (Burnett and Bender Baker, 2001, McKercher et al., 2003, Ray and Ryder, 2003, Smith, 1987, Ernawati and Sugiarit, 2005, Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999, Turco et al., 1998, Israeli, 2002, Swarbrooke, 2003, Ozturk et al., 2008). In light of these findings, Swarbrooke (2003) stresses that companies should accept that they have a commitment to make tourism more socially inclusive, with Shaw et al. (2005) adding that this requires widening access to tourism opportunities.

Despite the fact that tourism research has emphasized the need to enhance equity and inclusion over the last 30 years, it was not until the last decade that tourism writings began to embrace the social model of disability (Aitchison, 2003). By drawing on the social model, all disabling
barriers that impact upon tourism participation need to be dismantled or reduced to ensure the participation of disabled individuals (Stumbo and Pegg, 2005, Aitchison, 2003). Hence, it is important to review the constraints faced by people with a disability not only to reach an in-depth understanding of these barriers, but also to recognise to what extent the social model is applicable to tourism and to highlight certain limitations. This corresponds to claims made by a number of authors (Takeda and Card, 2002, Card et al., 2006, Darcy, 2002). Also Smith (1987) notes that the "plethora of barriers" faced by disabled people has to be identified (p.377) and all barriers need to be addressed to eradicate social injustice (Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999).

Categories of barriers and constraints to tourism participation are employed as the use of categorisations is regarded as beneficial to understand the nature of individual barriers and their interrelationship (Smith, 1987). While some of these barriers are either external or internal to an individual, others occupy an intermediate position. Although barriers and constraints are used in a synonymous way although it is acknowledged that a constraint represents a broader conceptualisation and moves beyond barriers to participation (Daniels et al., 2005, Arab-Moghaddam et al., 2007).

2.5.1 Economic Barriers

While some authors include financial limitations as part of environmental barriers (Crawford and Godbey, 1987, Daniels et al., 2005), others list economic constraints under social obstacles (Gladwell and Bedini, 2004). McKercher et al. (2003) anticipate that economic barriers fit into the overarching category of internal constraints, which are entirely under the control of the individuals. This assumption can be questioned as disabled people only have limited influence on whether employers accept them as part of the labour market. Hence, in line with Murray and Sproats (1990), financial constraints are dealt with as a separate group of economic barriers. They form part of the materialist approach to the social model, which demands the creation of a different social system, moving away from capitalist structures, to overcome exclusion.

Financial limitations represent a major access barrier to tourism due to the economic costs involved in taking holidays (Shaw et al., 2005, Darcy, 1998, Shaw and Coles, 2004). People with disabilities face economic constraints due to limited access to employment, which constraints access to tourism opportunities (Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999, Shaw and Coles, 2004).
Furthermore, attendant costs, equipment hire and lack of budget accommodation represent major economic obstacles, above all for people with high support needs. Particularly, attendant costs add to the economic burden if the assistant is not a friend or family member as it has direct and indirect cost implications (Darcy, 2002). With regard to budget options, Murray and Sproats (1990) claim that disabled people do not have the flexibility to use low price offers as the offered facilities and modes of transport are usually not accessible. Buildings that are accessible usually charge higher prices which individuals with a disability cannot afford (Murray and Sproats, 1990). Also in a travel agency context, McKercher et al. (2003) state that the customisation and personalisation of packages is likely to result in an increase of costs which affects those individuals who cannot afford surcharges, leading to additional financial disadvantages.

Despite the fact that economic considerations are intrinsically bound to tourism opportunities, Darcy and Daruwalla (1999) report that economic issues are not the only or most frequently stated constraint by disabled people. This is supported by Daniels et al. (2005), highlighting that financial constraints, which have a real impact on the possibility of a travel experience, are minimal. Considering these opposing arguments, financial constraints might be a considerable impediment for some individuals, particular for people with high support needs (Darcy, 2002), while for other disabled persons, economic aspects do not represent a significant barrier.

2.5.2 Environmental Barriers

A variety of authors note that an inaccessible environment represents a major barrier to people with a disability (Veitch and Shaw, 2004a, Darcy, 1998, Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999, Imrie and Kumar, 1998, Ernawati and Sugirti, 2005, Turco et al., 1998, Yates, 2007, Packer et al., 2007, Shaw and Coles, 2004, Israeli, 2002, Sen and Mayfield, 2004). The notion of an accessible environment embraces all structural and institutional aspects of the physical infrastructure (Darcy et al., 2011c). Furthermore, the more severe a mobility impairment, the greater the individuals’ accessibility needs (Burnett and Bender Baker, 2001).

Aspects of physical access in tourism include inaccessible accommodation and attractions (Turco et al., 1998), with transport being of special concern (Shaw and Coles, 2004), all leading to oppression in the built environment (Imrie, 2001). Takeda and Card (2002), investigating access barriers from the perspective of tourism intermediaries, discovered that all tourism sectors score
low in terms of providing adequate access, with the attraction sector receiving slightly better results (Takeda and Card, 2002). By incorporating the travellers’ perspective in a proceeding study (Card et al., 2006), disabled tourists rated the inaccessibility of attractions higher than perceived by intermediaries.

Also related to different perceptions, Israeli (2002) investigated the relative importance of accessibility features for mobility impaired travellers compared to non-disabled people. It was found that disabled travellers face a non-compensatory situation as they cannot make a trade-off between different features of a site (Israeli, 2002). Hence, regardless of the attractiveness of a destination, accessibility components cannot be compromised (Yates, 2007). Supporting these arguments, people with mobility impairments usually do not have the opportunity to alter their travel plans by choosing an alternative accommodation establishment if they are not satisfied due to the limited number of accessible rooms available (Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999). As a result, people with a disability often need to abandon their plans (Darcy, 1998).

In addition to rooms not meeting the needs of impaired travellers, accessible pathways are frequently neglected (Stumbo and Pegg, 2005). An accessible path of travel or continuous pathway is an uninterrupted path to or within buildings, attractions or events, which allows disabled people to access all required facilities (Darcy, 1998, Stumbo and Pegg, 2005, Darcy and Harris, 2003). The absence of accessible pathways prevents disabled people to have an independent and complete travel experience (Darcy, 1998), with Israeli (2002) emphasising the increased importance of paths once more travel experiences are gained.

Yau et al. (2004) argue that progress has been made in removing obstacles in the physical environment, supported by Cavinato and Cuckovich (1992) claiming that the transport sector has reduced barriers, whereas others show that inaccessible public transport is still a major constraint (Darcy, 1998, Stumbo and Pegg, 2005). By analysing transport experiences, it was observed that air travel generates a disembodied experience due to airline staff not being aware of people’s needs, regulatory mechanisms and general airline procedures. It is argued that the social model should be incorporated into airline management to eliminate barriers (Darcy, 2007).
Even though legislative acts are in place, a number of obstacles exist that hinder the development of a fully accessible tourism environment. To start with, private ownership structures of most of the tourism infrastructure represent a major impediment to the removal of barriers (Rains, 2008). Private owners usually regard the laws protecting the rights of disabled people as representing an additional cost category (Imrie and Kumar, 1998) or as legal risks of law suits to be managed (Rains, 2008). In this respect, legal acts generate resistance with the result that private businesses do not regard individuals with disabilities as lucrative customers (Rains, 2008). This is supported by Imrie and Kumar (1998) stating that the needs by impaired individuals are often perceived as marginal, with minimum standards only poorly implemented (Stumbo and Pegg).

Furthermore, a fully accessible environment would require the implementation of Universal Design, as a human-centred framework to design places, information, communication and policy in a way that benefits the broadest range of individuals in the ampest range of situations without the need for specialised adaptations (Veitch and Shaw, 2004b, Horgan-Jones and Ringaert, 2001, Rains, 2008). In this way, disability is recognised as part of human diversity (Darcy and Harris, 2003) and accommodates disabled individuals without stigmatising them (Brown et al., 1999). Hence, society should aim at implementing criteria of Universal Design instead of designing facilities 'for' disabled people (Dattilo, 2002). Further, Universal Design is a process that changes according to different user experiences and shifting definitions of disability (Rains, 2008). However, despite the positive tendencies brought by Universal Design, Freund (2001) contends that only a minority of architects explore the options provided by this design paradigm.

An additional obstacle refers to the likely incompatibility between access objectives, as laid down in the DDA, and conservation policies for historic environments. Often conservation planning authorities prevent historic attraction providers to make improvements in physical accessibility to their sites (Goodall et al., 2005, Goodall, 2006). In a similar vein, the majority of natural settings also offer limited accessibility for disabled tourists (Brown et al., 1999). Drawing an analogy to heritage sites, the conflict arises by making a natural area accessible while at the same time following preservation principles (Muloin, 1992). While not offering an in-depth analysis of this controversy, Muloin (1992) argues that disabled people would not want to have these natural areas modified when it eliminates the reason for visiting the place, hence giving precedence to preservation objectives. This is supported by Nisbett and Hinton (2005), making
the case that the desire to have more access to natural areas exists alongside goals of environmental protection.

Given the preceding discussion, it can be argued that the social model is relevant to tourism as it highlights where and which barriers have to be removed to ensure full participation to tourism opportunities. However, while tourism providers have started to reduce barriers in terms of improving accessibility, the social model has not yet been fully employed (Darcy, 2007). Reasons for this negligence relate to legal acts partly following the medical model and incompatibility issues between preservation and accessibility. Building on the list of obstacles that prevent the development of an accessible tourism infrastructure, Imrie and Kumar (1998) claim that the origins of barriers in the built environment are grounded in the domination of able-bodied values which excludes people with disabilities from key decisions concerning land use and building design. The lack of opportunities to influence building constructions is coupled with wider negative perceptions of disability (Imrie and Kumar, 1998), which highlights the interrelationship of environmental and interactive barriers.

2.5.3 Interactive Barriers

Interactive barriers result from the interplay between disabled people and other individuals’ attitudes. This category takes up an intermediate position between pure external conditions and individual factors (Daniels et al., 2005, Gladwell and Bedini, 2004, McKercher et al., 2003, Murray and Sproats, 1990). While transforming the physical environment is important, changes to attitudes are equally crucial (Imrie and Kumar, 1998). However, although some authors claim that there has been a change in public awareness which led to more positive attitudes towards disabled people (Cavinato and Cuckovich, 1992), others argue that negative attitudes still represent a major barrier to tourism participation (Murray, 2002, Shaw et al., 2005, Smith, 1987, Horgan-Jones and Ringaert, 2001, Muloin, 1992, Murray and Sproats, 1990). McKercher et al. (2003) provide evidence that some travel agents held the extreme belief that disability per se effectively excludes people from travelling.

By reviewing attitudinal and physical accessibility barriers, Takeda and Card (2002), found that accessibility barriers were more prevalent than attitudinal constraints from a tourism service provider’s point of view (Takeda and Card, 2002). However, when incorporating the perceptions
of physically impaired travellers, results showed that disabled tourists do not only identify a greater number of barriers, but also perceive the lack of accessibility and negative attitudes stronger than service providers (Card et al., 2006). In contrast to arguments highlighting that an inaccessible physical infrastructure represents the major barrier, with travel providers having control to reduce these barriers (Card et al., 2006, Takeda and Card, 2002), Murray (2002) states that people's attitudes represent the focal constraint for accessing inclusive leisure opportunities for young teenagers with a disability. Muloin (1992) goes as far as stating that negative attitudes are at the "roof of all barriers" (p.23).

In addition, it is emphasised that barriers in the physical environment can only be reduced or more easily managed once a profound change in attitudes has been achieved (Murray and Sproats, 1990, Packer et al., 2007). Opposing this view, Darcy (2003), examining the Sidney 2000 Games, concludes by affirming that the Games have accelerated changes for improving the physical accessible infrastructure, however, they did not bring social change in terms of more favourable attitudes or increased awareness. He further criticises the official Olympic Games ticket book, which entailed the question “I am confined to a wheelchair. Will I miss out on the Games?” (cited by Darcy, 2003, p.744). This statements reinforces existing stereotypes and it is inappropriate to regard a person as ‘confined’ to a wheelchair as a wheelchair offers liberty in terms of mobility and community participation (Darcy, 2003).

Despite the fact that many scholars highlight attitudinal barriers, only a few examine the subject at a deeper level. Notable exceptions are Bizjak et al. (2011), investigating different types of attitudes and Daruwalla and Darcy (2005), who analyse personal and societal attitudes. While the former refers to beliefs and opinions that individuals possess with regard to certain objects, the latter relates to widespread attitudes held by society at large, influenced by civil and legal rights. Findings indicate that both types of attitudes can be altered through training programs. However, it is easier to change societal attitudes, while changing peoples' personal attitudes is more challenging. What is needed is regular personal contact with disabled persons, which should be placed within the social model perspective to avoid the 'personal tragedy' perception (Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005). The need to provide staff training is highlighted by a variety of authors (Gladwell and Bedini, 2004, McKercher et al., 2003, Card et al., 2006), particularly with regard
to increased consultation and interaction with disabled people in everyday situations (Stumbo and Pegg, 2005, Loo, 2001).

Stumbo and Pegg (2005) identify two barriers with regard to tourism staff. These relate to negative and condescending staff attitudes and the inability to provide reliable information. Particularly travel agencies were found to act as an inhibitor to travel (Stumbo and Pegg, 2005, McKercher et al., 2003). Apart from negative attitudes, package tours do not meet the needs of disabled people and the information provided is often inaccurate (McKercher et al., 2003). As a result, disabled people do not trust travel agencies which claim that they offer holidays catering for the disability market (Ray and Ryder, 2003). In this context, McKercher et al. (2003) state that the travel trade largely promotes a myth in presenting travel agencies as experts for all travel-related issues. Although it is worth highlighting individual efforts, such as a travel agent learning sign language (Yates, 2005), the majority of industry reports appear overly optimistic. For example, the Travel Agent Magazine claims that due to mixed adaptations of legal standards in different countries, the skills of travel agents are helpful (Esquiroz Arellano, 2003). However, for this to happen, travel agencies need to shift from selling inflexible packages, designed to meet the industry’s needs, to offerings that correspond to consumer’s needs and information requirements (McKercher et al., 2003).

The lack of accurate information is often stated as a major barrier (Packer et al., 2007, Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999, Stumbo and Pegg, 2005, Yates, 2007, McKercher et al., 2003, Darcy, 2005, Darcy, 2002, Turco et al., 1998, Miller and Kirk, 2002, Eichhorn et al., 2008, Darcy, 2010), with Cavinato and Cuckovich (1992) arguing that the availability of information and its subsequent dissemination probably represents the greatest constraint. As disabled individuals have to undertake a high degree of pre-planning to ensure that their needs are met (Darcy, 1998, Pühretmair, 2004), detailed information on the current state of accessible facilities can lead to an enhanced decision-making process (Pühretmair, 2004) and subsequently to not having to abandon the holiday intention (Darcy, 1998). Therefore, Darcy (2002) accentuates that providing information represents an important step in overcoming barriers. It is anticipated that the fulfilment of informational needs of disabled people would potentially assist in removing physical barriers by highlighting where environmental barriers have been removed, or contrarily, are still in existence (Eichhorn et al., 2008).
Related to the social model, interactive barriers are aligned with the social constructionist approach, focusing on negative attitudes on behalf of tourism service providers and other tourists. While it is argued that attitudinal barriers are difficult to overcome, hence posing challenges to the social model, personal contacts between disabled and able-bodied people are seen as essential.

2.5.4 Intrapersonal Barriers

Intrapersonal barriers relate primarily to internal aspects such as physical, psychological and cognitive attributes (Smith, 1987). Whereas the previously debated barriers are accommodated within the social model, intrapersonal constraints are currently neglected. However, as will be shown, a negligence to account for intrapersonal barriers leads to an incomplete understanding of disability.

While the unavailability of reliable information has been identified as part of interactional barriers, Daniels et al. (2005) argue that particularly the limited awareness of information represents an intrapersonal constraint. By analysing the levels of knowledge of parents with disabled children with respect to standards and regulations and perceived risk, it was found that a lack of knowledge increased their perceived subjective risk (Falkmer and Gregersen, 2002). The link to perceived risk places knowledge and information constraints within the cognitive dimension of intrapersonal barriers. Particularly for people with hearing impairments, not being able to understand the tour guide’s explanations causes communication disorders which increases travel risks for this impairment group (Chou and Chao, 2007). While it is anticipated that the knowledge construct can be placed within the cognitive dimension of intrapersonal barriers, emotional constraints, such as feeling of discomfort and cumulative stress (Daniels et al., 2005) have psychological underpinnings. Emotional barriers do not only hinder disabled people from travelling, but can equally bring considerable stress for caregivers, which might result in an inhibitor to travel planning and implementation (Gladwell and Bedini, 2004).

In addition to cognitive abilities and a person’s psychological state, intrapersonal barriers also embrace physical functioning levels, such as the nature of impairment itself (Daniels et al., 2005), which links directly to an individual’s disability (Smith, 1987). Mactavish et al. (2007)
investigated quality of life related to vacations of families that have a disabled child and found that health and impairment concerns can constrain quality of life and influence vacation meaning. The ability to engage in vacations is influenced by social and personal identities including race, gender, disability and nationality and valuable vacation experiences are regarded as an important indicator for quality of life (Mactavish et al., 2007). Similarly, by investigating outdoor recreation, Burns and Graefe (2007) found that personal disability was reported as the greatest constraint by disabled people. These constraints also varied depending on the type of disability, age and other demographic variables. In contrast, able-bodied family members perceived fewer constraints (Burns and Graefe, 2007). These different perceptions might be explained by distinguishing between constraints that reduce an individual’s participation, ‘limitors’, and others that completely stop their participation, ‘prohibitors’. As poor health acts as the major prohibitor to outdoor recreation (McGuire et al., 1986), having an impairment might hence result in a subjectively perceived prohibiting situation, whereas families with a disabled member, might regard the impairment as limitor but not prohibitor.

Given the preceding discussion, one could argue that intrapersonal barriers correspond to elemental constraints that need to be overcome before an individual with a disability can engage in the travel process, which involves self-acceptance and personal initiative (Yau et al., 2004, Packer et al., 2007). Intrinsic barriers have the most detrimental effect on disabled people and increase as external barriers amplify, which poses a threat to the future demand for tourism by these individuals (Yates, 2007). Exploring constraints and motivations of long-distance hikers with special needs, persons that successfully completed the hike, showed a lack of intrapersonal constraints and high levels of intrinsic motivational factors despite the existence of interactive and structural barriers (Nisbett and Hinton, 2005). This example highlights that intrapersonal constraints are linked to external and interactive barriers due to the ongoing interaction between person and environment (Crawford and Godbey, 1987). Also Smith (1987) refers to “a network of interrelated forces that limit the individual’s opportunities to experience leisure” (p.386).

Looking at interactive constraints, McKercher et al. (2003) assert that these have an effect on the self-concept of disabled people as negative attitudes are likely to be absorbed and internalised by disabled individuals. If people with disabilities do not succeed in overcoming environmental barriers, they are likely to regard this failure as lack of competence, which in turn increases
intrinsic barriers (Smith, 1987). Despite the apparent importance of intrapersonal barriers, Yau et al. (2004) claim that, “the individual’s own tourism career is a subject that has not been examined in a comprehensive manner” (p.948). By analysing the process of becoming and remaining travel active, Packer et al. (2007) found that the disability context, which relates to internal factors, influences the personal stages of becoming travel active. In contrast, the environmental/travel context, which refers to exogenous factors, impacts on both, personal and public stages. The authors conclude that for overcoming barriers, it is crucial that health professionals, the tourism sectors and disabled people themselves take over responsibility (Packer et al., 2007), suggesting that barriers have to be tackled from macro-societal and individual perspectives. This, however, opposes the social model, which places the responsibility for removing barriers purely at the macro-societal level and pays only marginal attention to personal factors.

Yates (2007) emphasises that internal aspects, which limit tourism opportunities, are augmented by society due to its inability to cope with greater variety “outside the norm” (p.164). However, without denying the crucial role of society for overcoming barriers, the presented argumentation has highlighted the importance of intrapersonal factors for engaging in the travel process. This is supported by Yau et al. (2004) confirming that “the nature of the journey is highly personal” (p.950). In relation to this, economic, environmental, interactive and intrapersonal barriers need to be overcome (Smith, 1987, Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999), underlining the need to pay equal attention to internal and external constraints. Yet, the analysis has shown that the social model seems to focus on economic, environmental and interactive constraints, leaving out intrapersonal elements as the causes of disability are said to be found external to an individual. In this context, Bickenbach et al. (1999) assert that limited research has been conducted that focuses on how individual dimensions interact with the social environment. The omission of personal factors, the ‘self’ and the ‘body’ is recognised as a major critique of the social model of disability.

2.6 Critique of the Social Model of Disability

During the last 10 years, the social model of disability has been criticised by a variety of authors (Turner, 2001, Hughes and Paterson, 1997, Dowse, 2001, Bickenbach et al., 1999, Shildrick, 2005, Crow, 1996, Marks, 1999). It is argued that the principles of the social model, such as the development of positive attitudes and the creation of inclusive environments, had little impact on
mass perceptions (Miles, 1996). Critique of the social model can be summarised under a variety of different but highly interrelated dimensions.

Starting with the notion of identity, Dowse (2001) investigated why the social model has difficulties in building a strong disability identity. By referring to collective action frames, as part of social movement theory, which are regarded as essential for identity formation and shared interpretations, it is argued that the disability movement attempts to develop a collective identity to pursue strategic aims (Dowse, 2001). However, the development of a positive collective identity is very difficult for disabled people due to the existence of various forms of oppression and identity choices. As a result, the social model marginalises other experiences and neglects to account for heterogeneity and multiplicity of identities (Dowse, 2001). In fact, it is argued that disability politics conceal difference with the aim of focusing only on disability as uniting factor for social exclusion (Shakespeare and Watson, 2001). Shakespeare’s (2008) critique of disability studies supports this concern, asserting that the overreliance on the social model and the absence of questioning the benefits of identity politics lead to a failure to encapsulate the complexity inherent in disabled peoples’ life. For overcoming these shortcomings, Price (2007) calls for the development of ‘Critical’ Disability Studies that engage with a number of theories across disciplines in order to move beyond the fixed identity of the social model.

This fixed identity, however, is vital to the social model. It is accentuated that disability studies are dominated by discussions of policy matters and political discourses (Gleeson, 1997, Shelton and Tucker, 2005, Shakespeare, 2008, Branfield, 1999). While Gleeson (1997) argues that this policy orientation is a strength as well as a weakness, Barnes (2000) notes that the social model has been crucial to accelerate the politicization of disability in the world. Branfield (1999) supports this view as the social framework should primarily be regarded as a tool to fight a political argument against oppression. As such, disability is only to be regarded as related to oppression (Thomas, 2004, Branfield, 1999) and the meta-narrative of the social model is needed to inform about the aspects that comprise oppression (Branfield, 1999). Price (2007), however, claims that particularly the creation of this meta-narrative neglects the multitude of different dimensions effecting people’s life. Hence, the experience of disability cannot be subsumed under one unitary model (Price, 2007).
Further, although the historical review of disability has shown that early studies in 1910 included the voices of disabled people, the social model seems to include only a few ‘selected’ experiences, while paradoxically stressing that disabled people are not a homogenous group (Branfield, 1999, Reeve, 2002). This has led to calls to account for more subjective experiences of disability. Central here is the claim to move the role of the body to the foreground of the discussion. It is argued that by insisting that disability is only related to social oppression, which is asserted by the social model, has left out the body and hence the subjectively lived experience of impairment (Hughes and Paterson, 1997, Crow, 1996). By capturing individuals’ own experiences, the body becomes a source of knowledge (Hughes and Paterson, 1997). In contrast, the social model holds a neutral ‘disability as all’ stance in which no personal levels exist, leading to a failure to account for the complexity of experiences and to represent the full range of disabled individuals (Crow, 1996). In this context, the social model devalues the phenomenology of embodied difference and denies difference all together (Shildrick, 2005). Although Freund (2001) acknowledges the importance of individual differences, it is reiterated that difference related to minority status is important for political activism, group identity and cohesion.

Given the centrality of the body in the debate on difference, new thinking and knowledge is required in which subjectivity and lived embodied experiences are linked together (Price, 2007). Supporting the view that impairment and subjective experiences need to be considered, Marks (1999) draws on people with learning difficulties and argues that it is inadequate to define disability as either purely caused by the environment or mainly related to the body. Only by acknowledging biological, social and relational levels of analysis and different dimensions of experiences can the social model overcome its limitations and incorporate subjective as well as emotional aspects without falling back into medical approaches (Marks, 1999). Hence, disability consists of both, individual factors such as impairment, motivations and aspirations and contextual factors which comprise barriers in the environment (Shakespeare, 2008).

In countering this critic, Barnes (1999) claims that the social model has never rejected the experience of impairment per se. Also Thomas (2004) emphasises that the majority of articles from disability studies and medical sociology do not deny that impairment plays a role in restricted activity caused by social barriers. An exception is Finkelstein’s work, which accentuates that disability only refers to oppressive social relations. Hence, multiple forms of
social exclusion faced by disabled people should be made public, whereas experiences related to impairment should remain within the private realm. While Thomas (2004) acknowledges that this thinking got lost in the social model, it is stressed that any other critique of the model derives from the negligence to highlight that disability only comes into existence when restrictions are socially imposed. Other "impairment effects" (p.581) are not of interest for combating disability.

A variety of authors criticise that disability is only to be regarded as oppression. For example, Shakespeare (2008) asks if a person with an impairment who is not oppressed is consequently not disabled. Also Crow (1996) emphasises that personal struggle is still apparent even when disabling barriers are removed. Hence, the social model dichotomy between impairment and disability is disapproved by many authors (Shakespeare, 2008, Hughes and Paterson, 1997, Crow, 1996). Particularly the exclusion of the body ignores the reality of the impaired body and leaves out any real experience of bodily distress (Tregaskis, 2002), which has caused the aforementioned separation between impairment and disability, body and culture (Hughes and Paterson, 1997).

The differentiation between impairment and disability also leads to difficulties in distinguishing between exclusionary practices deriving from different impairments and class, race, gender or economic status, which causes problems in operationalising the social model (Bickenbach et al., 1999). The link between disability and other oppressing factors is elaborated by disabled feminists, which were among the first critical voices that stressed the negligence of the social model to explore the relationship between gender and disability (Dowse, 2001). As the Disability Movement has been characterised by men, it excludes female experiences, reiterating the need to account for individuals' own personal experiences (Tregaskis, 2002). Current debates start to incorporate the multiplicity of experiences of black or gay people with impairments, which the social model has marginalised (Dowse, 2001). In addition, as accounts of disability are often provided from a Western perspective, different knowledge is required that can be applied to other contexts (Miles, 1996). Given these arguments, new and different forms of knowledge related to different experiences of disability are necessitated.

However, although experiences can be regarded as the origin of knowledge, it has to be kept in mind that they are also embedded in wider social structures (Diedrich, 2005). Therefore, an
understanding of experiences requires an awareness of processes encompassing power relations, which shape experiences in different contexts (Davis, 2001b). In this context, Crow (1996) talks about an elite of people with impairments that excludes other disabled individuals with the result of failing to achieve the main goal of equality. In fact, it leads to reproducing exclusionary processes which the social model tries to eliminate in the first place.

In addition, Donogue (2003) claims that the social model has lost its importance by following a social constructionist approach as this adoption indicates that any individual can resist prescribed roles. As such, the model returned to individualising the nature of disability, consequently hindering any kind of change. Similar to Diedrich’s (2005) argument, the significance of social structure in dictating a legitimate definition among competing identities is neglected, which allows the social constructionist approach to redefine a group of individuals through actions of a few people (Donoghue, 2003). While Dowse (2001) talks about the power of language which excludes people with learning difficulties, Shakespeare (2008) shares the scepticism related to social constructionist thinking. Without denying the importance of the social constructionist approach as a political instrument, people with dyslexia would benefit from a medical-based approach instead of following a social constructionist method. To overcome these limitations, a new social movement is needed that focuses on the dialect between language and social structure, which provides a strategy to structural resistance (Donoghue, 2003).

Also being critical of the social constructionist approach, Dewsbury et al. (2004) argue that the approach is in fact anti-social. Merely stating that disability is a social construct does not improve the situation of disabled people. It either privileges one version of experience, leading to the “best theory of inequality” (p.147) or de-privileges other experiences and voices (Dewsbury et al., 2004). While the former leads to maintaining the client/expert view, the latter highlights an incomplete version of experiences. As such, the social model follows anti-individualist positions, leading to political rhetoric in which everyday realities are removed. Hence, it is proposed that political rhetoric should be replaced by a wide range of experiences, which in turn enhances the understanding of the needs of disabled people (Dewsbury et al., 2004).

In contrast, instead of abolishing the social model, Freund (2001) calls for an expansion by incorporating an emphasis on spatial organisation, as all bodies have spatial-temporal
requirements. Therefore, expanding the social model by including phenomenological, social and material aspects would move away from an over-emphasis on bodily differences with the result of helping all citizens in society (Freund, 2001). Crow (1996) also calls for a renewed social model. Here, impairment should be regarded as an objective concept based on which people apply their individual meanings and definitions, allowing for personal and subjective experiences. However, external constituents also need to be taken into consideraton by incorporating the wider social context acting upon impairment (Crow, 1996). According to Crow (1996), it was previously safer not to mention bodily experiences as it made political involvement difficult. Hence, the emphasis was placed on exclusion being a result of discrimination and prejudice, with Thomas (2004) reiterating that disability is only associated with external social oppression and systematic social exclusion.

The above discussion has highlighted some of the critiques of the social model. Central here are difficulties to account for multiple identities and heterogeneous, subjective experiences, obstacles to incorporate the body without falling back to the medical model and questions about other forms of knowledge and power struggles. Additionally, these aspects led to questioning the assumption that disability can be equated with social exclusion without accounting for potentially numerous interpretations of social exclusion. According to Crow (1996), external barriers lead to social exclusion but at the same time, subjective, bodily experiences are also important as part of an individual’s everyday reality. While the importance of psychological effects of exclusion has been highlighted by Reeve (2002), Crow (1996) accentuates that the exclusion or inclusion of individuals is determined by different responses to impairment (Crow, 1996). Hence, a focus is needed on both, external and internal factors (Crow, 1996, Shakespeare, 2008). Dimensions of interaction between external and internal elements also vary from person to person and from time to time (Crow, 1996).

While there are a few attempts to reconcile tourism and disability studies, in-depth investigations related to the link between social exclusion, barriers to tourism participation and disability are lacking. Although the literature offers insights into different types of barriers to tourism participation, little is known about the prevailing perceptions of disabled people in terms of social exclusion and the extent of their problems, thus making it difficult to devise any kind of strategies for society to overcome negative impacts. Directly addressing this aspect, Darcy and
Daruwalla (1999) pose the question: “So what are the major forms of social exclusion in tourism, and what are the solutions” (p.41)?

Highlighting the important role of academic research, Shakespeare (2008) calls for further investigations to reach a better understanding of social exclusion faced by disabled people. While Shakespeare (2008) argues that greater insights into medical ethics and disability studies are needed, this study claims that it is essential to focus on the limitations of the social model, which comprise the negligence to recognise multiple identities, heterogeneous and subjective experiences as well as power and knowledge. It is anticipated that a more nuanced understanding of these aspects does not only improve the overall understanding of disability but also leads to advancing the understanding of social exclusion.

2.7 Summary

This chapter offered a discussion on how to understand disability. After providing an historical review, outlining paradoxical interpretations of disability, the medical and social models of disability, which emerged at different points in time, were discussed. While the medical model focuses on physical dysfunctions and posits disability as being the ‘problem’ of the individual, the social model locates the causes of disability in the economic, political and cultural structures of society, which exclude people with impairments.

The social model has shaped society’s understanding of disability over the last three decades and offers the basis for continuing debate. An example of this debate is the distinction between two approaches to the social model, offering two distinct explanations for the exclusion of disabled individuals. While the materialist approach focuses on structural exclusion, the social-constructionist, stresses relational exclusion. However, both approaches point towards the negligence to account for multiple forms of oppression and identities. Following this discussion, the disability rights movement was investigated. Despite theoretically being grounded in the social model, it was highlighted that anti-discrimination legislation and the operation of disability organizations point towards following the medical approach. With regard to legal acts, it was assumed that disabled people are only granted conditional rights, which focus on the notion of ‘normality’ and cost implications for service providers. Furthermore, by looking at the
operation of disability organizations, the governance of able-bodied persons leads to an increase in dependency instead of a reduction of barriers.

Following these points of critique, the chapter dealt with the relevance of the social model to tourism with the aim to highlight further controversies. As the social model envisages the removal of all barriers that impact on tourism participation, four groups of barriers could be identified which relate to economic, environmental, interactive and intrapersonal constraints. Despite the use of this categorisation, it was emphasized that barriers do not exist in isolation but are interrelated and interwoven. The discussion has also highlighted that barriers do not only need to be tackled from a macro-societal point of view, but increased attention has also to be paid to individual perspectives, which the social model currently neglects.

These insights, deriving from reviewing tourism-specific literature, drew attention to additional controversies and critiques of the social model. As the social model focuses only on macro-environmental barriers, individual, personal factors remain neglected. This leads to a failure to account for multiple identities and subjective knowledge deriving from embodied experiences. Another overlooked aspect relates to the power of language or discursive formations that excludes some individuals by either privileging one set of experiences and de-privileging other. By critically examining these limitations, it is questionable if disability can be equated with social exclusion without taking into account different subjective experiences and responses to exclusion. As Dowse (2001) asserts that by using disability and social exclusion in a synonymous way, the dichotomy of impairment and disability, body and mind is maintained, which ultimately denies human agency in dealing with impairment. Hence, what is needed is an engagement into the complexities of experiences (Crow, 1996).

It is anticipated that these critiques might assist in shaping or modifying the understanding of disability and social exclusion. This requires an investigation into different approaches that can be used to represent the range of experiences of disabled individuals, drawing on the complexity of identity and power/knowledge constructs, currently neglected by the social model.
Chapter 3: Identity and Power/Knowledge

3.1 Introduction

Given the hindrances faced by the social model of disability, this chapter starts by discussing identity constructs linked to power and knowledge, and subsequently relates the debate to disability. Central for examining power and knowledge constructs are ideas of Michel Foucault. Although Foucault never analysed disability per se, his arguments can be used to explain why disability, as an identity category, forces certain groups or individuals into a marginalised position in society. Foucauldian thinking provided the original impetus in the literature, explicitly linking the construction of identities to power and knowledge.

With the aim of reducing current limitations of the social model and contributing to an improved understanding of disability, three perspectives are explored, including the gaze, embodiment and performativity. These frameworks are chosen, not only because they have already been applied in a tourism context, but also because they incorporate the complexity of identity, power and knowledge constructs, building on or being related to Foucauldian ideas. After outlining insights gained through these approaches and delineating weaknesses, the chapter concludes by proposing the application of a performative framework, which represents the most suitable framework for understanding disability and the power processes by which individuals become tied to a certain identity. As the current understanding of disability equates disability with social exclusion, a revised framework might also offer new perspectives related to understanding social exclusion.

3.2 Reflecting on Identity Constructs

The concept of identity is of key importance in social science (Crossley, 2005), mainly because it represents the fundamental link between an individual and the socio-cultural context (Hammack, 2008). By asking what is meant by identity, Butler (2007) distinguishes between explanations that purely refer to internal features of an individual and those justifications that build on regulatory practices, which shape identities. The former emphasises that internal features
establish the self-identity of a person (Butler et al., 2007). In the process of making sense of oneself, individuals use self-images for intrapersonal and interpersonal reasons (Chen, 2001). In contrast, explanations building on regulatory mechanisms stress external forces, which operate beyond a person’s control and centre on “normative ideals” instead of “descriptive features of experience” (Butler, 2007, p.23). Burkitt (2008) recaptures that identity is intrinsically interrelated with the social world and its relationships. As such, individuals need to constantly ‘remake’ themselves according to different situations.

By investigating identity as a construct, Burkitt (2008) revisits the distinction between sex and gender and stresses that gender is a social construct, with the attribution of gender representing a complex process of social interaction. As gender appears in a variety of forms, normative judgements are in place, which produce exclusionary practices (Butler, 2007). Butler builds her arguments on Foucault, who has entirely revised the concept of identity by claiming that the identity construct is produced by power relations (Mills, 2003). By using discursive explanations to explain what qualifies as ‘gender’, Butler (2007) argues that gender norms are produced by regulatory practices. Butler’s account was criticised for limited insights into unofficial discourses leading to the (re)production of different types of identities (Burkitt, 2008). Further, while Burkitt (2008) argues that Butler adopts a narrow interpretation of discourse, relating the individual to language and norms and less to relations with others, Watson (2002) argues that over-relying on discursive means leaving no room for reflexivity and agency.

Agency can be referred to the rejection of one’s destiny and a classical liberal stance views the ‘liberal subject’ as one with a consistent and coherent identity with possibilities for agency as opposed to the ‘welfare subject’, which lacks agency due to a range of deficiencies (Frost and Hoggett, 2008). Similar to the liberal position, Kirchberg (2007) regards agency as the ability to change or alter social surroundings. However, agency does not only refer to actively intervening as deliberately abstaining from certain interventions can also be regarded as evidence of agency (Lieblich et al., 2008). In this context, the rational ‘I’ acts and influences social processes, whereas poststructuralist thinkers focus on many ‘selves’ constructed in different situations (Wearing and Wearing, 2001). Adorno and Giddens accommodate “individual agency through the conceptualisation of a dialectic between societal structure and human agency” (Aitchison, 2005, p.214).
In order to understand the connection between individuals and culture, Hammack (2008) focuses on three assumptions related to identity development. First, the self is linked to ongoing social processes on the basis of power relations. Second, understanding these processes requires an examination of the link between ‘master’ narratives and personal narratives. Third, in case of identity threat, a strong relationship between ‘master’ and personal narrative is apparent to prevent the loss of the legitimacy of identities. Hence, understanding the development of identities requires cognitive, social and cultural levels of analysis, as this permits the recognition of the role of the larger social and cultural system. However, it also allows for personal transformation through agency as individuals challenge ‘master’ narratives to make sense of their cultural environment (Hammack, 2008). In a similar vein and specific to tourism, Wearing and Wearing (2001) argue for a dynamic, emotional and subjective ‘I’ that contains individual agency, while still acknowledging the influence of powerful discourses and reference groups.

To challenge social realities, a variety of studies focus on ‘identity politics’, emphasising the ways in which social policies and structures create categories of social identities that determine the inclusion or exclusion of certain groups from social citizenship rights and/or the participation in mainstream activities (Hammack, 2008, Taylor, 1998). However, more attention has to be paid to individual subjectivity in order to move away from the focus on social categorisations (Hammack, 2008). A good example is McCabe and Stokoe’s (2004) study on talk as identity work. Central to this study is that visitors to the Peak National Park resisted membership categories with the aim to highlight other types of self-categorisation.

3.2.1 Identity and Disability

By comparing the general discussion on identity with the literature informing the disability debate, it is recognisable that the social model emphasises ‘identity politics’ based on a collective identity, which leaves out any intra-group heterogeneity. As such, everyone is subsumed under one identity within one uniform model. In fact, already the medical model initiated the development of group identities through the segregation of people with similar impairments, as shown in the historical review. Hence, there is a need to question if people with a disability accept or reject the collective disability identity (Shelton and Tucker, 2005).
Critically questioning if a shared identity exists, Watson (2002) found that impairment and difference is not relevant for disabled people. Instead, individuals with a disability define themselves by highlighting what they can do or alternatively by challenging the notion of normality. This leads to the assumption that the social model is rejected by many disabled people (Watson, 2002). It can further be argued that the aim of disabilities studies is to destabilize any concept of self-identity, which leaves no agency to disabled people (Watson, 2002). However, as previously stated, the development of peoples' own identity is an important issue within the disability debate (Shakespeare, 1993). Consequently, it is argued that the variety of disabled identities needs to be taken into account instead of focusing on one collective identity (Reeve, 2002, Sherry, 2004).

By examining the concept of identity in relation to new social movements and its implications for social policy, Taylor (1998) suggests that a clarification of the terms identity and difference is needed as well as an understanding of the relationship between categorical identity and ontological identity. Categorical identity refers to social categories, in which individuals share common experiences of difference. In contrast, ontological identity is not related to difference but to unity and a coherent sense of self (Taylor, 1998). Both aspects of identity are interrelated and exist within power relations that seek to ascribe certain characteristics to the entire disabled population. Hence, Taylor (1998) calls for a deeper understanding of discourses of power in order to oppose welfare discourses that attempt to "totalise identity categories" (p.349). As identity constructs, central to this thesis, seem to be related to power relations, a discussion on different interpretations of power is introduced next, followed by Foucault's ideas.

3.3 Reflecting on Power/ Knowledge Constructs

Power and knowledge constructs are neglected in many disciplines. Studies in social psychology studies focus only on objective group differences, similar to categorical identity (Taylor, 1998), in which identity is equated with difference. However, power relations and inequalities associated with these differences are ignored, which hinders the generation of knowledge (Hollander and Howard, 2000). Especially in tourism, power and knowledge are often stated as evaded issues (Cheong and Miller, 2000, Tribe, 2008, Hollinshead, 1999).
A possible explanation for this negligence is that defining power is immensely problematic and different meanings have been adopted. Studies focus on conflictual and consensual power (Coles and Church, 2007) and often, power has been conceptually combined with domination, offering explanations related 'power over' and 'power to'. However, current studies start to move away from political and economic concepts of power to investigations of social and cultural power relations based on Foucauldian thinking (Hannam, 2002, Davis, 2001b). For example, Cheong and Miller (2000) illustrate the omnipresence of power in tourism through multiple networks of relations. Tribe (2008), calling for more critical approaches in tourism, argues that Foucauldian notions of power and discourse assist in challenging the dominant management and governance discourses. These examples, together with claims by Hannam (2002) and Coles and Church (2007), indicate that tourism research slowly engages in analysing social relations of power to enhance the understanding of tourism experiences.

In general, Foucault has worked on re-conceptualising power relations (Mills, 2003). His view denotes a significant change compared to previous thinking as it challenges radical and liberal conceptions of power (Coles and Church, 2007). It represents the most influential thoughts of the century (Hollinshead, 1999, Cheong and Miller, 2000). A Foucauldian notion of power rejects the generalised assumption of one group exerting power over another. Power is not simply an institution or a structure, but instead derives from multiple points of origins at the local level and operates everywhere (Coles and Church, 2007). It is intrinsically bound to the everyday life and to be found within multiple relations of the social nexus (Foucault, 1982). This makes power a highly relational phenomenon, which is always related to knowledge (Coles and Church, 2007).

The power/ knowledge dyad can be explained by Foucauldian notions of archaeology and genealogy. In archaeology, Foucault investigates systems of knowledge, distinguishing between formal bodies of learning, such as disciplines ('connaissance') and implicit knowledge ('savoir'). Implicit knowledge incorporates philosophical ideas, rules of jurisprudence, norms, political ideas but also institutions and statements of the everyday life (Schurich and McKenzie, 2005). It is particularly 'savoir', the broad discursive conditions, that is necessary for developing 'connaissance' (Schurich and McKenzie, 2005, Best, 1994).
Hence, archaeological studies investigate processes and conditions by which something becomes established as a fact (Mills, 2003). The rules for this formation, triggered through changes in concepts, practices and procedures, in short, changes to the 'savoir', function beneath the level subjective awareness (Best, 1994). Guided by anti-humanism and a critique of the modernist conception of reason, Foucault denies that the knowledge deriving from 'savoir' is guided by a human subject, posing a challenge to the meta-narrative of formal knowledge, coherence and human rationality endorsed by modernity (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005).

Common to a variety of accounts on discourse is the agreement that meanings in discourse are never fixed or exist in singular appearance (Bishop, 2005, Burkitt, 2008). Also Foucault has defined the notion of discourse in a variety of different ways throughout his work (Mills, 2003). In 'The Archaeology of Knowledge' he refers to discourse as the "general domain of all statements", which have meaning and effect (Mills, 2003, p.53). From his point of view, two perspectives play together. The first one relates to a group of statements, such as the discourse of madness, which entails or possesses a specific meaning. The second perspective does not refer to the meaning per se but to the effect of this particular meaning. It is particularly the second explanation that links archaeology to genealogy.

In contrast to archaeology, genealogy embraces investigations into power relations (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005) and widens the scope of analysis as non-discursive domains such as institutions, political events, economic practices and processes are added to examinations of discursive formations, while denying the coherency of discourse, or groups of statements. Important are processes of exclusion, through which certain discourses and knowledge systems are produced while others are getting suppressed (Mills, 2003). It is the power-filled tactics of non-discursive elements that demonstrate how local discursivities come into play, which in turn builds the basis for the formation of 'connaissance' (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005, Best, 1994). For example, Foucault argues that the psychiatric discipline was formed based on discursive knowledge deriving from a network of non-discursive elements such as hospitalization, internment, the conditions and procedures of social exclusion, the rules of jurisprudence and norms (Foucault, 1974).
Similar to archaeology, Foucault's genealogy focuses on micro-level structures. He argues that reason at the macro-level is often not logical and rational but complex, contradictory and problematic (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005). Rabinow (1984) argues that Foucault opposes the effects of centralising power structures that are linked to economic imperatives and/or the juridical model, with the latter referring to the assumption that power is possessed by an external authority (Tremain, 2005). In contrast to economic or juridical models, Foucault argues that power relations operate in a much wider field and are interwoven with all kinds of relations, as for example family or sexuality (Dickens and Fontana, 1994, Escobar, 1984). They never exist in an isolated sense and encompass a multitude of processes that multiply across the social arena (Hollinshead, 1999).

Related to this complexity, Foucault proposes the concept of bio-power, referring to disqualified discourses as a result of normalisation procedures and disciplinary forces that administer the collective human body (Rabinow, 1984). Foucault contends that particularly the tendency to supervise the population through demographic studies and sexual categorisations contributed to the aim of normalisation strategies of power (Best, 1994). Hence, disciplinary power classifies individuals and through this documentation, individuals are placed under continuous surveillance, turning them into objects of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1991). As a result, the production of knowledge triggers claims for power (Mills, 2003). Illustrating this dualism, marginalised individuals often become objects of research, which explains why there is a great amount of studies on feminism or homosexuality rather than on masculinity or heterosexuality. In a very complex process, this production of knowledge about disadvantaged people plays a crucial role in maintaining them in this position (Mills, 2003). Constituted by privileged discourses about objects (Dickens and Fontana, 1994), these processes are regarded as regulatory mechanisms to prescribe norms and turn individuals into targets for control (Tremain, 2005).

Despite the fact that Foucault's studies are considered as highly influential, they do not remain uncontested (Coles and Church, 2007). Critics of Foucault claim that his thoughts pay insufficient attention to distinguish between different forms of knowledge/power (Dickens and Fontana, 1994). For example, different groups of women may have different perspectives of what 'women' are (Mills, 2003). In addition, among the most cited critiques is the death of 'Man' as Foucault denies any possibility for human autonomy and responsibility (Coles and
Church, 2007), which leads to systematically eliminating agency (Best, 1994). Instead, Foucault uses the word ‘subject’ to express that individuals are subjects to control and dependence as well as subjects tied to their identity (Foucault, 1982). Both meanings entail a notion of power that subjugates and makes subject to (Tremain, 2005). However, Foucault stresses that power is not entirely repressive but also contains productive or positive effects (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005, Cheong and Miller, 2000).

In relation to this, Best (1994) argues that in Foucault’s later work, his ideas about the subject changes as in the ‘practices of the self’, he examines the modes by which individuals are given to recognise themselves as subjects (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005), which might allow breaking out from disciplinary systems (Best, 1994). At this juncture, Foucault tries to understand how identities are formed in negotiation with dominant discourses through the development of counter-discourses (Mills, 2003), which allow individuals to negotiate the meanings given to their practices (Uriely, 2005). The process of producing knowledge can alter the status quo of the marginalised (Mills, 2003) in that it acts as a strategy of resistance (Dickens and Fontana, 1994).

Despite Foucault’s move to incorporate the ‘self’, a variety of feminists have rejected Foucault because of the denial of any agency of the subject (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005). Proponents of the agency approach claim that every individual can and will apply their own meanings to a place or situation and act in it. In contrast, opponents like Giddens, deny the freedom of agency and argue that dominant actors are always in place to constrain other individuals according to their hegemonic representations. Hence, power is said to be always inherent in wider social structures that constrain the behaviour of individuals and their acts of agency (Davis, 2001b). Other authors claim that the agency-structure polarity should be dismantled entirely and instead, both concepts should be regarded as complementary (Kirchberg, 2007). Although Foucault rejected the concept of freedom of agency, he never became a proponent of the structuralist approach as he concentrated on local, micro-levels in contrast to Giddens, focusing on macro structures to explain power systems (Hollander and Howard, 2000). Therefore, Foucault often gets disapproved for making only passing references to large social structures and society-wide hierarchies (Antonio, 1991). Lastly, Foucault has been criticised for failing to outline conclusive responses to contemporary questions (Hollinshead, 1999, Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005).
However, one has to take into account that a Foucauldian notion of localised resistances is probably never able to confront the totality of power (Escobar, 1984).

Specific to tourism, Church and Coles (2007) argue that the highly contested and nuanced approaches to power and knowledge are often not understood. These limitations can be found in tourism writings applying a Foucauldian lens. For example, Cheong and Miller (2000) view tourists predominantly as targets. Furthermore, there seems to be an over-emphasis on agents, such as travel agencies that constrain behaviour and thoughts of tourists, ignoring that power exists in a large and complex network of relations. Moreover, the linkage between power and knowledge remains largely unexplored and references to discourse formations are restricted to a general and opaque ‘tourism discourse’, which ignores the plurality of discourses in tourism.

In order to overcome these flawed accounts, research into power relations needs to move beyond elementary conceptual simplifications and understand that the relationship between discourses of tourism and power is a highly fluid and reflexive one (Coles and Church, 2007). If conceptualisations of power are to be moved to the centre of tourism research, critical perspectives on the nature of tourism as a social phenomenon have to be developed (Franklin and Crang, 2001). As power and knowledge aspects assist in analysing taken-for-granted conformities (Hollinshead, 1994), scholars need to comprehend why some discourses and tourism representations become privileged, while others are suppressed (Hollinshead, 1999). By looking at the governance of tourism and the current political environment, Tribe (2008) stresses that tourism has difficulties in admitting conditions of crises as its underlying ideology builds on the freedom to travel and enjoyment. As a result, tourism avoids the critical core of crises and focuses instead on technical measures, such as the increase in security measures.

### 3.3.1 Power/Knowledge and Disability

Using Tribe’s (2008) account as an analogy to the social exclusion of disabled people, one could argue that tourism focuses on the removal of external barriers. While this procedure is not without value, it can be equally referred to as overly technical, as the critical core of disability and social exclusion remains unexplored. Applying a Foucauldian notion of bio-power, social exclusion might stand for a disqualified discourse as a result of normalisation processes. In tourism, the norm represents going on holiday and experiencing enjoyment rather than exclusion.
This normalisation strategy is upheld by positivist knowledge through statistics, showing how many people travel, where to and how long. With the support of this statistical surveillance, the allegation is sustained that tourism is the world’s biggest industry instead of critically examining the discursive foundation and processes of social exclusion.

For Foucault, processes of exclusion are related to discourse formations and he tried to explain why certain discourses are more accepted than others based on a complex web of power relations (Mills, 2003). In his book ‘Madness and Civilisation’, Foucault investigated the construction of madness and mental illness, processes which sustain these categories and possibilities for the emergence of new knowledge. One could argue that similar to madness, ways of knowing ‘disability’ moved from explanations based on religion to medical rationalisations, resulting in the medical model of disability. Within the medical discourse, disability was placed in the hands of ‘experts’ to propel normalisation procedures.

Through the proliferation of discourses on impairment, the category of disability emerged as new knowledge. Thus, the medical model was challenged through strategies of resistance, which led to the creation of the social model (Reeve, 2002). In a tentative way, it is suggested that the social model arose out of counter-discourses with the aim to improve the situation of disabled people as a whole. However, in offering a counter-discourse, the social model assigns one aggregated identity category to all individuals. By referring to the power/ knowledge dyad, Tremain (2005) explains this phenomenon by stating that:

“in many cases, the people who are classified as members of a kind come to have knowledge of the relevant kind, which changes their self-perceptions and behaviour, motivates them to forge group identities, and often forces changes to the classifications and knowledge about them” (p.7).

With regard to the quote above, people with impairments are grouped into one category because they meet certain criteria of this identity category, which was formed by contemporary political and social arrangements. Paradoxically, the same political arrangements were thought to be contested by the social model in the first place (Tremain, 2005). As a result, the interests of those benefiting from the new discourse might potentially only serve a few individuals or institutions. Diedrich (2005) argues that these explanations can help disabilities studies to understand that
subjects are not autonomous actors in their everyday day, but are instead embedded in a complex network of social relations. In order to move towards productive aspects of power, Tremain (2005) argues that the juridical conceptions of disability, inherent in the social model, needs to be overcome. Power can hold transformative potential by recognising that individuals can occupy a number of identity positions and can resist normalisation processes and identity categories (Sullivan, 2005).

In an attempt to overcome deficiencies of the social model, three frameworks that assimilate the complexities of identity and power/knowledge are investigated next. These perspectives have already been applied in a tourism context and build mainly, but not exclusively, on the work of Foucault. Specific to disability, Foucauldian ideas have become an important resource (Hughes, 2005) and researchers who challenge the social model of disability have incorporated the thinking of Foucault (Price, 2007). However, identifying a framework dealing comprehensively with power mechanisms that shape identity constructs, such as disability, does not only help in providing solutions to overcome the limitations of the social model, but also serves as a potential basis to re-conceptualise social exclusion in relation to disability.

3.4 Incorporating Identity and Power/knowledge: The Gaze

The British sociologist John Urry was probably the first among tourism scholars to elaborate explicitly on the Foucauldian notion of power in the gaze (Hannam, 2002, Ryan, 2002). Urry (2002) argues that part of the tourism experience is to gaze at different landscapes and scenes. The power inherent in the tourist gaze can be applied to several aspects from looking at attractions to manipulating tourism experiences and representations. Gazes exist in a multiplicity of forms, to be distinguished by different societies, social groups and/or historical periods (Urry, 2002).

Coles and Church (2007) point out that ‘The Tourist Gaze’ triggered more detailed explorations related to power in tourism. It highlights key issues of societal processes, such as discipline and surveillance (Hannam, 2002). The gaze of surveillance is to look upon a world consisting of an array of different symbols, chaos and uncertainty (Ryan, 2002). It is particularly the emphasis that Urry placed on vision for conceptualising tourism that separated the viewing subjects from signifying objects. Positive aspects deriving from this distinction is an intensified focus on
tourists as subjects (MacCannell, 2001) and the social construction of signifying objects (Franklin and Crang, 2001). Another important contribution by Urry is the gaze on the ‘other’ (Hannam, 2002). For example, it was found that tourists who visit Amsterdam do not glance at historical sites but instead look at other tourists (Nijman, 1999).

Despite these contributions, the gaze also became subject to critique. Among the critics is Leiper (1992), who argues that Urry’s Foucauldian analogy is confusing and unsatisfying as it does not adequately scrutinize the ways how ‘gazing’ is used to gain real knowledge and fails to explain why travelling for pleasure signified a change in societal practices (Leiper, 1992). While Hollinshead (1994) acknowledges that Urry’s account would have benefited from more detailed comments on Foucault’s ‘eye of power’, Scheurich and McKenzie (2005) claim that Foucault’s explanations on panopticism are in general “more simplistic, more totalized, and more poorly developed concepts” (p.856). Nonetheless, Urry provides a true Foucauldian account as the link between discourses held within disciplines and power aspects, that allow or constrain behaviour within different contexts, is investigated (Hollinshead, 1994). For example, Urry (2002) outlines that philosophical ideas, such as flexibility became a dominant discourse which led to the development of holidays abroad (Urry, 2002). The identification of these discourses help to understand how tourism normalises certain behavioural types while it defines others as deviant (Hollinshead, 1994, Hollinshead, 1999).

Other authors have criticised Urry’s account for the static nature of the gaze based on the assumption of ‘travelling to’ and ‘returning home’ (Franklin, 2004, MacCannell, 2001, Franklin and Crang, 2001). Particular this binary division between the ordinary and the extraordinary leads to determinism in Urry’s explorations (MacCannell, 2001). Veijola and Jokinen (1994) critically ask if individuals do not also gaze at performances at home. Supporting Urry’s account, Hollinshead (1999) emphasises that the interconnectedness of tourism and the everyday life is explained so that tourism even loses its distinctive features with the overall aim of discovering the larger context of power in contemporary society. However, a strong over-emphasis of tourism sites and objects for the gaze is noticeable, dismissing a more detailed analysis of the broader social and cultural processes (Franklin, 2004).
An additional point of criticism relates to the reliance upon and prioritisation of visualism (Franklin, 2004, MacCannell, 2001, Perkins and Thorns, 2001, Veijola and Jokinen, 1994). The centrality of the vision appeared during the modern era (Franklin and Crang, 2001). As a response to the dominant visual, Veijola and Jokinen (1994) ask provocatively if places are not created for meanings, experiences and knowledge by, in and for the body. In order to overcome the visual domination, MacCannell (2001) proposes a second gaze as something always remains invisible. In this second gaze, the viewing subject has the responsibility to reflect on the first gaze to reveal the constructed nature of objects and to question its representation, calling for greater agency of tourists. This can be compared with Foucault’s third axing ‘the practices of the self’ and the need to investigate possibilities of resistance.

In essence, without undermining the importance of the visual, tourism has to move beyond the visual repertoires of consumption (Franklin and Crang, 2001) and embrace a multi-sensory perspective (MacCannell, 2001). With the notion of ‘doing something’ during holidays, the body becomes the object of tourism experiences (Franklin and Crang, 2001, Perkins and Thorns, 2001). Before moving on to embodiment, the gaze related to disability is discussed, with the aim of re-emphasising current limitations of the gaze framework.

3.4.1 The Gaze and Disability

Within the disability debate, only a few studies draw on the Foucauldian notion of the gaze. References are made to the ‘clinical gaze’, in which disabled people are subject to medical surveillance that marks them as deviant (Reeve, 2002, Allan, 1996). In this context, the notion of bio-power is utilised as prenatal scanning techniques, indicating that the foetus has an impairment, often leads to abortion. Thus, normative judgments are in place, which assign values to what type of life is worth existing (Reeve, 2002). The constant monitoring of people with learning difficulties or children with special educational needs acts as additional example how people become subject to professional control (McIntosh, 2002, Allan, 1996).

Apart from the medical sphere, the gaze also exists in the everyday life as able-bodied individuals ‘gaze’ at people with impairments. Influenced by existing stereotypes and prejudices, they form knowledge about disabled people, consequently exposing power over other people’s bodies. This varies according to the type of impairment, with greater visibility leading to a
greater probability of becoming subject to the gaze (Reeve, 2002). Although no specific studies deal with the gaze and disability in tourism, it is anticipated that disabled people confront the gaze at home and while being away.

An additional example accentuating how the body of disabled individuals becomes subject to control relates to the Foucauldian concept of self-surveillance based on Bentham’s idea of the panopticon. Using the example of prisoners, the major effect of the panopticon is:

“to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power” (Foucault, 1991, p.201).

For disabled people, the permanent visibility that imposes ‘self-control’ can either lead to attempts to modify certain behaviour in order to comply with the norm and to achieve acceptability or alternatively resist normalisation practices (Reeve, 2002). However, it would seem that the former does not represent an option for individuals with more obvious disabilities. Also, people with learning difficulties continue to be subjects of objectification through surveillance which creates a normalising gaze (McIntosh, 2002). With regard to resistance, Reeve (2002) argues that evidence of this can be found in magazines such as ‘Dazed and Confused’ (Figure 4), where a disabled individual gazes back at the audience.

Figure 4: Disability Representation in ‘Dazed and Confused’

Source: Dazed and Confused (1998)
Another example of resistance is provided by Ben-Moshe and Powell (2007). By critically examining the International Symbol of Access (ISA) (Figure 5) (Disability Access Symbols, 2008), which is often regarded as a representation of disability, it is argued that the symbol creates fixed boundaries between disabled and non-disabled. This in turn leads to a reinforcement of ‘normality’ and stigmatization. Referring to Foucault, it can be interpreted as a form of disciplinary control through the creation of the ‘ab/normality’ dualism (Ben-Moche and Powell, 2007).

**Figure 5: The International Symbol of Access (ISA)**

In order to challenge the ISA and the associated negative identity focusing on abnormality, oppression and discrimination, disability activists have created their own symbols that highlight experiences of pride and resistance (Figure 6) (American Disabled for Attendant Programs Today (ADAPT), 2008, Not Dead Yet, 2008). These modifications change the meaning of accessibility and disability (Ben-Moche and Powell, 2007). They may also represent a different gaze, where the disabled community gazes back at able-bodied citizens.

**Figure 6: Modifications of the ISA Showing Resistance**

Investigating the gaze related to disability has shown that the continuous gaze on people with obvious impairments, might affect individuals at home and away. As such, disabled people become subject to objectification, providing objects for the gaze of others. Also, while possibilities of resistance include gazing back, it is anticipated that this does not apply to all individuals. Visually-restricted people are neglected by the gaze’s power of resistance, hence they only represent objects for the gaze. This calls for a more comprehensive framework to overcome apparent limitations, such as the prioritisation of the visual, the lack of possibilities for resistance and the overemphasis of objects.

3.5 Incorporating Identity and Power/ Knowledge: Embodiment

At its core, the embodiment perspective relies on a multi-sensory approach, incorporating being, doing, touching and gazing (Frank, 1990). The interest in the body relates back to identity and provokes the question if the body is actually ‘ours’. Philosophical thinkers have long been debating the role of the body as either central to a person’s identity, representing the essence of what individuals are, or alternatively as a tool to be used, with the mind dominating an individual’s existence (Herring and Chau, 2007). Particularly Decartes’ statement ‘Cogito, ergo sum’ (‘I think, therefore I am’) emphasises that human existence relies on the mind. Conversely, the embodiment perspective breaks with the Cartesian tradition by arguing that the mind does not see everything (Veijola and Jokinen, 1994). Therefore, the mind should not be enhanced at the expense of the body (Wang, 1999, Veijola and Jokinen, 1994).

The embodiment approach demands a critical analysis of aspects of citizenship, identity and power (Crouch and Desforges, 2003). Power derives from a multiplicity of force relations operating in institutions, economic production systems and families, which all cut across the social body. Hence, the embodiment perspective stresses the importance of the body as a key source of power relations and social differences linked to age, class, disability, gender, race and sexuality (Coles and Church, 2007).

Foucault strongly placed his analyses on the body, which he regarded as central for understanding the production of discursive pressures (Mills, 2003, Best, 1994). He was interested in the means by which experiences of individuals are regulated by pre-formulated limits and
collective power/ knowledge forces (Hollinshead, 1999). Thus, the body becomes a battlefield, where the control and manipulation of it enables claims for power:

"the body is also directly involved in a political field; power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs" (Foucault, 1991, p.25).

The political investment is explained by arguing that the body only becomes of economic use when it is both, a productive body and subjected body, with the latter representing a form of power controlling the body (Foucault, 1991). However, instead of viewing power in a purely negative sense, Foucault argues that it can also be positive and productive (Foucault, 1991). Taking an extreme corporal notion of the body, Frank (1990) emphasises that the discourse of fitness has contributed to preventing overweight. Also specific to tourism, an embodied pursuit offers potential sites of resistance (Veijola and Jokinen, 1994, Hannam, 2002, Johnston, 2001). Resistances come into play through the formulation of counter-discourses by which individuals take on board their assigned stigmatised individualities and use it to form elements of their own individuality (Mills, 2003). An often cited example is the use of the word ‘queer’ by homosexual individuals to describe anti-essentialist lesbian and gay theories (Mills, 2003).

Apart from recognising the body as a site for the production of counter-discourses, power relations are to be found everywhere (Foucault, 1991). This emphasis on the multi-presence of power questions the dualism between ‘home’ and ‘away’. Whereas previously, it was assumed that tourism relies on two separate poles (Urry, 2002), recent tourism literature challenges this polarity and argues that the boundaries between everyday life and tourism are becoming less distinct (Rosh White and White, 2007, Franklin and Crang, 2001, Franklin, 2004, Stylianou-Lambert, 2011). In addition to dismantling the binary division of ‘home’ and ‘away’, an embodiment approach also questions the distinction between academia and popular culture (Frank, 1990). In the quest for scientific objectivity, researchers were attributed a universal status without a body (Johnston, 2001). However, by applying an embodiment perspective, the analyst becomes integrated into the ‘corpus’ of research (Veijola and Jokinen, 1994).

These arguments highlight that an embodiment perspective assists in overcoming a variety of dichotomies: the body/ mind dichotomy which enhances the status of the body with the mind no
longer being the dominating factor, the binary division between home/away, encouraging a view that tourism experiences are embedded in a wider social context and finally, the objectivism/relativist dichotomy, offering a context for shared bodily experiences by incorporating corporal aspects of the researcher. Despite these advancements, the embodiment approach has been less successful when dealing with other dualisms.

Major disagreements exist whether the body represents a subject in its own right (Wang, 1999) or the primary object of social inscription (Johnson, 1989 cited in Johnston, 2001). This dichotomy has a paralysing effect as it either sees the body as entirely restricted by social norms and regulations or completely free from them (Obrador Pons, 2003). While some authors argue that subjects ‘emerge’ through interaction of power relations played out on bodies (Gorringe and Rafanell, 2007), others hold the opinion that bodies are simultaneously connected to both, a subject and an object (Obrador Pons, 2003).

Furthermore, until now, the embodiment perspective has found no clear route to deal with the self/‘other’ dichotomy. The ‘other’ appeared as a research subject with a focus on identifying the ‘self’ and the ‘other’ (Hollinshead, 2002), in which the ‘self’ is usually regarded as the subject and the ‘other’ as object (Wearing and Wearing, 2001). Revealing discourses through tourist experiences sheds light onto perceptions and attitudes towards the ‘other’ (Noy, 2004). Also, according to Johnston (2001), research concentrating on the ‘other’, like homosexual, disabled and black individuals, represents a good starting point for re-theorising. However, although these studies have provided valuable insights into discourse formation and question who is allowed to speak for whom, the dichotomy of the ‘other’ and the ‘same’ still remains a difficult issue. Veijola and Jokinen (1994) exemplify this problem by stating that by solely focusing on differences, researchers pay inadequate attention to the structure of these differences and to who has defined difference in the first place, hence reinforcing the subordination of the ‘other’. Therefore, the ‘other’ might remain in a negatively defined position (Johnston, 2001).

Dualistic thinking always represented a part of Western philosophy, with elements opposing each other (Johnston, 2001) and a variety of models have been developed to illustrate dualisms. Ravaud and Striker’s differentiation model (2001) emphasises that differences are recognised by at least one distinctive feature, which can be the distinction between male/female or able/
disabled individuals. Once this differentiation is established in society, persons grouped by a specific feature are not considered as equal (Ravaud and Striker, 2001). Hollander and Howard (2002) explain the tendency of these dualistic taxonomies by outlining that society tends to focus on differences that are, in many cases, visible and that provide the basis for cognitive categorisations. However, particularly these categorisations ignore the contextual embeddedness of experiences and disregards specific situational circumstances under which power processes take place (Hollander and Howard, 2000). In a similar argument, McCabe (2005) stresses that investigation into tourist experiences has neglected the role of discursive functions related to specific contextual circumstances (McCabe, 2005).

In sum, limitations of the embodiment perspective include the difficulties to deal with object/subject and self/other dichotomies. While the former relates to the construction of identities, the latter calls for a stronger emphasis to be placed on contextual analyses. While Coles and Church (2007) call for more nuanced investigations into the ‘embodied’ power of the tourist, the examples above highlight the need to pay closer attention to the context in order to contest hierarchical dualisms. A contextual analysis offers insights into different dimensions how people in different situations and with different characteristics develop distinctive knowledges (Crouch, 2000). Hence, embodiment perspectives need to engage in greater detail in contextual, situational, spatial and temporal aspects. By highlighting the potential of this option, Johnston (2001) affirms a great amount of research still to be conducted in this area. Before introducing the performativity perspective, the embodiment debate is discussed with reference to disability.

### 3.5.1 Embodiment and Disability

Related to disability, two major claims have been raised which support the incorporation of the body as its conceptual terrain, which can assist in expanding the social model (Hughes and Paterson, 1997). First, the body is connected with the process of identity construction (Hughes and Paterson, 1997). Given that in the social model, ‘disability’ is referred to as only oppression, it does not leave room for feelings, such as pride, which is an embodied experience (Dowse, 2001). With regard to the ISA, authors have criticised the static bodily nature of the symbol (Ben-Moche and Powell, 2007). Expanding on this argument, the representation of an active body (Figure 7) could lead to encompassing pride.
However, the process of positive identification is difficult and complex for many disabled people because it means acknowledging a range of identity choices among gender, sexuality and ethnic background. Hence, Dowse (2001) emphasises that self-advocacy represents a more flexible approach to develop a positive identity, allowing for multiple realities and identities. Self-organisation and direct action challenges stereotypes of powerlessness and objectification, which is important for the development of identities (Shakespeare, 1993). Though some authors have proposed a number of disability identity types and stress that individuals move along and within these categories (Darling, 2003, Moser, 2005), other authors deny the establishment of categories of identities in general (Davis, 2001a). Questioning the 'belonging' to any identity group, Davis (2001a) stresses the concepts of subject, character and personality linked to subjectivities, the human body as well as the social body.

The argument above leads to the second reason for incorporating the body, emphasising the need to account for the full range of complexities of disability. This complexity is captured by focusing on the impaired body as lived and experienced by disabled people and analysing these lived experiences within a framework of structural conditions that impact on individuals (Kelly, 2005). Turner (2001) calls the engagement of these two elements a “rapprochement between Foucault’s poststructuralism and Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology” (p.255).

By taking a phenomenological approach to disability, authors try to overcome the dichotomy of disability and impairment (Hughes and Paterson, 1997, Turner, 2001). They argue that the body, whether impaired or not, is an experiencing agent. However, by talking about actual, lived experiences, these experiences become social because they enter the world of discourse formation and inter-subjectivity. In this case, the body becomes a source and subject of
knowledge (Hughes and Paterson, 1997). Given these explanations, disability and impairment are not to be regarded as two opposite ends, but instead form one expression: disability/impairment.

The rejection of the meta-narrative of the social model is regarded as a major problem for disability activists and received sharp critique (Thomas, 2004, Branfield, 1999). Branfield (1999) argues that this rejection is nothing else than a contribution to academic discourses which prevents political change. Given that phenomenology is often characterised as apolitical and individualistic (Hughes and Paterson, 1997), opponents stress that it is important that the social model remains a political rather than academic approach (O'Grady et al., 2004). The rejection to include the body into the analysis of disability might derive from a fear that society will move back to the medical model and its bodily pathology. However, proponents of a phenomenological approach argue that particularly the distinction between impairment and disability, made by the social model, underlines impairment as part of the biomedical model (Hughes and Paterson, 1997).

Dowse (2001) offers a different angle to this discussion as even by incorporating a sociology of impairment, people with learning disabilities would still be marginalised. Their impairment does not belong to the medical construct but instead to an educational discourse. As the body itself is not impaired, the voices of people with learning difficulties remain rather invisible in the bodily language of impairment (Dowse, 2001). As outlined earlier, a major achievement of the embodiment approach is the rejection of the dominance of the mind over the body. However, the previous example shows that privileging the body over the mind leaves out people with learning difficulties, suggesting that both should achieve equal status. This coincides with Turner's argument (2001), stating that embodiment embraces body and mind and connects it to the world.

Hughes and Paterson (1997) regard the body as both, an experience and a discursive construction. While a phenomenological approach regards the body as a subject, revealing a multiplicity of experiences, a poststructural approach, building on Foucault, investigates the categories of these experiences. These categories are bound to the particular cultural, historical and political parameters and milieus (Diedrich, 2005, Shildrick, 2005) and their enabling and disabling consequences (Freund, 2001). In contrast to a phenomenological approach, a
Foucauldian approach stresses that the body is an object of knowledge. It is an object of institutionalised discourses of control and containment (Shildrick, 2005). As an anti-humanist, Foucault de-centres the individual as the prime subject (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005) in favour of an analysis of discursive ordering of bodily regimes (Turner, 2001). In relation to this, Foucault focuses on the socio-political context and not the subjective body itself.

Evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of both approaches, phenomenology is said to contribute to the understanding of individual, subjective experiences. Experiences, as the origin of knowledge, lead to the recognition of different identities. However, phenomenology neglects that bodily experiences are embedded in wider social realm (Diedrich, 2005) and political power structures in particular (Kirchberg, 2007). Discursive regimes are in place, allowing certain experiences to emerge while others are denied (Diedrich, 2005). In contrast, poststructuralism denies the idea of embodied agency and hence, rejects social transformation, making it difficult to propose ways to improve the life of disabled people (Hughes, 2005). Furthermore, poststructuralism does not only disregard the subject, but also neglects processes of identity formation (Corker, 1999). However, a poststructuralist approach assists in revealing the constructed nature of experience. Hence, in a tentative way, it is suggested that poststructuralism needs to be combined with phenomenology (Hughes and Paterson, 1997) as the latter acts as corrective to Foucault's approach (Hughes, 2005), providing an adequate phenomenology of the body (Turner, 2001). This combination allows to turn social constructs into personal ones and personal issues are made social (Frost and Hoggett, 2008).

The often cited claim of making private troubles into public issues (Dowse, 2001, Shakespeare, 1993, Tregaskis, 2002) can represent the link between phenomenological and poststructuralism. In the development of individualisation, disabled people are affirming the importance of their own identity within a wider social context (Shakespeare, 1993). While some argue that a 'disabling culture' has led to the social exclusion of disabled people (O'Grady et al., 2004), it is important to recognise different experiences. A phenomenological perspective of the body, as the basis of lived experience, could contribute to a better understanding of multiple forms of oppression and exclusion. The analysis of these within a framework of power relations could potentially serve as a more powerful political tool for disability activists.
While a combination of poststructuralism and phenomenology offers the possibility to regard disabled people and their respective bodies as both, subject and object, helping to overcome the outlined limitation of the embodiment debate on how to deal with the subject/object dualism, concerns related to the compatibility of the two approaches should be raised. First, while phenomenology highlights that bodies are free from social norms, a poststructural view regards the body as foremost restricted by norms and regulations (Obrador Pons, 2003). Second, with regard to resistance strategies, a phenomenological account regards disabled people as subjective agents, which stands in contrast to a Foucauldian approach, which denies subjective agency. Diedrich (2005) argues that Foucault’s genealogy is a method to understand multiplicity in society, but fails to indicate ways to overcome negative oppressing effects. Also Scheurich and McKenzie (2005) claim that no alternatives or paths for resistance and emancipation are offered to reduce oppression, while Mills (2003) emphasises counter-discourses or counter-identifications as a strategy of resistance.

Hence, although some authors argue that both approaches should be used together, the issue surrounding identity is not comprehensively examined as a phenomenological approach would emphasise self-identity while a poststructural perspective would focus on categories of experiences within a socio-political context. In addition, limited account is given to strategies for resistance incorporating individual knowledge. Hence, more attention needs to be paid to different forms of knowledge/power within groups or identity categories (Dickens and Fontana, 1994). In this context, a performative approach might help to overcome existing shortcomings.

3.6 Incorporating Identity and Power/Knowledge: Performativity

A performative approach is not to be regarded as entirely distinct or separate from embodiment and gaze perspectives but offers an expansion to these frameworks. Viewing tourism as performance embraces embodied actions and individuals’ physical, intellectual and cognitive activities as well as gazing. Regardless of what tourists choose among these possibilities, they participate in a performance (Perkins and Thoms, 2001). Thus, it is claimed that investigations should incorporate the sensual, the embodied and performative dimensions of change in tourism (Swain, 2004). The performance approach also ties experiences into a stronger social, cultural and geographical context and forces tourism studies to deal more reflexively with the social arena of which it forms a part (Franklin and Crang, 2001). As such, its application raises new
questions about the theorisation of the socio-cultural formation and social construction of
tourism experiences (Jamal et al., 2003). While the use of performance has become a critical
focus of attention in recent years (Coleman and Crang, 2002, Edensor, 2000, Edensor, 2001), the
discussion is highly fragmented and lacks clarity (Jamal et al., 2003). In order to achieve
conceptual clarity, it is necessary to differentiate between performance and performativity.

All types of social encounters are comparable with theatrical performances and individuals, or
'homo performers' (Turner, 1974) play certain roles when they interact with their friends or
strangers (Goffman, 1959). Performances differ due to distinct influences such as age, ethnicity
and gender (Gray, 2003). Hence, in a metaphorical sense, performance provides an explanation
for all types of human engagement and activity (Alexander, 2005) and is used as a mechanism to
comprehend the world (Pollock, 1990). Performance is thus as an organising concept to explain
social phenomena (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998).

Whereas Goffman (1959) argues that persons are modifying their roles to show certain
impressions of themselves, stressing that performance is driven by a consciously performing
'self' (Gregson and Rose, 2000), others argue that power, control and conflict play a crucial role
for examining how individuals perform (Hochschild, 1983). Hence, individual roles can only be
investigated on the basis of wider social processes in which roles are embedded. External social
structures, for example mechanisms of social control, determine who has access to certain
resources and who is denied access (Weaver, 2005). Hence, in contrast to 'performance',
'performativity' takes into account social relations and power structures and explains what
certain performances do (Alexander, 2005).

By comparing performance and performativity, Crouch and Desforges (2003) emphasise that
performance is crucial to develop ideas and it is the notion of performativity that represents the
everyday practices of these ideas. Similarly, Gregson and Rose (2000) stress that performance
relates to what individuals say, whereas the notion of performativity refers to the reproduction of
discursive practices. Given the different but interrelated meanings attached to performance and
performativity, performance can be compared to Foucault's archaeology, identifying discursive
knowledge to describe how society makes sense of the world. In contrast, performativity
represents the everyday practices of this understanding and investigates what performances do
instead what they are. As such, performativity investigates power relations and systems of cultural, political and administrative exclusion, similar to Foucauldian thinking of genealogy. Foucault argues that power is something that is 'performed' (Mills, 2003), as it is exercised rather than possessed and is highly relational (Foucault, 1991). Hence, using a performative approach offers opportunities to deal extensively with the subject of power (Jamal et al., 2003) and knowledge as performativity is also referred to the practice by which discourse produces the effect it names (Sherry, 2004). Further, as Gregson and Rose (2000) assert, performance and performativity are conceptual tools that question taken-for-granted social practices.

As the whole social life can be considered as performative (Edensor, 2000), the sphere of tourism is not to be regarded differently. This assists in emphasising the changeability of human activity in many different tourism-related contexts (Crouch, 2004, Crouch and Desforges, 2003). For example, Edensor (2000; 2001) argues that while different performers share the same tourism places, their performances depend on three different aspects (Edensor, 2000). First, social performance is linked to the cultural context or origin of the tourist (Edensor, 2000). Tourists play different roles which are grounded in habitus and the dispositions that evolve around class, gender or ethnicity. These distinctive performances map out different individual and group identities (Edensor, 1998). Competing ideas about what particular sites symbolise may generate contrasting performances, give opportunities to challenge normative habits and reproduce the social world (Edensor, 2000; 2001). Tourists who deliberately refrain from what they regard as conventional represent an example of non-conformist performances which deviate from normative assumptions and contradict social and cultural conventions (Edensor, 2001), indicating that tourists have their own assumptions about what distinguishes them from 'others'.

Second, the ‘stage’ per se contains different types of social and spatial control that influence performances (Edensor, 2000). Social control instances vary according to different tourism stages (Crouch and Desforges, 2003). Edensor (1998) distinguishes between enclavic and heterogeneous stages. Enclavic tourist stages are generally more controlled and homogenous. They are primarily designed for gazing and underlie a strict system of ordering. In contrast, heterogeneous tourist stages are often multifunctional spaces with less social barriers through managers and guards. However, local forms of power relations are still present in these spaces, but are often not known to the tourist (Edensor, 1998). The focus on tourist stages provides a
conceptual framework for analysing spatial aspects in relation to power based on Foucauldian thinking. For Foucault “space is fundamental in any exercise of power” (Foucault cited in Soja, 1989, p.19). As space is constructed by social processes, investigations have to be undertaken, showing how interactions occur in spaces and shape experiences (Davis, 2001b).

Third, internal and external surveillance play a role (Edensor, 2000). Internally, specific roles are acquired by self-monitoring and learning processes to ensure an accepted level of competence in the performance. While internal surveillance includes self-regulation and negotiation (Crouch and Desforges, 2003), external surveillance is imposed by co-participants monitoring performances in terms of what is considered as ‘appropriate’ behaviour within dominant discourses (Edensor, 2000). Hence, the social practices of tourism are often subject to the disciplinary gaze of the group (Edensor, 1998), determining which practices are accepted and which behaviour is forbidden (Coles and Church, 2007).

These three dimensions suggest that immersion in or alienation from a particular performance depends on a certain set of conditions (Edensor, 2000). This knowledge is used to explain the (un)conscious regulation of tourism experiences related to levels exclusion or inclusion (Edensor, 2000, Edensor, 2001). Important here is the recognition that typologies of tourists can only represent a description of regular or dominant tourist roles. However, tourism represents a social process that is interactive and that cannot be placed in fixed social categories (Edensor, 2000). In line with Edensor, Coleman and Crang (2002) contend that tourism implies a series of performances, in which people and places are in process. In this case, tourists’ identities are not viewed as categories. Instead, performative studies look at identity formation as a process and acknowledge that multidimensional performances are in place (Coleman and Crang, 2002). This enables a better understanding of spatial and temporary changes and also allows for a more detailed conceptualisation of tourism experiences in contemporary society (Perkins and Thorns, 2001, Crouch and Desforges, 2003, Jamal et al., 2003).

The original impetus for regarding identity as performative was provided by Judith Butler. Using the example of gender, Butler argues that gender is a performance of actions, behaviours and gestures (Butler, 2007). Drawing on Foucauldian thought, the concept of discourse is used to tie the performance of gender to power (Burkitt, 2008). In this context, any identity concept is
performed on a continuous basis and not given as a fact. Therefore, identities do not exist prior to the performance (Gregson and Rose, 2000). Providing a useful summary of Butler’s work on performativity, Lester (2008) works along three categories. First, identity is created through discourse. However, as mentioned above, it is not fixed but represents a fluid process with multiple identities existing simultaneously. Individuals, consciously or unconsciously, perform these identities within a specific context. Second, as identity is an effect created by discourse, regulatory power shapes and forms an individual (Lester, 2008). As Hammack (2007) states: “identities are performed for others but also created in the performative social interaction itself” (p.234). Third, power structures limit agency as social norms enable or prevent performances. However, “agency is not entirely limited, and by over-performing or resisting the norm, the norm is exposed providing potential for social transformation” (Lester, 2008, p.283). Specific to tourism, Hannam (2002) argues that the everyday experience and performance of tourism can be viewed as a form of resistance, challenging the power-knowledge relations provided by agents and guides. Resistances can take up many forms (Mordue, 1999) and particular the notion of tourism ‘stages’ allows the subaltern to speak for themselves (Aitchison, 2001).

As Foucault was interested in relational analyses linked to madness or illness, knowledge and power (Best, 1994), it is anticipated that tourism can benefit from these insights. This is supported by Hannam (2002) who argues that a thorough rethinking of power relations is required and similar to Foucault, who gave considerable attention to marginalised discourses (Best, 1994), tourism studies need to examine discourses which became oppressed at different times or places. Here, it is important to pay closer attention to the individual voices of people (Hannam, 2002). As such, experiences of social exclusion in tourism should be investigated to highlight performances that are involuntary, unintentional and forced. This can assist in revealing aspects that are hidden or obscured by the official touristic discourse (MacCannell, 2001). There is a strong need to explore inequalities in tourism as these reflect general exclusionary practices in social life (Obrador Pons, 2003). Following this argument, tourism might reflect a “discrete concretisation of cultural assumptions” (Carlson, 1996, p.16) that reproduces social norms of what is ‘appropriate’ and who is allowed to participate.

In sum, a performative approach offers the possibility to account for multiple identities, while still acknowledging that these identities are bound to power relations. An approach based on
performativity also ties experiences into a stronger context. Specific to tourism, calls for the development of tourism as performance are made to capture the complex relationship between human practice and the wider social milieu (Weaver, 2005). In relation to this, tourism acts as a central component for identifying and understanding social organisations (Franklin and Crang, 2001). Crouch and Desforges (2003) argue that “the issues about control and formation of performance within the sphere of power are important to understanding tourism” (p.18). The process of revealing these issues can help to identify which barriers persist and which emerge as new barriers (Crouch and Desforges, 2003). At this point, it is important to reiterate that performance and performativity are intrinsically interrelated and it is difficult to treat each concept separately. While differences have been outlined, the chapter continues by referring to performativity due to its strong emphasis on power related to identity positions. Before outlining in greater detail why performativity represents a valuable framework for this study, performative dimensions are linked to disability.

3.6.1 Performativity and Disability

Only a few disability studies embraced a performative perspective (Samuels, 2002). For example, Sherry (2004) investigates the experiences of disabled and queer individuals as they are held to share questions about private/public and social/biological dualisms associated with the construction of identities. Looking at theoretical similarities, performativity can be applied to both, queer theory and disability studies. Specific to disability, it is argued that the disability identity is produced by processes and repetitive norms (Sherry, 2004). Supporting this argument, Holt (2008) emphasises that disability merely represents fragile repetitions instead of apparently natural subject positions. It is the performativity of the everyday which poses questions regarding the constituents of disability and ability (Price, 2007). With regard to Butler’s original idea, concerns have been raised for substituting the terms sex/gender with disability/impairment (Samuels, 2002, Corker, 1999). Corker (1999) asserts that the substitution does not allow for gaining a better understanding and Samuels (2002) asks “what meaning, or intention, is lost through the wholesale adoption of Butler’s theoretical framework inflected only by a mere substitution of terms?” (p.64). As a result, differences between sex/gender and disability/impairment need to be explored to avoid a fixed application and cultivate flexible and changing meanings (Samuels, 2002).
The critique of Butler’s theories when applied to disability coincides with critical assessments at a broader level. Watson (2002) goes as far as stating that her approach denies agency due to an overreliance on discursive means. Lovell (2003), focusing on effective political agency, argues that while Butler’s work has been successful in terms of making room for the possibility of agency, the concrete mechanisms needed for effective agency are neglected. Hence, agency should be perceived as collective and interactive within socio-historical contexts as individual agency is not automatically bound to resistance (Lovell, 2003). In contrast to Lovell (2003) who makes a case for moving away from the emphasis on agency, Holt (2008) stresses the performativity behind individuals in terms of becoming human subjects/agents. The author asserts that performativity theories clarify that the agent does not come first in ‘doing’ the performance but ‘becomes’ through the event (Holt, 2008). Building on Butler, Lloyd (1999) reiterates that performativity relates to the repetition in which discursive enactments produce phenomena that they try to regulate and constraint.

Disabled identities are consequently an effect of discourse (Holt, 2008). A number of actors are involved in this process of identity performances, which are regulated through power relations within a given spatial and socio-cultural context (Holt, 2008, Holt, 2007). As such, identities are never stable (Lloyd, 1999). As Foucault views identity as performative instead of essentialist (Mills, 2003), it is argued that the social model needs to be expanded to include the performative role of discourse in order to question language, difference and the unequal distribution of knowledge. This in turn would lead to interrogations in terms of individuals’ agency (Corker, 1999). Furthermore, although not applying a performative stance, Watson (2002) emphasises the need to account for evolving multiple identities, integrating a level of self-reflexivity and agency. This coincides with Wearing and Wearing’s (2001) claim to allow for greater reflexivity when analysing the self. Agency is constructed through narratives by rejecting identities others try to impose on disabled people. This represents a political act, refusing to follow the disabled/able-bodied categorisation upheld by the social model (Watson, 2002). Butler (2007) highlights the link between identity and politics succinctly by stressing:

‘The deconstruction of identity is not the deconstruction of politics; rather, it establishes as political the very terms through which identity is articulated’ (Butler, 2007, p.203).
Questioning the homogeneity of categorical identity concepts such as disability necessitates deeper insights into the use of certain concepts. According to Holt (2008), performative theories of identity emphasise the relational and contextual character of individual subjectivity, offer an improved understanding of the structure and agency debate and deal with some critiques of poststructuralist ideas. It is anticipated that performativity could potentially overcome limitations of both, phenomenological and poststructural perspectives. These limitations are related to identity formation and the recognition of multiple identities bound to different forms of power/knowledge as well as strategies for resistance within different contexts. At its core, phenomenology stresses the individual, the concept of self-identity and the body as subject of knowledge. It neglects, however, the social construction of disability as a category. In contrast, poststructural thought emphasises the body as object of knowledge, questions essentialist identity categories while paying less attention to individual agency and individual knowledges.

By applying a performative framework to disability, identities are regarded as performed for others but also created in the performative social interaction itself, which leads to the recognition of multiple identities bound to power processes. Disability is regarded as a socially constructed category and disability norms are defined through the process of performing and appear apparently neutral (Holt, 2007). However, these processes also allow for individual agency as narratives become active through performances to resist dominant discourses. Important for applying a performative framework is the emphasis placed on the context. A contextual analysis incorporates spatial, situational and temporal aspects as well as distinctive knowledges, which have been highlighted by Edensor’s studies (2000, 2001). While his studies contributed to the use of performance in tourism, Edensor pays limited attention to the formation of identities as an effect of discourse. As performances refer to the development of ideas reflected in discourses (Crouch and Desforges, 2003) and are influenced by or depend on dispositions related to, for example class or disability (Gray, 2003, Edensor, 1998), which represent essentialist identity categories, a performative approach would investigate what these discursive knowledges do in particular contexts.

In sum, a performative framework offers unique opportunities to provide a better understanding of disability for various reasons. First, as multiple identities and power/knowledge concepts have often been evaded by the social model, a performative approach deals explicitly with the
knowledge/ power dyad related to identity formation. At its core, performativity stresses that discourse produces the effects that it names. Hence, the disability identity is created through discourse, underlined by a set of norms and expectations. These norms and expectations are internalised within an individual's self-identity (Holt, 2008). Individuals perform these identities consciously or unconsciously, for example by accepting the condition of 'disabled' given to them (Holt, 2008). However, apart from reproducing norms, people can also transform the dominant disability discourse through resisting the norm (Holt, 2008). With regard to the social model, it can be argued that by equating disability with social oppression and exclusion, disabled people might unconsciously accept the marginalised, excluded position. Hence, the social model would, at first sight, work as a disadvantage for many disabled people.

Second, a performative approach generates a better understanding of the importance of contextual analyses including spatial, situational and temporal elements. As the reproduction or transformation of 'disabled' positions differs from context to context, multiple identities can exist simultaneously. This assists in dismantling the concept of an essentialist disability category. In this context, Corker (1999) stresses that particular the increasing importance of local knowledges needs to be understood and recognised.

Third, by focusing on a wider contextual analysis, dichotomies can be subjugated as performativity focuses less on visible differences. Instead, it favours a process-based approach in which multidimensional performances are acknowledged, hence rejecting all sorts of categorisations. Therefore, a focus on multi-dimensional performances can assist in overcoming the object/ subject dichotomy, highlighting not only the existence of multiple identities but also taking into account that disabled people can be both, subjects and objects of knowledge. It can be suggested that the essentialist category of disability makes individuals objects of knowledge, where individuals might internalise the marginalised identity position. However, by transforming or resisting dominant disability discourses, disabled persons might become subjects of knowledge through the use of narratives. Furthermore, conflicts of difference and dominant discourses of what is deserved and attainable are questioned (Hollinshead, 2002) rather than emphasising difference per se, which might lead to dismantling the self/ 'other' dualism.
Fourth, an analysis based on performativity urges tourism to investigate certain phenomena, such as social exclusion, as a result of highlighting that tourism, as one component of the social world, plays a role in identifying social organisation and disorganisation. According to Corker (1999), any phenomenon needs to be studied based on what it is taken to be and also what it appears to exclude. However, absences tend to be suppressed (Corker, 1999) as it is the case for social exclusion. Specific to tourism, there is a need to reveal what social exclusion stands for. It is also important to investigate what the use of the concept of social exclusion does to individuals labelled as socially excluded.

3.7 Summary

With the purpose of identifying an appropriate framework, this chapter has introduced key debates in relation to identity and knowledge/ power. The complexity of this debate was highlighted by examining concepts linked to self-identity and collective identity, accentuating that the social model of disability relies on a collective, essentialist identity. It has also been demonstrated how identity constructs are related to the knowledge/ power dyad, drawing on Foucauldian thinking of archaeology and genealogy. After having discussed the criticism against Foucault, three theoretical perspectives were examined, which refer to the gaze, embodiment and performativity. The aim was to identify a valuable framework, which can be used to analyse disability and social exclusion, incorporating the power/ knowledge dyad in relation to identity.

The discussion highlighted that the gaze has contributed to more detailed investigations into power, discipline and surveillance in tourism. Based on the recognition of different gazes, the framework of the gaze accounts for subjectivity and stresses the importance of socially constructed objects provided by the tourism industry. By relating the concept of the gaze to disability, it could be identified that disabled individuals become objects for the gaze of others. Furthermore, general limitations of the gaze perspective could be confirmed. These include the static nature of 'home' and 'away', the overemphasis on objects, the prioritisation of the visual and the lack of possibilities for resistance.

For overcoming these limitations, the embodiment framework was introduced as it highlights all sensual aspects and introduces the body as a site for resistance. The analysis of the embodiment approach has shown that incorporating the body causes a rethinking of both, the binary
distinction between ‘home’ and ‘away’, emphasising that tourism is part of the everyday, and the objectivism/relativist dualism, incorporating the body of the researcher, hence denying universal and objective truth. Despite the fact that the embodiment approach contributes to a more thorough understanding of power and knowledge, it failed to provide sufficient answers in terms of self/other and object/subject dichotomies. These deficiencies occur as the embodiment perspective pays less attention to the context of discursive formations in which the body is placed. By paying attention to the object/subject dualism, the discussion related to disability highlighted two approaches, both focusing on the body. While phenomenology emphasises the body as a subject of knowledge with its inherent lived experience, poststructuralism refers to the body as object of knowledge. Although Hughes and Paterson (1997) argue that both approaches should be used together, issues surrounding identity formation, the recognition of multiple identities bound to different forms of power/knowledge and strategies for resistance within different contexts remain ambiguous. While phenomenology pays less attention to the social construction of disability as a category, poststructuralism focuses on questioning the categorical identity approach. However, with regard to the self/other dichotomy, individuals remain negatively stigmatised and few options on how to overcome the essentialist, categorical identity approach are available. In addition, as phenomenology emphasises self-identity, poststructuralism denies individual agency, making it difficult to understand how both approaches can actually be translated into practice.

The need to allow for multiple identities according to different contexts led to an investigation of the performativity framework to cover for these shortcomings. As it includes investigations into the visual and the embodied, it is anticipated that current tourism research should investigate performative dimensions (Franklin and Crang, 2001). Important here is the understanding that the formation of identities needs to be analysed based on the power/knowledge dyad linked to contextual, situational, spatial and temporal aspects as well as the role of discourse. By emphasising multidimensional performances, all types of dichotomies are questioned. Related to disability, a performative framework allows for the recognition of multiple identities bound to power processes. Focusing on discursive enactments, disability is produced and disabled identities are an effect of discourse. However narratives, which become active through performances, offer possibilities in terms of individual agency. Hence, applying a performative
approach can overcome existing limitations of the social model related to the apparent lack of
the knowledge/power linked to identity.

The context-specific nature of a performative approach also requires tourism to investigate all
types of phenomena, in particular with regard to how certain discourses are understood and the
effect that these have on individuals. Hence, an analysis is needed to reveal what social exclusion
stands for and what effect it has on individuals with a disability. The following chapter examines
the current understanding of social exclusion in social policy compared to tourism and disability.
Chapter 4: Social Exclusion

4.1 Introduction

Over the last three decades, the concept of social exclusion was used to analyse current societal processes (Room, 1995a) and continues to be of social importance in the 21st century (Richardson and Le Grand, 2002). It has sparked a multitude of political debates (Davies, 2005), instigating a large amount of literature on social issues, such as unemployment, low income and bad health (Silver and Miller, 2002). Although combating social exclusion is regarded as one of the major principles in the 21st century (Bhalla and Lapeyre, 1997) to overcome the increasing polarisation of social groups (United Nations Development Programme, 2007), it is often argued that a full understanding of the concept of social exclusion has not yet been achieved (Kenyon et al., 2002, Lyons and Kenyon, 2003). Byrne (2005) argues that it is important to consider the historical development to understand the term together with its conceptual origin. In line with this claim, the chapter starts by offering an overview of the historical origin of social exclusion.

After discussing the difficulties associated with defining social exclusion, three different paradigms are outlined, which assist in developing a gradual exposition of key definitional elements based on relational aspects. These relational aspects, deriving from social policy, are grouped into three main categories, which comprise interpersonal, institutional and intrapersonal dimensions. These are subsequently juxtaposed with the understanding in tourism and disability studies to examine differences and similarities. Following this, it is investigated to what extent social exclusion masks individual agency in dealing with or responding to experiences of exclusion. It is also questioned who authorised the given representation of socially excluded individuals and whether the term itself could be seen as an agent causing exclusionary processes. This links back to the performative role of discourse, highlighting the importance to discover not only the meaning of a certain phenomenon but also the effect that this has on individuals.

Subsequently, the performative framework is applied to social exclusion and disability, paying particular attention to the relational nature of self and identity and forms of social power. By doing so, the general usefulness of employing the category of disability when debating social
exclusion is questioned. The chapter concludes by outlining how a performative framework can assist the disability debate for re-conceptualising social exclusion.

4.2 The Historical Context of Social Exclusion

Historically, the term 'social exclusion' was used to express a new set of problems caused by these fundamental changes in the nature of society (Byrne, 2005). It came into ever greater use with the deepening of the economic crises (Silver, 1994, Silver and Miller, 2003, Miller, 2003), which led to a reduction of the primary labour market in advanced industrialised countries and an increase in low-income households (Young, 1999). At the same time, society witnessed a rise in individualism (Silver, 1994). Individuals demanded their own lifestyle in comparison to the rather 'uniform' lifestyle of the Fordism era (Giddens, 1990). Related to the identity debate, it is anticipated that an emphasis was placed on self-identity while categorical identity was rejected. This heightened the demand for more developed citizenship structures (Young, 1999). It was stipulated that the welfare development of a society should not only be based on material dimensions such as income but also incorporate social aspects such as quality of life (Berger-Schmitt and Noll, 2000). Thus, it was mainly the apparent disintegration of societies that caused wide-ranging new developments (Atkinson, 2000).

By looking at the European level, the first Poverty Program focused exclusively on the notion of 'poverty'. However, particularly French researchers felt uncomfortable about following the Anglo-Saxon tradition of poverty (Atkinson, 1998, Burchardt et al., 1999). As a result, it was Jacques Delors, striving towards a more 'social dimension' to European integration, who introduced the term 'social exclusion' at the institutional level (Cameron and Davoudi, 1998, Room, 1995a, Silver and Miller, 2003, Berger-Schmitt and Noll, 2000). Exclusion or in French 'les exclus' became subject of political debates in France already in the 1960s (Silver, 1994).

By that time, the term embraced people with impairments, single parents, drug addicts, asocial persons and multi-problem households (Silver, 1994, Burchardt et al., 1999, Silver and Miller, 2003). These individuals and groups were said to be at danger of breaking social bonds (Spicker, 2002, Silver and Miller, 2003). Yet, the associated notion of solidarity failed to recognise 'difference' that is voluntary and therefore stigmatised those who chose an 'unconventional' lifestyle. Hence, the state protected its citizens only under the premise that they fulfil their
obligations to larger society. It was argued that if exclusion is based on individual behaviour, for example by living an unconventional lifestyle, then structural inequalities are a fact of life (Révauerg, 1997). This argument lost in importance as by the 1980s exclusion was increasingly regarded as having its roots in wider social changes, particularly the labour market, with the focus of attention shifting to unemployed people (Silver, 1994).

Towards the end of the second Poverty Program, the European Commission made reference to social exclusion and as a result, the third Poverty Programme moved away from poverty and emphasised the process of becoming detached from society. For the first time, relational in addition to distributional aspects were recognised as forming a part of social exclusion (Berger-Schmitt and Noll, 2000). The term ‘social exclusion’ was then transferred to the EU Social Charter in 1989 (Agarwal and Brunt, 2006) and the European Social Protocol developed gradually from 1989 to 1997. One major reason for this delay was the British refusal to authorize changes made to the section that assigns social protection responsibilities (Silver and Miller, 2003). In the following years, the term ‘social exclusion’ became a key objective of the Structural Funds (Room, 1995a, Agarwal and Brunt, 2006). The development of the term ‘social exclusion’ is summarised in Table 2.

### Table 2: Historical Development of the Concept of Social Exclusion

| 1975 –1980 | 1st European Poverty Program: focus on poverty |
| 1980s      | Introduction of the concept of social exclusion in a European institutional context |
| 1986 – 1989| 2nd European Poverty Program: more references to social exclusion |
| 1989       | Concept of social exclusion was transferred to the EU Social Charter |
| 1990       | Adoption of resolution on how to combat social exclusion by the Council of Europe |
| 1990 –1994 | 3rd European Poverty Program: focus on social exclusion |
| 2000 –2005 | Combating ‘social exclusion’ as one of the key objectives of the Structural Funds |

Source: Burchardt et al. (1999); Room (1995b); Cameron and Davoudi (1998); Silver and Miller (2003); Berger-Schmitt and Noll (2000); Agarwal and Brunt (2006)

The importance given to combating social exclusion within European Structural Funds led national governments, which had an interest in European resources, to investigate ways on how to respond to social exclusion at the national level. However, this did not happen in a unified approach as different countries had different perceptions of what social exclusion stands for.
(Silver and Miller, 2003). While some countries referred to exclusion in economic terms, others embraced social aspects of life (Silver and Miller, 2003, Barnes et al., 2002). The UK, for example, viewed social exclusion in terms of multiple deprivation (Silver and Miller, 2003) and established the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) in 1997 (Byrne, 2005, Burchardt et al., 1999). The aim of the SEU was to improve the understanding of the key characteristics of social exclusion and to prevent or reduce exclusion (Social Exclusion Unit, 1997a), by re-integrating people and making sure that mainstream services are delivered for everyone (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004a). However, critics claim that the SEU only made a limited impact and that the way in which the SEU was managed led to weaknesses that were exploited by pressure groups. It was reported that the SEU failed to reach some of the poorest, most isolated and vulnerable families (Wintour, 2006). As a consequence, its work was transferred to a smaller workforce in the Cabinet Office, called the Social Exclusion Taskforce. While the tasks of this taskforce remain similar to those of the SEU, it is anticipated that advantages of the Social Exclusion Taskforce relate to stronger links to relevant departments such as health, education and communities (Wintour, 2006).

Summarising these historical landmarks, the origin of the concept ‘social exclusion’ can be found within the realms of social policy, and in particular in the domain of political discourses (Berghman, 1995, Byrne, 2005, Burchardt et al., 1999, Church et al., 2000, Miller, 2003, Barnes et al., 2002, Koller and Davidson, 2008). However, given that social exclusion offers ways to understand current societal developments, the concept does not only have historical and political dimensions but is also of social importance, making it relevant and important for academic social sciences (Byrne, 2005, Peace, 2001).

### 4.3 The Difficulty of Defining Social Exclusion

Many authors stress that defining social exclusion is extremely difficult (Silver, 1994, Burchardt et al., 1999, Democratic Dialogue, 1995, Atkinson, 2000, Church et al., 2000, Agarwal and Brunt, 2006, Kenyon et al., 2002, Miller, 2003, Jermyn, 2001). This is mainly because different writers have established different theories of social exclusion as they were investigating different individuals and/ or groups that are deemed to be excluded (Atkinson, 2000). As a result, abundances of definitions of social exclusion are in existence.
It is argued that the proliferation of definitions is the result of choosing definitional frameworks that best serve different purposes, situations or programmes (Lyons, 2003). Related to this, different ways of measuring social exclusion increases the inconsistency in definitions (Church et al., 2000). Hence, determining if social exclusion is reducing or increasing strongly depends on the definition employed (Davies, 2005). Furthermore, ways in which social exclusion is understood in different countries results in a lack of agreement about its precise meaning (Agarwal and Brunt, 2006). Defining social exclusion encounters an additional problem as it deals with personal experiences and hence, a subjective awareness of the concept (Cars et al., 1999). However, often, the empirical referents considered as excluded are not discussed in the terminology (Silver, 1994).

Some authors argue that the non-existence of a single definition causes considerable hindrances to operationalise social exclusion (Room, 1995a, Kenyon et al., 2002), precluding the development of appropriate policy responses (Walker, 1995). Others, however, maintain the view that a range of definitions is not only unavoidable but also appropriate (Lyons, 2003) as it provides an indication that many dimensions of exclusion exist, which facilitates a continuing dialogue of social and economic processes (Walker, 1995).

Common to most definitions is the emphasis placed on multi-dimensionality (Kenyon et al., 2002, Byrne, 2005). A number of studies focus on social, cultural, political and economic dimensions (Bhalla and Lapeyre, 1997, Burchardt et al., 1999, Kenyon et al., 2002). Within the economic dimension, the emphasis is placed upon income, production and access to goods and service. Whereas Bhalla and Lapeyre (1997) highlight that these dimensions are interrelated, Burchardt et al. (1999), deny that non-participation in one activity is likely to influence another, hence arguing that each individual dimension should be analysed separately.

In contrast to economic, social and political dimensions, other authors emphasise spatial dimensions, referring to the characteristics of an area (Berghman, 1995), ‘poor’ places and ‘spatial exclusion’ (Room, 1995b). Byrne (2005) argues that spatial exclusion is the most visible form of exclusion. Kitchin (1998) recollects that the role of space, in reproducing and maintaining exclusionary processes, needs to be recognised along with social aspects, portraying exclusion as a socio-spatial process. The geographical dimension also assists in identifying that
the vulnerability of an individual to social exclusion depends in part on the availability of transport networks (Room, 1995a). Given the emphasis placed on transportation networks, many authors argue for investigations into the mobility dimension when analysing exclusion (Grieco, 2003, Kenyon et al., 2002, Hine and Mitchell, 2001, Church et al., 2000). In this context, debates focus on the use of new technologies to alleviate exclusion linked to mobility (Lyons, 2003, Social Exclusion Unit, 2004b, Lyons and Kenyon, 2003, David, 2003, Grieco, 2003). However, opponents argue that the emergence of ICTs has exacerbated social exclusion due to financial constraints and deficient skills (Cornwell and Lundgren, 2001 cited in Lyons and Kenyon, 2003).

Bringing in an additional dimension, Byrne (2005) talks about cultural exclusion, in which people are refused the possibility to participate in certain cultural activities, either as producers or consumers. While a range of dimensions have been proposed, the relationships between dimensions are uncertain in nature (Clifton, 2003). Supporting this argument, identifying dimensions alone cannot determine the importance given to each dimension (Whelan and Whelan, 1995).

Despite disagreeing on specific dimensions, social exclusion is acknowledged as a process (Sehgal and Edwards, 1999, Berghman, 1995). Supporting this argument, it is emphasised that social exclusion is a mechanism that detaches groups or individuals from mainstream society (Giddens, 1998). Hence, it is not the lack of specific social or economic conditions that causes a 'state' of exclusion. It rather refers to the risk of becoming more vulnerable to a 'process' that leads to marginalisation (Cars et al., 1999). Although a variety of authors emphasise the process-related aspects of social exclusion and provide a number of potential outcomes of social exclusion (Silver and Miller, 2003, Berghman, 1995, Silver, 1994, Burchardt et al., 1999, Sehgal and Edwards, 1999, Barry, 1998, Agarwal and Brunt, 2006), Koller and Davidson (2008), found that progressive word forms, such as 'excluding', are largely absent in policy documents. This leads to the conclusion that the understanding of social exclusion is based on viewing social exclusion as a state and not an ongoing process.

Whereas social policy examines the concept of social exclusion based on definitional and operational aspects (Koller and Davidson, 2008), only a few studies deal with social exclusion as an effect of different discourses and paradigms. According to Byrne (2005), the identification of
different discourses assists in revealing the increasing social and economic changes in society and the resulting inequalities that individuals face. Related to this, Silver (1994) emphasises that a semantic analysis of multiple meanings is useful to identify conflicting social science paradigms and political ideologies in which the term is embedded.

4.3.1 Three Paradigms of Social Exclusion

Silver (1994) identifies three paradigms, ‘solidarity’, ‘specialisation’ and ‘monopoly’, which provide multiple meanings of social exclusion in terms of theoretical perspectives, political ideologies and national discourses. By identifying and investigating these paradigmatic approaches to exclusion, specific values and worldviews can be extrapolated, which provide the basis for a deeper investigation.

Solidarity is the underlying paradigm of the French Republican ideology based on the belief that individuals are tied to society through interrelated mediating institutions. Exclusion occurs when social solidarity between individuals and society breaks down, with the focus being placed on cultural and moral aspects instead of economic issues. Integration is seen as appropriate to place individuals back into the system, which is the main responsibility of the state (Silver, 1994). While Silver (1994) highlights that multicultural notions of solidarity have been incorporated in recent years, Bowring (2000) argues that the value and existence of alternatives modes of social integration are largely omitted.

The specialisation paradigm, deriving from Anglo-American liberalism, views exclusion as discrimination. Specialisation occurs on the basis social differentiation and social groups. Thus, a strong emphasis is placed on individualism in form of personal attributes, behaviour and individual experiences at a micro level. In an ideal state, individual differences should not lead to hierarchically ordered social categories. When it does, exclusion arises out of inadequate separation of spheres and inappropriate rules. Emphasising that exclusion can appear in different spheres, the specialisation paradigm highlights multi-dimensional aspects and causes. Depending on the sphere in question, a person may be excluded in one but not in all areas (Silver, 1994) and is excluded either due to voluntary choices or the interests of others leading to discrimination (Berger-Schmitt and Noll, 2000).
The monopoly paradigm, used by the political European left, focuses on hierarchical power relations. As a result, exclusion arises out of the interplay between class structures and political power. Institutions and cultural distinctions create boundaries to participation (Silver, 1994) and privileged groups in society protect their monopoly position by controlling access to goods and services (Berger-Schmitt and Noll, 2000). In order to combat exclusion, the state has to grant equal citizenship rights to all individuals (Silver, 1994).

While these paradigms represent clear-cut typologies, with each of them viewing the causes of social exclusion in a different light, research into the subject of exclusion draws on more than one paradigm (Silver, 1994). Common to all three types is the focus on relational aspects either between individuals and the state or between individuals. This relational emphasis indicates the existence of different agents at different levels causing exclusion (Silver, 1994, Berger-Schmitt and Noll, 2000). While the solidarity and monopoly paradigms focus on the macro-level, investigating the relations between citizens and institutional organisations, the specialisation paradigm embraces a micro-level perspective, examining interpersonal relations between individuals, or even intrapersonal relations, the relation with oneself. Given the importance of the relational character of social exclusion, its overall relational claim is analysed next before moving on to three relational levels: interpersonal, institutional and intrapersonal.

4.4 Beyond Poverty: Relational Aspects of Social Exclusion

With the explicit introduction of social exclusion into the third Poverty Programme, the focus of analysis shifted away from distributional issues, such as the lack of resources, to relational issues in terms of inadequate social participation, lack of social integration and lack of power (Room, 1995a). Hence, social exclusion is a broader concept when compared to poverty (Duffy, 1995) as it moves beyond the redistribution debate (Berghman, 1995, Kenyon et al., 2002).

Although poverty and the limits imposed by income distributions might be one dimension of social exclusion (Kenyon et al., 2002) it is recognised that individuals can also be excluded without living in poverty. Ethnic minorities and gay communities are examples where exclusion may not be linked to poverty (Democratic Dialogue, 1995). As a consequence, the use of income as indicator for exclusion neglects relational and spatial aspects (Atkinson, 2000). Whereas some
authors argue that the concept of social exclusion is close to that of poverty (Bhalla and Lapeyre, 1997), Kenyon et al. (2002) identify clear distinctions between the two concepts (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Social Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material resources</td>
<td>Participation in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributional Outcomes</td>
<td>Relational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic rights</td>
<td>Citizenship rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up from Down</td>
<td>In from out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni-dimensional</td>
<td>Multiple dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily quantifiable</td>
<td>Difficult to quantify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kenyon et al. (2002)

Hence, moving away from an emphasis on poverty, non-material deprivation might result in reduced citizenship, leading to social exclusion (Kenyon et al., 2002). This is supported by Duffy (1995) arguing that social, political and cultural systems determine the social integration of a person in society. As a consequence, the notion of social exclusion has the potential to explore key relational issues in terms of autonomy and dependency (Room, 1995a). Despite this terminological shift, Vobruba (2000) argues that current research either continues to focus on poverty, hence maintaining a uni-dimensional basis, or falls short to identify the causalities of multiple dimensions.

While moving beyond the poverty debate is often referred to as one of the major strengths of using the term ‘social exclusion’ in social policy (Room, 1995a), specific to disability, the need to dismantle the link between poverty and disability is emphasised (Braddock and Parish, 2001). Studies dealing with disability and social exclusion highlight that disabled individuals are the most excluded group as they are among the poorest people in the developing world. Reasons for this include a lack of education, less paid work and limited involvement in community affairs (Elwan, 1999). While Elwan (1999) focuses on disability in developing countries, Hughes (2002) argues more generally that poverty is the key factor affecting disabled individuals. Also Collins and Kay (2003) stress poverty as a number of disabled people depend on welfare benefits due to extra living, travel and care costs. These costs are not adequately reflected in the social exclusion
literature. Instead, research focuses on social inclusion through employment, which is not a real option for many people with a disability (Collins and Kay, 2003). Supporting this argument and embracing a tourism perspective, Darcy (2002) reports that disabled people have far less prospects of paid employment and therefore less income. These complex equity issues, embracing employment, income and travel costs related to social exclusion have not be addressed sufficiently (Darcy, 2002).

Collins and Kay (2003) accentuate that poverty is the key determinant affecting access to leisure. As a result, citizens with financial power are allowed to exercise their consumer rights, whereas others with less financial resources are not. Leisure cards are seen as an effective means to grant these rights to overcome exclusion. They also play an important role in reducing stigmatisation. However, despite the potential that leisure cards offer, there are not fully exploited as a social policy management tool (Collins and Kay, 2003). The argumentation above reflects the general discussion in social policy as an emphasis is placed on rights, highlighting the importance of institutional relations, and interpersonal relations in form of stigmatisation and discrimination. Hence, these two elements appear crucial elements for investigating the social exclusion of disabled people in tourism. However, linking the debate to structural barriers to tourism participation, it has been highlighted that despite the fact that disabled people face more costs involved in travelling, financial aspects seem to have only a limited impact as barriers to travel, which draws attention away from the importance of economic means.

Comparing the dimension of poverty in social policy with disability and tourism, contradicting results are identified. While some studies point out that poverty is at the core of social exclusion as it prohibits individuals fulfilling their consumer rights, others highlight that income alone does not lead to social exclusion. This demands further investigations into relational aspects of exclusion to understand their relative importance.

4.4.1 Interpersonal Relations

Particularly within the monopoly paradigm, group distinctions are regarded as central as powerful groups with distinctive cultural identities keep others out or restrain access to resources. Access barriers can be of material, legal and cultural nature and those who have power over these resources include some while exclude others (Silver, 1994). By looking at power
structures, a distinction between weak and strong social exclusion is made. In its weak form, solutions for overcoming social exclusion include altering the situation of excluded people to integrate them into society. In contrast, the stronger type of social exclusion stresses the need to identify those in society that do exclude with the aim to reduce their power (Veit-Wilson, 1998).

When groups and individuals impose their power on other individuals and exclude them from mainstream society, stigmatisation and stereotyping play an important role, which is discussed by only a few studies (Democratic Dialogue, 1995). However, stigmatisation might be regarded as the origin of social exclusion (Kurzban and Leary, 2001). It is anticipated that stigma is a form of deviance that leads others to judge upon the participation of individuals because of abilities and skills. Once individuals have been classified as illegitimate to participate, they are no longer within the protection of social norms and are subsequently excluded (Elliott et al., 1982). In a similar line, Kurzban and Leary (2001) note that stigma occurs when an individual is being negatively evaluated on the basis of attributes or devalued social identity. Groups that fulfil ‘normative’ requirements of society, systematically exclude non-members from access to resources, the means of attaining resources and social interactions (Kurzban and Leary, 2001).

While Kurzban and Leary (2001) do not provide an account of the individuals affected and their attributes, Barnes et al. (2002) stress that power structures generate inequalities based on age, gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality and disability. Despite these insights, the analysis of social exclusion based on the separation from important social entities, desired relationships or being devaluated by certain groups has received little attention (MacDonald and Leary, 2005). Once individuals experience social exclusion, they move away from the sources of rejection, as unstable source of support, and try to find sources of acceptance (MacDonald and Leary, 2005). Supporting this argument, the Democratic Dialogue (1995) emphasises that when social exclusion is associated with stigmatisation and stereotyping, individuals experiencing exclusion develop different types of survival strategies.

Specific to tourism, homosexual individuals can be used as an example to explain interpersonal relations as gay and lesbian travellers often experience injustice in form of discrimination and social exclusion (Coles and Church, 2007). By considering the gay identity as ‘abnormal’ (Pritchard et al., 1998, Pritchard et al., 2000), hegemonic structures and ideologies of the
dominant group in society pose leisure constraints on homosexual travellers. Consequently, homosexuality becomes a stigma that is deeply discrediting (Herrera and Scott, 2005). Due to the negative stigma attached to homosexuality, gay and lesbian people often live double lives and are largely invisible community members (Collins and Kay, 2003). In order to overcome discrimination, homosexual individuals adopt negotiation strategies in terms of searching for travel experiences in destinations where their sexual preference is welcomed and accepted (Pritchard et al., 2000, Pritchard et al., 1998, Clift and Forrest, 1999, Holcomb and Luongo, 1996, Herrera and Scott, 2005, Hughes, 1997). In fact, it is argued that tourism can offer homosexual individuals the opportunity to confirm their gay identity (Hughes, 1997).

Also focusing on the notion of dominance, Collins and Kay (2003) argue that class categories continue to influence participation and access as leisure structures are embedded in social class, with the dominant class operating as a control mechanism over other classes based on dominant social principles and cultural meanings. As a result, Herrera and Scott (2005) assert that it is essential to encourage acceptance and understanding among society’s dominant group to overcome processes of marginalisation. Only by legitimising the ‘otherness’ can discrimination be overcome (Pritchard et al., 2000, Holcomb and Luongo, 1996). In relation to this, Herrera and Scott (2005) call for intensified research to reveal the constraints and negotiation strategies of other marginalised groups, such as disabled people, who remain largely invisible.

By looking at interpersonal relations, research into disability either emphasises relational structures among disabled people (Kelley and Betsalel, 2005) or their relations with family members or friends (Davis and Salkin, 2005). Crucial in this debate are aspects related to ‘norms’. The literature review on disability has demonstrated that the medical model focuses on ‘normalising’ the situation of disabled people through medical intervention (Donoghue, 2003, Hughes, 2002). By including theoretical constructs of the embodiment debate, disability is the outcome of an ‘abnormal body’ (Charlton, 1998) that deviates from the ‘ideal’ (Shelton and Tucker, 2005). In contrast, the social model decentres the body and society is regarded as the creator of a negative social identity for disabled people (Donoghue, 2003). The negative attribute attached to impaired people is said to arise out of interaction between members of society. A person’s disability is not the origin of stigma, but society’s tendency to assign stigma and deviancy to people with ‘undesirable’ differences (Dattilo, 2002).
These arguments assist in highlighting that social exclusion, construed on the basis of interpersonal relations, is closely related to interactive barriers faced by disabled people in tourism. This is supported by Knight and Brent (1998) who state that disabled people are excluded because of the negative attitudes and stereotyping of others. Problems related to discrimination find their expression in limited access to education, health and means of livelihood for disabled people (Bickenbach et al., 1999). By examining the ways in which the built environment is created, Imrie (2001) argues that urban space often produces distinctive forms of exclusion, which he refers to as “architectural apartheid” (p.232).

The discussion on interpersonal relations revealed that similar to social policy, studies in tourism and disability embrace and discuss interpersonal aspects in terms of stigma, discrimination, stereotypes and ‘norms’. Negative attitudes, central to the interpersonal level of the social exclusion debate, correspond to interactive barriers to tourism participation. However, tourism and disability research fail to provide an explanation how individuals can challenge existing norms and negative attitudes. As the social policy perspective emphasises the need to grant citizenship rights to reduce unequal power structures and to overcome exclusion (Silver, 1994), an examination into institutional relations is needed.

### 4.4.2 Institutional Relations

According to Room (1995a), each citizen has the right to a certain basic standard of living and to participate in major social or occupational institutions of society. Hence Berghman (1995) stresses that social exclusion can be conceived “in terms of the denial, - or non-realisation - of citizenship rights” (p.19). To understand institutional relations linked to social exclusion, societal institutions, in which those rights are embedded in, need to be investigated. Berghman (1995) identifies three major systems that link individuals to state institutions. First, individuals are part of a democratic and legal system, providing civic integration to ensure that all individuals are equal in front of the law. Second, the welfare state system promotes social integration through access to welfare benefits and services and third, offering economic integration is the labour market. As a consequence, when citizens are unable to secure rights within one or more of these systems, they suffer from a wide range of disadvantages (Berghman, 1995).
The Democratic Dialogue (1995) stresses the need to define parameters of social membership in order to develop strategies to prevent the exclusion of some groups from the cycle of opportunities which the rest of society takes for granted. However, this is problematic as different countries have different ideas about what membership means due to dissimilar histories and cultures that produce and shape national identities and criteria for citizenship (Silver and Miller, 2003). Hence, the social democratic dream of universal rights and social justice has never been fully realised (Brown and Crompton, 1994). It is also asserted that social structures hinder the development of social citizenship (Sehgal and Edwards, 1999, Lyons, 2003, Byrne, 2005). Principles of a free market economy with its structures and systems will always be in conflict with objectives of inclusion (Byrne, 2005). Related to this argument, Giddens (1998) criticises that New Labour links equality to inclusion and inequality to exclusion. When examining the condition of being equal, one has to question if the concept refers to equal use, equal opportunities or equal outcome. For example, equal access to resources, does not lead to equal use. As a consequence, inequality is not only inevitable but also a result of social freedom (Collins and Kay, 2003). In this sense, inequalities will always be present in capitalist societies. In contrast, other authors assert that favourable outcomes can be achieved by altering societal structures in terms of community development and consultation (Sehgal and Edwards, 1999).

Expanding the argument to leisure and tourism, additional areas of disagreement can be identified. While leisure can be regarded as a vital aspect of social membership (Silver and Miller, 2003), it is argued that although the state has the social responsibility to provide basic leisure needs, access is often restricted by the ability to pay (Ravenscroft, 1993). Also Slee (2002), while agreeing that tourism is a key right, emphasises that it is difficult to conceptualise what constitutes standards of citizenship. By critically investigating the normative citizenship paradigm, which regards the provision of leisure services as a key component of social citizenship, Coalter (1998) outlines two main reasons why social exclusion should not be theorised on the basis of citizenship. First, recreation interests are too diverse to make their satisfaction a right of citizenship. Secondly the commercial nature of leisure services prevents many individuals from participating, which coincides with Ravencroft’s (1993) argument. Hence, one should investigate which groups are excluded and on what basis rather than using the concept of citizenship (Coalter, 1998). This calls for deeper investigations into intrapersonal relations, a shortcoming that tourism shares with social policy.
Specific to disability, the advancement of civil rights is often stated as a key requirement to improve the lives of disabled people (Braddock and Parish, 2001). Related to tourism, it is argued that the denial of the freedom to travel infringes on social rights and works against equal opportunities (European Disability Forum, 2001). With the introduction of the social model, a strong emphasis is placed on disabled people as a group of citizens with rights (Taylor, 1999, O'Grady et al., 2004, Burchardt, 2004). Hence, at its core, the social model is lobbying for the recognition of these rights, with Albrecht et al. (2001) stating that inclusion in society is based on civil rights. While this initiated the establishment of anti-discrimination acts, it was highlighted that disabled individuals are only granted conditional rights. By drawing on Berghman's (1995) differentiation of societal systems, it is anticipated that anti-discrimination acts are not sufficient to ensure full civic integration.

By looking at institutional relations, the denial of rights remains at the core of exclusion. While citizenship rights represent a key element in the disability debate, legal acts have not led to full civic integration. Specific to tourism, the concept of citizenship rights is difficult to apply as leisure and tourism interests are too diverse to make their fulfilment a right of citizenship. Instead, attention should be paid to different, individual experiences, highlighting the importance of intrapersonal dimensions of social exclusion.

4.4.3 Intrapersonal Relations

In highlighting that social exclusion is not a binary state, Lyons (2003) refers to social exclusion as "a spectrum of deprivation" (p.340). Hence, exclusion should be regarded as a continuum (Silver and Miller, 2003), indicating that there is no clear separation between 'in' and 'out' (Richardson and Le Grand, 2002). In this respect, many citizens can be excluded at some point, while others remain excluded for a longer period (Kitchin, 1998). This does not only highlight a temporal perspective but could also lead to the assumption that everyone in society lives within a multi-dimensional scale of exclusion depending on individuals' perceptions.

While the dynamic character of social exclusion is recognised, individuals need to be integrated into the multiple components of social space and order through which they live their life (Byrne, 2005). Thus, the exclusion experienced by a person is the result of a unique interplay between
dimensions and characteristics specific to the individual (Kenyon et al., 2002). For example, having less income, being unemployed or living with a disability are components that, when analysed in isolation, do not provide evidence of exclusion. A person with low income, but rich personal networks, may well have a fulfilling social life (Cars et al., 1999).

The need to investigate individual perceptions of social exclusion is emphasised in the specialization paradigm as discrimination is construed as an individual experience (Silver, 1994). Hence, a negligence to focus on individual experiences of social exclusion leaves certain groups invisible to society. In contrast, by encouraging minorities to express their perceptions with the aim to promote social exchange would foster the process of social integration (Democratic Dialogue, 1995). Furthermore, by drawing on legitimacy and authority, Richardson and Le Grand (2002) argue that legitimacy can only be established by integrating the voices of socially excluded people. Otherwise, the subjects of the debate would be missing and the ultimate authority rests with those individuals who directly face experiences of social exclusion.

The above argument requires an investigation into who actually defines who is excluded. In the UK, the SEU referred to disadvantaged adults, older people and people frequently moving home (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004a). The EU observatory (cited in the Democratic Dialogue, 1995) states that primarily elderly people and women with low income, disabled individuals, young people without education, and ethnic minorities are excluded. The Demographic Dialogue (1995) expanded this list and added single-parent families on low income, young people leaving care, long-term unemployed, gays and lesbians, homeless people and prisoners and their families as groups vulnerable to social exclusion. Given these examples, it is recognisable that predominantly national institutions establish lists of who is excluded. In this context, Davies (2005) questions if the government has the right to label people as excluded without their agreement. Few attempts have been made to incorporate the referents considered to be excluded (Silver, 1994), hence leaving out personal experiences and levels of subjective awareness (Cars et al., 1999). Therefore, it can be argued that intrapersonal dimensions are largely neglected.

The need to incorporate intrapersonal aspects is reflected by Lyons (2003) noting that social exclusion is “the discrepancy between what you can do and what you want to do” (p.340). Also Burchardt et al. (1999) embrace individual perceptions and desires by stating that individuals are
socially excluded if they would like to participate but cannot. By talking to resident representatives of socially deprived areas, Richardson and Le Grand (2002) found that two groups of socially excluded people exist. While the first group comprises individuals with no control and limited agency over their situation, leading to the assumption that certain agents cause exclusion, the second group includes people that are partly responsible for their exclusion, implying a degree of agency (Richardson and Le Grand, 2002).

Particularly with regard to the second group, the question arises if forms of social exclusion can also be voluntary. In this context, Burchardt et al. (1999) propose the distinction between total and problematic exclusion. Problematic exclusion is used when individuals do not experience any distress deriving from their situation. In this case, problematic exclusion is a subcategory of total exclusion. However, if it is assumed that any form of exclusion has an impact on society, whether the individual is concerned himself/herself or not, then the two sets are identical. In this case, all forms of non-participation are socially problematic (Burchardt et al., 1999). This is supported by Richardson and Le Grand (2002), declaring that regardless of the type of exclusion, problems are caused to society due to threats to social solidarity.

Barry (1998) accentuates that the distinction between problematic and total exclusion needs to be treated with scepticism because one has to question who classifies if exclusion is 'only' problematic or not. Social exclusion might be exacerbated if only a few individuals or groups decide on the type of exclusion. Furthermore, even by assuming that voluntary exclusion exists, the act of excluding oneself might have been triggered by a lack of alternative choices. Hence, the actual act of withdrawal is voluntary but the context that has caused this decision is not. It is this particular context that still makes the case for social exclusion and requires an understanding of the processes by which individuals and groups are excluded (Barry, 1998).

Many authors therefore stress the need for authentic voices to understand individual perceptions of social exclusion (Democratic Dialogue, 1995, Knight and Brent, 1998, Vobruba, 2000, Richardson and Le Grand, 2002, Frost and Hoggett, 2008). With regard to social policy, Frost and Hoggett (2008) emphasise the negligence to account for the lived experiences of exclusion and the feelings that are produced in this process. Also Vobruba (2000) accentuates that the interpretations of excluded people are important for the processes of exclusion and inclusion.
They represent the starting point for political intervention, which in turn can assist in developing strategies of agency (Vobruba, 2000). Developing the above mentioned positions further, participants of the study by Richardson and Le Grand (2002) underline the importance of insider perceptions as a way to overcome the enforcement of categories on people.

Specific to disability and in an attempt to account for intrapersonal perspectives, the integration of the capabilities approach is deemed crucial as it provides a useful complement to the human rights approach and the social model of disability (Baylies, 2002). However, the capabilities approach has been criticised as individuals with severe impairments fall below the threshold of the measurements that reflect ‘being human’. Hence, norms are constructed in a negligent manner with the result of excluding individuals on the basis of limitations (Burchardt, 2004). Capabilities should be understood as opportunities to do certain things in life which might be constrained by the characteristics of an individual and/ or the social, economic and physical environment (Burchardt, 2004). However, without denying the existence of external barriers “each individual’s capabilities are the relevant objects of value” (Burchardt, 2004, p.745).

In relation to this, it is regarded as important that disabled individuals devise their own definition of exclusion. Findings indicate that disabled people relate social exclusion to the counterpart of being able-bodied. For example, social exclusion is perceived as “not being able to play a full part in the activities that others can” (Richardson and Le Grand, 2002, p.504). In a different study, social exclusion is identified as collusion “to deny to disabled people the respect it gives automatically to able-bodied people” (Knight and Brent, 1998, p.5). From these definitions, which allow to place individuals’ perceptions of social exclusion at the core of the debate, a deeper insight into the importance of interpersonal relations can be gained.

The discussion of different but interrelated levels of relations has highlighted that intrapersonal levels have been largely neglected in the social exclusion debate, which prevents the identification of the heterogeneity of social exclusion, leading to generalisations regarding an individual’s experience. Disallowing for individual perceptions also leads to questioning whether social exclusion allows for the recognition of individual agency in dealing with or responding to experiences of exclusion.
4.5 Social Exclusion: Masking Agency?

Critically assessing social exclusion, Koller and Davidson (2008) apply a cognitively grounded approach to investigate social exclusion as a conceptual and grammatical metaphor. As a conceptual metaphor, social exclusion makes a space-related distinction between the ‘inside’, which represents the majority of society in a positively connoted manner and the ‘outside’, which remains represented negatively, undesired and problematic. Following these arguments, society is viewed as bounded space (Koller and Davidson, 2008), with the socially included portrayed as a homogenous group (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). Often, however, the diversity within the ‘included space’ remains unquestioned. It is assumed that everyone in the ‘inside’ occupies the same status, hence their behaviour is regarded as normative (Koller and Davidson, 2008, Vobruba, 2000). In fact, it is the notion of normality that defines the inside when compared to the outside (Vobruba, 2000). This normative framework can only be upheld through the existence of the other side (Sherry, 2004). Goodin (1996) outlines this paradox by arguing that the use of the concepts of inclusion and exclusion is in fact counterproductive as “the problem of exclusion is that there is an inclusive community” (p.344). Those who remain outside are given the status of the ‘other’ (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). Hence, related to the ‘inside’/ ‘outside’ dichotomy, is the use of the self/ other distinction, as ‘otherness’ is used as a concept to draw borders between inclusion and exclusion (Horsell, 2006). These borders highlight differences between individuals and groups and make the basis for differentiation obvious (Goodin, 1996). In a tentative way, it can be suggested that the conceptual metaphor of social exclusion has actually created the notion of the ‘other’.

As a grammatical metaphor, social exclusion transforms a process into a state, which leaves no agency to the so-called excluded as the voices on social exclusion that enter the public domain are exclusively those coming from the ‘inside’ (Koller and Davidson, 2008). Like Koller and Davidson (2008), Vobruba (2000) criticises the notion of the ‘state’ of exclusion as “biographical end of the road” (p.604). It is a state or a condition in which people are in, and no reference is made to the processes or agents that are responsible for that particular situation (Horsell, 2006). Hence, less attention is paid to examining who is actually responsible for the exclusion in the first place. Those who claim that they address social exclusion are usually featured in a positive light (Koller and Davidson, 2008). Hence, inclusion is given the status of ‘good’, in contrast to the counterpart, exclusion, which is associated with ‘evil’ and ‘bad’ (Vobruba, 2000). However,
those who promote the values of inclusion actually contribute to reinforcing marginality and boundaries. Additionally, as the objective of social policy is inclusion, it would appear as counterproductive to give insights into the inside and its own agents of exclusion. In this context, policy-makers prefer to deal with exclusion as an agentless state or try that agency is not evident when looking at the inside (Koller and Davidson, 2008). Related to this argument, Koller and Davidson (2008) speak about “backgrouding agency” (p.325) which is expressed in expressions like ‘bridging divides’. This emphasises a policy response in terms of bringing the excluded group back in rather than paying attention to the possibly multiple causes of exclusion.

Analysing the report by the Social Exclusion Unit ‘Bridging the Gap’, Colley and Hodkinson (2001) offer a similar critique. They argue that while the document appears to represent a concern for social matters, three major drawbacks lead to inconsistencies. First, the report places the causes for inequality and non-participation within individuals and their ‘deficient’ characteristics (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). By labelling them as ‘hard-to-reach’ redirects the attention away from policy to the ‘excluded’ themselves (Koller and Davidson, 2008). Individuals mentioned in the report are regarded as passive victims and their attitudes, values and beliefs are aspects leading to self-exclusion (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). In fact, within the field of social policy, words and expressions can be found that imply that individuals or groups are agents of their own exclusion (Koller and Davidson, 2008).

Second, while focusing on individual characteristics and deficits, paradoxically, the report ignores diversity and individuality by categorising individuals into social groupings (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). Horsell (2006) speaks about policy units aiming at addressing the needs of ‘identified groups’. As it is often stated that disability is a possible cause of social exclusion (Bowring, 2000), individuals facing social exclusion are dealt with as a category with the aim of achieving a uniform approach to tackle inequality (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). However, this leads to ignoring the strong biographical connotation of social exclusion as a personal experience (Béland, 2007) and reinforces stereotypes (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). With regard to the ISA, Ben-Moshe and Powell (2007) argue that while the symbol tries to follow ‘inclusive’ aims, it is also characterised by exclusionary facets due to an incomplete representation of other individuals with different impairments. Following this argument, social exclusion is based on the assumption of homogeneity (Koller and Davidson, 2008). This reduces the multitude of
inequalities of those individuals that are labelled as ‘socially excluded’ by offering a simple dichotomy of excluded/ included (Horsell, 2006). Hence, injustice is the result of the establishment of binary classification systems that reduce the complexity of lived realities and experiences (Fraser, 2007).

Third, the report criticises and locates the external causes for social exclusion within the failure of educational and social instances, such as career services. Based on these three factors, it is concluded that ‘Bridging the Gap’ attempts to address structural problems through a strongly individualistic approach, as individuals are blamed for their situation, while at the same time, leaving educational and social instances no real choice to implement individual cures given a tight prescriptive structural framework. In other words, agency-focused intervention is undermined by regulatory government targets which disallow for the identification of the actual needs of oppressed individuals (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). In this context, the concept of social exclusion becomes malleable (Koller and Davidson, 2008, Horsell, 2006). It allows policy makers to set targets and establish indicators in order to be able to measure the quantifiable progress in reducing social exclusion. Discourse recipients, for example voluntary groups, are held responsible for action based on models and agendas set by the government (Koller and Davidson, 2008). Hence, groups employed within social services are pushed to act as entrepreneurial agents without questioning the value system that works based on predetermined principles and norms (Fisher, 2007). Differently expressed, institutions are regulating access back to the inside based on pre-defined norms (Vobruba, 2000). This might obscure certain needs that are not compatible with the dominant norms of society and its institutions (Bowring, 2000). Supporting this argument, Vobruba (2000) argues that dimensions selected depend on the institutional conditions in each country, which in turn prevents the incorporation of dimensions that are important to the individuals affected. Hence, Colley and Hodkinson (2001) argue that this approach is counter-productive and the outcome is likely to “closing the door” instead of “bridging the gap” (p.355).

Supporting this argument, Béland (2007) argues that social exclusion is used as an ideological tool and Koller and Davidson (2008) assert that its use allows action to be directed at objects that can be manipulated. It is a form of governance that reproduces dominant representations as the producers of the discourse of social exclusion become “problem-solvers who ‘tackle’ the now
tangible ‘social exclusion’ by policies” (p.309), hereby reifying ideological models of society. Therefore, the use of social exclusion leads to the establishment of new categories of ‘problem people’ which determine social relations between groups. Importantly, power among discourse participants are distributed unequally, which reinforces social inequality. Individuals and groups with less power to express their counter-discourses remain marginalised (Koller and Davidson, 2008). By examining ways on how to conceptualise enabling care, Fisher (2007) found that counter-discourses of parents of disabled children are necessary to develop different patterns of meaning that pose a challenge to existing boundaries that define normality.

These arguments link back to the debate on power and knowledge. The use of the concept of social exclusion could potentially be regarded as disciplinary power. In this case, power is carried out intentionally without any specific agent (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005). Using a Foucauldian analysis, Horsell (2006) claims that it is important to understand the taken for granted assumptions inherent in concepts like exclusion. The underlying social relations of power produce social groupings and an investigation of their heterogeneity is neglected (Horsell, 2006). In line with these thoughts, it can be argued that it is particularly the establishment of classifications and categories of ‘problem people’ (Koller and Davidson, 2008) that places certain groups and individuals under continuous surveillance and consequently turns them into objects of power/ knowledge (Foucault, 1991). When relating this understanding to the inclusion/exclusion debate within the area of welfare and policy discourses, it is recognisable that the emphasis shifts away from politics of needs interpretation to politics of control, subjectification and discipline (Horsell, 2006). Related to this, discourses become a site of power in which subjects are constituted by power relations (Horsell, 2006).

Koller and Davidson (2008) assert that the term ‘exclusion’ is used to divide society into a simplified model of two sides, thereby giving less attention to the causal relations. Foucault, however, would argue that instead of focusing on cause-effect relations, it is more important to look into the complexity and contingency to see how power is dispersed throughout the whole society (Mills, 2003). Denying the concept of the state representing a “super-human agent” (Mills, 2003, p.49), Foucault called for unravelling the complexity of the notion of the state. With regard to the social exclusion debate, not only political instances and different Cabinet offices are involved but also other professionals, educational and social instances, which all have
their own aims and agendas, leading to the existence of a multiplicity of agencies involved in the relations of power.

However, what all these instances have in common is that they represent so-called experts of social exclusion. The knowledge or the experiences of those individuals that are objects of the social exclusion investigation are usually omitted. In case, their voices are embraced, they are reconstructed through an expert gaze (Horsell, 2006). Although not explicitly referring to social exclusion but building a similar argument, Watson (2000) criticises that homelessness is defined by objective criteria and fixed categories instead of paying attention to subjective experiences. Using the power/knowledge framework, it can be argued that by privileging expert knowledge, certain individuals and groups gain even greater power to impose further surveillance techniques on objects of exclusion (Horsell, 2006). It is particular during periods of social change that individuals are turned into objects of change, denying possibilities for agency (Frost and Hoggett, 2008). Vobruba (2000) highlights that if individual perceptions of social exclusion were allowed, people would become actors instead of passive victims. This in turn, would provide the basis for political interventions instead of regarding standards of ‘normality’ as an inappropriate base for change (Vobruba, 2000).

By looking at the implications for social workers, Horsell (2006) argues that possibilities for change exist as society offers space for negotiation. Therefore, counter-discourses need to be created that endorse client knowledge to challenge official versions and constructions, which would endow individuals with greater agency in society. Related to the object/subject debate, Bowring (2000) states that individuals that have been reduced to objects cannot escape the “grid of objectification” (p.317) by conforming to normalised values. Hence, it is only through resistance to these normalised practices and challenges to dominant models that creates the subject. This provides the values, practices and patterns of integration (Bowring, 2000).

Based on these arguments, the notion of agency appears to be a central concept within the social exclusion debate. Although Foucault outlined the possibility of resistance through the establishment of counter-discourses, he places this resistance within power structures and rejects the concept of freedom of agency of the oppressed (Mills, 2003). As the oppressed have limited opportunities to formulate counter-discourses, Koller and Davidson (2008) argue that the use of
social exclusion as a metaphor subsequently masks agency, denies difference and ignores responsibility. The deletion of the agent is regarded as advantage for discourse producers, as they do not need to engage in the complexity of causes leading to inequality. However, resulting from this process, heterogeneity is reduced and ‘the excluded’ are regarded as victims (Koller and Davidson, 2008, Colley and Hodkinson, 2001). Related to the disability, the victim-blaming approach is a predominant feature of the medical model of disability. While the social model tried to move away from the victim-centred approach, equalling disability with social exclusion might have a similar effect as heterogeneity and agency is denied by establishing a collective disability identity, leaving out any intrapersonal perceptions.

While Colley and Hodkinson (2001) and Koller and Davidson (2008) offer a critical debate, arguing that genuine agency is dismissed through the establishment of broad generalisations, the authors neglect to provide potential solutions on how to move away from categorised identities. By establishing fixed boundaries for social inclusion, a large number of people are marginalised who “live partly different lives and hold partly different values or priorities” (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001, p.354). Particularly looking at homelessness and social exclusion, Horsell (2006) claims that social exclusion, which is used as a tool for policy intervention, has predominantly a rhetoric intention and obscures lived experiences and subjectivities. This is further supported by Murray’s (2002) study, highlighting that many young disabled people were frustrated by the gap between rhetoric and their experience of exclusion. This leads to questioning how subjective experiences can be incorporated into policy discourses and what would be potential effects of that integration (Watson, 2000).

In an attempt to provide an answer to these questions, Watson (2000) argues that dominant discourses of society have to be challenged through resistances at the local level. These resistances may take up various forms and could involve contesting the representations of particular subjects (Watson, 2000). In a similar vein, Horsell (2006) argues that expert knowledge that has informed policy needs to be challenged in order to move away from fixed identities. As the social exclusion discourse has not been able to account for individuals’ experiences of inequality, a greater emphasis needs to be placed on incorporating subjectivities which relates to people’s own understanding of concepts such as exclusion (Horsell, 2006). What is needed is the acknowledgement of “multiple, overlapping memberships, with correspondingly
multiple sources of identity, multiple sources of claims and multiple places to lodge them” (Goodin, 1996, p.363).

Whereas it was highlighted earlier that the social exclusion debate related to disability often neglects to account for intrapersonal dimensions, this section critically discussed whether the concept of social exclusion allows for individual agency. The question of agency was addressed alongside the use of ‘disability’ as identity category, which overlooks different individual experiences of social exclusion. Instead, precedence is given to a narrow structural framework based on pre-determined principles and norms. As a result, the use of social exclusion leads to the establishment of new categories in which individuals become objects for manipulation. This links back to the power/ knowledge debate related to identity positions, as individuals become objects of surveillance and politics of control under an ‘expert’ gaze. Hence, the discourse of social exclusion becomes a site of power in which subjects are categorised, which diminishes opportunities to formulate counter-discourses and genuine agency. Koller and Davidson (2008) go as far as referring to social exclusion as an actor, which deny any voices or subjectivities from the ‘outside’, accentuating that social exclusion contains inherent performative power (Koller and Davidson, 2008). In line with these arguments, a performative framework can assist the disability debate for re-conceptualising social exclusion, which is outlined next.

4.6 A Performative Framework for Social Exclusion and Disability

By analysing social exclusion, the preceding section has shown that the concept relies on the inclusion/exclusion dichotomy. Particularly this dualistic thinking creates a field of power which leads to the categorisation of individuals. Similar to the social model, the concept of social exclusion ignores individuality, heterogeneity and diversity as seen by the lack of attention paid to intrapersonal relations. In a tentative way, both the social model and the discourse of social exclusion can be seen as related. The social model creates the category of disability as collective identity, strongly related to the aim to pursue identity politics. This then allows discourse producers of social exclusion to direct action at this group. Individuals become objects of control, rather than individuals with the opportunity for agency. Hence, bodies are marked out by discourses that draw attention to difference. It is this particular process that positions and labels individuals and groups as ‘other’.
Since disability and social exclusion are both connected through the act of delineating difference, a multi-layered investigation into knowledge/ power related to identity construction is required. As both discourses reduce the complexity of lived realities and experiences through the establishment of binary approaches such as impairment/ disability and inclusion/ exclusion, this research follows Holt (2008) accentuating that key dualisms need to be dismantled to better understand embodied identities. It is anticipated that a performative framework can assist in achieving this aim. Recalling that performativity requires investigations into how certain phenomena are understood and the effect that this understanding has on individuals, two main reasons can be outlined that demonstrate how a performative framework assists the disability debate for re-conceptualising social exclusion.

First, a performative framework questions all dichotomies as they ignore lived experience and subjectivities. However, a performative framework does not over-emphasise phenomenological accounts, but instead builds on identity related to power/ knowledge. This enables an improved understanding of disability as an embodied, yet relational identity position, where bodies are inscribed within discourses. As disability is ‘performed’, leading to the recognition of multiple identity positions, an essentialist disability identity category does not exist (Holt, 2007). This leads to questioning the collective identity approach upheld by the social model. Central to applying a performative analysis to disability is reaching an understanding what social exclusion means to different individuals with a disability, while at the same time investigating social relations of power. It is anticipated that this assists in re-conceptualising social exclusion in tourism, which is the aim of chapter seven.

Second, a performative framework emphasises the importance of context and space for different identity performances (Holt, 2007). Specific to tourism, the notion of performing places highlights the process-based nature of a performative approach with “multidimensional views of performances in place” (Coleman and Crang, 2002, p.12). Also Mordue (2001), referring to Edensor (2000), emphasises the dynamic value of performances for analyses in tourism. Related to disability, it is particularly the importance placed on multiple identities that does not only highlight different effects of social exclusion but also allows for different responses to social exclusion. In line with Holt (2007), dominant and marginalised representations can either be reproduced or transformed. By considering the reproduction aspect, negative representations,
such as being categorised as socially excluded, are discursive messages that can (sub)consciously be internalised (Holt, 2007). In contrast, transformation relates to the act of resistance through, for example, challenging norms (Holt, 2007). In line with earlier discussions, resistance is established through counter-discourses in which dominant discourses and representations are contested (Watson, 2000). The resistance to normalised practices creates the subject (Bowring, 2000), which in turn questions the expert knowledge of fixed identities (Horsell, 2006).

By analysing how children reproduce or alternatively transform disability in relation to exclusion, negative representations and stigmatisation, Holt (2007) claims that children never experience long periods of total exclusion. Although not explicitly referring to a performance approach, also Shildrick (2005) states that disability is best understood as a fluctuation between integration and exclusion. In relation to this, Holt (2008) argues that further investigations are needed to understand how dominant and marginalised identity positions and multiple forms of inclusion and exclusion are (re)produced. Following this claim and given the context-specific underpinnings of the performative framework, chapter eight of this study investigates how disabled individuals reproduce marginalised identity positions, or contrarily, transform or deconstruct ‘norms’ of disability and social exclusion in tourism.

Overall, a performative framework can assist social policy concerns. Currently, social exclusion is transformed into a state, leaving no agency to individuals (Koller and Davidson, 2008). In contrast, a performativity approach allows for a process-based thinking. By highlighting socio-cultural processes of inequality instead of a fixed state (social exclusion) or collective identities (disability), the social model could hence potentially benefit from incorporating a notion of disability that is relational and dynamic. Important hereby is the recognition of subjective, individual experiences and the identification when and where negative representations of disability are reproduced and where and when they are transformed, offering the possibility to direct social policy actions to the situations where negative representations still prevail.

4.7 Summary

This chapter has provided a discussion related to the current understanding and conceptualisation of social exclusion. The historical review highlighted that the concept originated in the field of social policy and political discourses. However, different countries adopted the term in different
ways, resulting in multiple definitions with little agreement on what constitutes social exclusion. Three paradigms of social exclusion have been introduced, which led to the recognition of the importance of the relational character of social exclusion. After contrasting the relational claims with distributional aspects, the chapter identified and discussed institutional, interpersonal and intrapersonal relations, which reflect the current thinking in social policy.

Consequently this understanding was compared to disability and tourism. The comparison led to the recognition that the role of poverty within tourism and disability studies remains ambiguous, coinciding with economic barriers to tourism participation faced by disabled individuals. Interpersonal relations related to stigma, discrimination, stereotypes and norms were found to be linked to environmental exclusion as space is created based on the norms of the able-bodied population. While tourism and disability studies emphasise the crucial role of attitudinal barriers, limited attention is paid to outlining negotiation strategies to resist normative assumptions. With regard to institutional relations, it was shown that while rights remain at the core of the disability debate, limited evidence can be found that an approach based on rights leads to successfully overcoming exclusion. Furthermore, the rights perspective causes difficulties as tourism and travel interests are too diverse to make their satisfaction a right of citizenship.

Most importantly, individual perceptions of social exclusion, which relate to the intrapersonal dimension, represent a neglected area not only in social policy but also by examining research dealing with social exclusion in disability and tourism studies. As a result, the heterogeneity of social exclusion is ignored, which in turn leads to broad generalisations. Related to this, it is claimed that relational aspects linked to identity and social power need to be incorporated into the social exclusion debate.

By examining the importance of social power, the distinction between the conceptual and grammatical use of the metaphor of social exclusion led to the realisation of two aspects. First, the concept of social exclusion establishes a space-related normative framework for marking differences based on an inside/outside dichotomy. Second, the spatial separation establishes new categories of 'problem' people, formulating the proposition that individuals are agents of their own exclusion due to their 'deficient' characteristics. As part of this process, individuals become objects for manipulation and are placed under surveillance and politics of control. All of the
above indicates that the discourse of social exclusion becomes a site of power in which subjects are categorised, denying agency for individuals.

The chapter concluded by outlining the reasons for applying a performative framework to social exclusion and disability. At its core, a performative framework stresses that binary approaches, such as impairment/disability and inclusion/exclusion, which are upheld by discourses on disability and social exclusion, reduce the complexity of lived realities. Both discourses disallow for subjectivities, indicating their intrinsic performative power. While critics of the social model have outlined deficiencies in terms of failing to incorporate the heterogeneity and multiplicity of identities as well as subjective knowledge deriving from embodied experiences, only a few studies have applied a performative perspective, which questions the collective identity upheld by the social model. Similarly, the current approach to social exclusion also follows a categorical approach, allowing action to be directed at individuals, hereby ignoring diversity and denying agency. However, by moving intrapersonal relations to the forefront of the debate would move beyond categorical approaches to social exclusion.

As a performative approach highlights the importance of different contexts, it provides the opportunity to recognise the existence of multiple identities. The contextual analysis requires an understanding of the circumstances under which negative and marginalised identity positions are either reproduced or alternatively transformed. The insights gained can potentially be used to re-define the current understanding of disability and to improve approaches in social policy related to social exclusion. The application of a performative framework also brings changes to the methodological base of the research, which is discussed next.
5.1 Introduction

It is recognised that recent tourism studies have endeavoured to reach a better understanding of the lived experiences of individuals (Humberstone, 2004). Equally for this study, it is highlighted that lived experiences of social exclusion by disabled individuals are crucial to avoid generalisations and to draw attention to the heterogeneity of forms of exclusion. This can lead to an improved understanding as part of a meaning-making process. According to Krauss (2005), meaning derives from, or is given to, by a person based on events and experiences. However, this is not a static process. Instead, “experiencing starts to make sense as the person performs his or her psychological functioning of translating it into how he or she thinks and feels” (p.763) (emphasis added). Hence, the performance of an experience leads to meaning (Chen, 2001), highlighting the centrality of performative elements that this research embraces.

As meaning derives from subjective experiences (Krauss, 2005), a key challenge is to bridge the gap between meaning and meaning making, drawing attention to the interpretation of knowledge, hereby scrutinising the role of the researcher. Central is the notion of subjectivity which forms the basis for the construction of meaning (Chen, 2001). However, this does not happen in a vacuum but is influenced by various societal and cultural settings, personal and interpersonal contexts as well as environmental dimensions (Chen, 2001).

In order to deal with the challenges related to meaning making, this chapter offers an in-depth investigation into the epistemological, ontological and methodological aspects as these elements determine how research is conducted (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). While Guba (1990) argues that the distinction between quantitative and qualitative approaches is not a paradigmatic consideration, Krauss (2005) opposes this view by stating that the quantitative-qualitative debate is embedded in a philosophical context as assumptions about the nature of reality ultimately determine the design of any study. Given this argument, a discussion on quantitative and qualitative perspectives is included in the section on positivism as it is acknowledged that this paradigm mainly employs quantitative methods (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004). Scholars opt
for different approaches in terms of being committed to qualitative and/or quantitative research as they follow different paradigms (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

Before introducing different paradigms, which are subsequently applied to the topic of this research, the term ‘paradigm’ is discussed at a holistic level to clarify not only its meaning but also the purpose and importance of a chapter on paradigms as part of the research process. The chapter concludes by outlining the dual-paradigmatic framework adopted for this study.

5.2 Research Paradigms

A number of researchers agree that the term ‘paradigm’ is difficult to define and remains a controversial concept (Guba, 1990, Phillips, 1990, Hollinshead, 1996). Looking at its elements, ontology raises crucial questions about the nature of reality (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004; Hollinshead, 2004), while epistemology provides insights into the relationship between the knower (the inquirer) and the known (or knowable) (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004, Guba, 1990). Influenced by ontology and epistemology are methodological considerations which refer to operational practices, guiding the choice of methods. Further, apart from delineating the overall research strategy, limitations can be outlined (Wijesinghe, 2009).

Kemmis and McTaggart (2005) emphasise that reflecting on what ‘practice is’ and what is meant by ‘knowing a practice’, researchers openly expose their opinion of ‘seeing practice’. In this context, a paradigm is the first step to understand what inquiry is and how it is to be practiced, highlighting sets of beliefs and values that guide the researcher’s inquiry (Guba, 1990), which is important for any research (Wijesinghe, 2009). While Denzin and Lincoln (2005) acknowledge that the boundaries between different paradigms have become increasingly blurred, Henderson and Bedini (1995) claim that researchers who have adopted an interpretive position cannot use quantitative methods as this would represent a violation against their basic underlying beliefs.

Related to this, Guba (1990) clarifies that all paradigms offer alternatives, stressing that the paradigm debate is not about primacy or superiority. This is supported by Phillips (1990) underlining that paradigms “serve as lenses, not as blinders” (p.41). The specific paradigm adopted depends on the researcher’s ontological, epistemological and methodological stance (Guba, 1990), indicating that researchers respond with different approaches (Hollinshead, 1996).
Research is considered as useful when there is a strong match between the researcher's worldview, research questions and methods (Henderson and Bedini, 1995). Differently expressed, paradigms are chosen for specific purposes, reflecting researchers' needs, images, understanding and interpretation of the world or the phenomenon under analysis (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004). For example, some paradigms adopt questions investigating breadth, while others address aspects related to depth, such as analysing individuals' opinions of certain phenomena (Henderson and Bedini, 1995).

As a paradigm cannot be proven or disproven (Guba, 1990), the selection of a paradigm cannot be declared as either right or wrong per se. This is supported by Tribe (2001), emphasising that all paradigms provide different avenues for doing things, leading to different approaches to methods and subsequent practices. A paradigm can hence be seen as something that is shared by members of a scientific community and it is the responsibility of the researcher of any given community to outline the research specialities and adopted techniques (Kuhn, 1977). Researchers need to carefully evaluate which paradigm is likely to lead to more complete representations when compared to other paradigms (Kuhn, 1970 as cited in Zahra, 2009). These different responses need to be accommodated as there is no single approach to inquiry with a 'perfect' outcome and no single 'right' answer (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004).

Thus, all research can be regarded as contested and methodological choices represent political acts (Hollinshead, 2004, Guba and Lincoln, 1989, Cousins, 2002). Morrow (2007) underlines this argument by stressing that certain paradigms dominate over others and/ or receive greater support in terms of what counts as science, what gets published or funded. Related to this, a paradigm can represent a source of power in itself as it sets the acceptable boundaries for any research, which impacts on the knowledge creation process. Hence, once rules belonging to a paradigm are established, they determine what is acceptable in terms of knowledge creation (Tribe, 2006). However, it has to be recognised that truth cannot be established by objective criteria only but depends on the agreement within scientific communities. As researchers have the power to choose between paradigms, subjective perspectives play a role in the pursuit of conducting research (Kuhn, 1962). While Tribe (2006) argues that researchers “should seek to speak truth 'of' power” (p.377), highlighting the need to disclose power elements within research, Said (1994) refers to speaking the truth 'to' power (Said, 1994), meaning that:
‘it is carefully weighting the alternatives, picking the right one, and then intellectually representing it where it can do the most good and cause the right change’ (Said, 1994, p.75)

In line with Said’s quote, the following sections examine different paradigmatic alternatives. As a paradigm clarifies what lies within and outside the researcher’s inquiry (Guba, 1990; Goodson and Philimore, 2004) and exploring differences among paradigms is a philosophical exercise (Krauss, 2005), the aim of discussing paradigms is to highlight the researcher’s belief and values and to achieve a strong match between the researcher’s worldviews, research questions and methods. Furthermore, it is endeavoured to follow paradigmatic assumptions that allow gaining a suitable representation for investigating the phenomenon of social exclusion.

While categories might over-simplify the diversity and complexity of each paradigmatic approach (Morrow, 2007), five paradigmatic categories are discussed related to the theoretical constructs used in this study, as the focus should be on the phenomenon studied and not the paradigm itself (Zahra, 2009). In addition, the notions of value, reflexivity, power and truth run as continuous themes throughout the discussion of different paradigms.

5.3 Positivism

Positivism is embedded in a realist ontology, strongly related to the belief that there is one reality which can be predicted and controlled by laws and mechanisms, building on cause-effect relationships (Henderson and Bedini, 1995, Guba, 1990). This assumes that truth can be obtained (Krauss, 2005) as reality is not only fully understandable but also replicable based on objective inquiry mechanisms (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002). Current research into social exclusion seems to follow the realist ontological claim of positivists, focusing on investigating what ‘causes’ social exclusion and what is the ‘effect’ or outcome of it. For example, causes are identified as becoming vulnerable to a process leading to marginalisation (Cars et al., 1999). Other research emphasises the effect or outcome of social exclusion (Burchardt et al., 1999, Silver, 1994, Silver and Miller, 2003, Barry, 1998) and numerous studies focus on both, cause and effect (Sehgal and Edwards, 1999, Berghman, 1995, Kenyon et al., 2002). Related to disability, it is argued that disability is an effect of social exclusion (Hughes and Paterson, 1997).
The positivist paradigm relies on an objective epistemology, regarding the researcher as value-free, neutral and in a non-interactive position (Guba, 1990; Goodson and Phillimore, 2004). As the researcher can be replaced without having an impact on the findings (Tribe, 2001), methodological considerations are based on deductive approaches focusing on hypothesis stating and empirical testing (Zahra and Ryan, 2005, Guba, 1990). As such, positivism serves technical purposes (Tribe, 2004), in which questions are formulated in advance and then tested (Guba, 1990), often associated with quantitative approaches (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004, Tribe, 2001). Quantitative methodologies claim to produce reliable and valid knowledge by using scientific and statistical methods as well as by showing causal relationships between variables or indicators (Walle, 1997, Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

While it is anticipated that the measurement of social exclusion is complicated (Collins and Kay, 2003) and despite differences in the approaches adopted (Jermyn, 2001), a review of studies which deal with social exclusion, show that predominantly quantitative methodologies have been employed. These studies make use of different sets of indicators or variables, with pre-stated questions, as common for positivist methodologies (Guba, 1990). For example, social exclusion is measured based on indicators linked to income as part of European Community Household Panels (ECHP) (Guio, 2005), indicating which countries are below the relative threshold of income poverty (Zajczyk, 1995, Barnes et al., 2002).

Similar to the ECHP, Burchardt et al. (1999) analyse social exclusion in English seaside resorts, by using the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), taking quantitative data from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS). By emphasising the importance of indicators, the IMD is said to provide the most suitable basis to investigate the occurrence, nature and extent of social exclusion (Agarwal and Brunt, 2006). Advantages for using household surveys include that the duration of exclusion can be taken into account. Single indexes also aggregate data easily for examining large geographical areas (Byrne, 2005), evident also in studies that use accessibility measures as index of exclusion (Casas, 2007). However, it can be argued that measurements based on household panels neglect other forms of social exclusion that cannot be easily quantified. For example, social questions are under-represented, which is surprising particularly since relational aspects are at the core of the debate (Room, 1995c). While there is a lack of agreement on social dimensions, indicators for economic dimensions, such as income, are
acceded in a more unproblematic manner (Silver and Miller, 2003). This coincides with tourism research, which followed the dominant positivist paradigm possibly because of the economically-driven focus to quantify aspects of this industry (Riley and Love, 2000).

Ayikoru (2009) acknowledges that quantitative, positivist approaches are valuable for some areas in tourism research. Specific to social exclusion, levels of access can be determined by a set of parameters, however, quality of access has to be analysed beyond the measurable proxies of these parameters (Grieco, 2003). Important here is the people-based approach to examine individual life experiences (Miller, 2003), which stands in contrast to the category-approach, focusing on patterns of particular social groups (Church et al., 2000). While group comparisons generate prototypical classifications of category memberships (Byrne, 2005), it can be argued that these classifications are the origin of social exclusion. While the people-based approach contains limitations due to its individualist fallacy, ignoring external influences (Miller, 2003), the category-approach can be criticised as it considers social groups as homogenous, focusing on one particular element of social identity, for example disability.

These arguments are related to the development of tourist typologies, central to positivism. However, typologies fall short in explaining the range and diversity of tourism experiences (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). Hence, the complexities of tourism interactions cannot be captured by the positivist paradigm as little attention is paid to variations in social categories such as class, ethnicity, gender, sexuality and disability (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). Also, Zahra (2009) claims that a positivist stance is too reductionist as it fails to account for historical and political aspects. Hence, certain areas of social inquiry require a different paradigmatic base and positivist claims with regard to predictability need to be treated with some scepticism due to the complexity of beliefs, attitudes and value systems (Ayikoru, 2009).

5.3.1 Overcoming Quantitative Tenets of Positivism?

Examining social exclusion under a positivist lens reveals a number of advantages and disadvantages. Among the advantages, the use of indicators allows for insights into the economic dimension of social exclusion, focusing on the outcome such as people with disabilities living in poverty. However, limitations exists as the realist ontology denies accounting for the complexity of social exclusion and works against more flexible conceptualisations of identities related to the
diversity of experiences. Specific to disability, a positivist ontology, relying on context-free
generalisations (Guba, 1990) is regarded as problematic. Instead, a deeper understanding of the
factors that contribute to experiences of disability is needed (French and Swain, 2006).

An objective epistemology, evident in the survey approaches to investigate social exclusion,
highlights the distant position taken by researchers. However, individuals who are subject to
social exclusion are often under-represented in mainstream surveys as they may not have access
to or may not be confident in using the ‘traditional’ channels of mainstream surveys (Clifton,
2003). Hence, it is crucial to work together with excluded individuals (Social Exclusion Unit,
1997b), which requires a shift towards a subjective epistemological base and a methodology
based on dialogue, where the personal contact between the researcher and individuals is
important (Clifton, 2003).

In addition, pre-formulated questions in household surveys might be deemed as inappropriate to
investigate people’s actual experiences. Instead, attention needs to be paid to what socially
excluded individuals have to say (Social Exclusion Unit, 1997b), which points towards adopting
a methodology that is dialogical. Byrne (2005) refers to this process as a programme of
empowerment as it allows those who perceive themselves as excluded to participate in a
transformative way. Particularly the relationships between individuals and social entities uncover
important social processes, emphasising that “social exclusion is something that is done by some
people to other people” (Byrne, 2005, p.2). It prompts society to focus less on tangible aspects
such as income in order to understand processes of risk, vulnerability, lack of choice and
powerlessness (Byrne, 2005). Therefore, it is argued that social exclusion needs to be examined
by focusing extensively on people’s actual experiences and aspirations with regard to social
participation in travel choices and daily activities, which requires revising traditional analytical
methods (Lyons, 2003). In this context, Cars et al. (1999) stress the need to develop
methodological procedures that combine quantitative with qualitative assessments, while others
call for intensified research using qualitative data (Clifton, 2003). Particularly when investigating
tourist experiences, studies have shifted towards qualitative methodologies, focusing on reaching
an understanding of peoples’ endogenous experiences (McCabe and Stokoe, 2009).
The arguments above show that adopting a positivist position based on quantitative procedures for the questions of this study would be in danger of oversimplifying reality, hence failing to capture social life in all its complexities (Walle, 1997). Thus, this research moves away from a positivist stance and employs a qualitative approach due to the following reasons. Instead of studying causal relationships, qualitative approaches stress processes and meanings as well as 'how' social experience is created by investigating the constraints of everyday life (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). This provides the basis for contributing to social change (Morrow, 2007). Krauss (2005) succinctly summarises this argument by stating that the ultimate goal of qualitative research is to facilitate meaning-making to get to know “how members define for themselves a given problematic topic” (p.766). As such, qualitative research provides in-depth knowledge of a particular phenomenon (Morrow, 2007), investigating the lived experiences of individuals (Wagle and Cantaffa, 2008) to understand individual perceptions of social exclusion (Byrne, 2005). This assists in uncovering multiple experiences of disabled people instead of regarding them as a homogenous social category, providing rich descriptions of social experiences (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Particularly these descriptions are important for an inductive approach to theorise social exclusion experienced by disabled individuals. Furthermore, related to rhetoric, while quantitative research accentuates an objective language (Morrow, 2007), using numerical statements as basis for rhetorical power (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002), the language of qualitative research allows for greater subjectivity (Morrow, 2007). The following paradigms have been more commonly employed within qualitative research (Cresswell, 2007).

5.4 Postpositivism

Postpositivism can be regarded as a successor of positivism (Guba, 1990) as voices of critique came from within the positivist tradition (Ayikoru, 2009). There has been a realisation that the link between scientific theories and evidence is more problematic than originally anticipated (Phillips, 1990). Hence, postpositivism moves towards a ‘critical’ realist ontological perspective. Although realism remains at the centre, it is recognised that reality cannot entirely be captured (Guba and Lincoln, 2005, Guba, 1990). This could be beneficial for the social exclusion debate as it leaves room for the recognition of multiple dimensions of social exclusion. Following Cresswell (2007), a critical realist ontology would stress multiple perspectives of social exclusion, instead of highlighting only one, possibly related to poverty.
However, it is questionable how these multiple perspectives can be accommodated within an objectivist epistemology as the ontological change did not have an effect on epistemological and methodological underpinnings when compared to positivism (Ayikoru, 2009). Postpositivist researchers still aim to be as neutral as possible by adopting a modified objective stance (Guba, 1990, Guba and Lincoln, 2005). Hence, objectivity remains a desirable ideal (Phillips, 1990) with the critical community as central to ensure that findings are in line with the tradition (Guba, 1990, Ayikoru, 2009). This is reflected in the methodological base comprising critical pluralism using a variety of triangulations (Guba, 1990) with the aim to ensure rigor and avoid distorted interpretations (Cresswell, 2007). Particularly the denial to account for the researcher's influence leads to assuming that not only positivism neglects to account for ethical considerations (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, Tribe, 2001, Cousins, 2002), but so does postpositivism.

5.4.1 Accounting for Values and Ethics?

According to Karnieli-Miller et al. (2009), axiological considerations, referring the role of values (Morrow, 2007, Cresswell, 2007) and ethics (Guba and Lincoln, 2005), have to be included into the paradigm debate. While some paradigms incorporate values as an integral part of the research (Morrow, 2007, Cresswell, 2007), positivist approaches rely on a value-free axiology, making a separation between the researcher's values, emotions, involvement and the research output (Ateljevic et al., 2005). This is also evident in postpositivist research, as the research output is presented in form of scientific reports (Cresswell, 2007), leaving out any values and involvement of the researcher. As such, researchers manage their subjectivity very carefully (Morrow, 2007), following principles of value neutrality (Guba, 1990, Guba and Lincoln, 2005, Tribe, 2001), with ethical considerations remaining extrinsic to the inquiry (Guba and Lincoln, 2005).

Given the exclusion of values and ethics from the research process, the aim is to avoid any biases so that findings can be replicated by following a specific set of procedures (Zahra and Ryan, 2005). However, the critical community, employed by postpositivist researchers, still comprises members within the ‘same’ tradition. It leaves out a number of people who have never been given the chance to contribute to the study (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Furthermore, triangulation relates to a form of scientific merit, in which the existing theories of a particular group of researchers are brought into play. This questions the position of neutrality as different value systems by different groups bring along different interpretations (Guba and Lincoln, 1989).
Particularly for social work practice, values and ethics play a crucial role (Butler et al., 2007). As social exclusion derives from social policy it is strongly linked to social work, which underscores the importance of values for this research. Specific to disability, values are crucial as it shapes the conclusion of any inquiry (Campbell Brown, 2001). Values and ethics are also regarded as central to this study as the choice of the topic and the approach taken has been decided by the researcher, indicating that the researcher’s values infiltrate the research process. Moreover, the topic is approached from an able-bodied perspective. This points towards the assumption that non-positivist paradigms might be more appropriate for this study as these account for values and ethics as an intrinsic element of the research (Guba and Lincoln, 2005).

However, while Cousins (2002) claims that the evolution of qualitative research is often seen as a search for truth and exploring ways how to report truth, Guba (1990) stresses that any new paradigm will not come closer to the concept of truth. This is supported by Kvale (2009), affirming that common to all types of knowledge is the recognition that truth cannot be guaranteed. Instead, knowledge creation strongly depends on the context (situated knowledge) and the relationship between the researchers and the researched-upon (produced knowledge). Particularly situated knowledge signals a shift away from claims of monumental truths (Feighery, 2006). Knowledge is declared as valid within a particular time and context, thereby denying truth in its ultimate form (Cousins, 2002). Also acknowledging that the entirety of truth can never be reached, Krauss (2005) accentuates that researchers engage in a transformative learning process, leading to continuously reaching new levels and forms of meaning, which can change perspectives and actions. Furthermore, Henderson and Bedini (1995) underscore that researchers need to outline how they define ‘truth’ and what it means for the research process.

5.5 Participatory/Cooperative

The participatory paradigm neither relies on a realist nor a relativist ontological stance but views reality as participatory and co-created. It is based on an epistemology that is subjective and transactional, with a strong emphasis placed on practical knowing (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). This practical perspective is strongly reflected in methodological assumptions and the supremacy of practical concerns is subsequently taken to the political arena (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). The main aim is to contribute to practical concerns of individuals (Rapoport, 1970) by developing
action agendas against oppression (Cresswell, 2007). Crucial here is the facilitation of a voice for marginalised individuals, which requires participants to cooperate and to be involved in all stages of the research process (Cresswell, 2007, Rapoport, 1970).

The participatory paradigm often employs action research with the aim to overcome deficiencies of positivist science (Susman and Evered, 1978), highlighting the need to focus on emancipation and empowerment (Belsky, 2004, Kitchin, 2000). Different practices emerged under the umbrella of action research (Waser and Johns, 2003). Specific to disability, Participatory Action Research (PAR) is identified as an empowering practice (Clear and Horsfall, 1997, Duckett and Fryer, 1998, Goodley and Lawthom, 2005, Kitchin, 2000, Taylor, 1999) as it is both participatory and action-oriented (Belsky, 2004). For example, the incorporation of disabled adults into investigations led to the development of action strategies to expand the user base for leisure recreation facilities (Pedlar et al., 1994). Similarly, participant-driven research led to the creation of neighbourhood tours conducted by individuals with learning difficulties (Duckett and Fryer, 1998). In line with these examples, disability studies highlight the usefulness of a participatory paradigm to incorporate the voices of disabled individuals and to prevent that disability research is dominated by able-bodied researchers (Gill, 2001), highlighting the potential in terms of empowerment, participation and facilitation.

5.5.1 Real Empowerment, Full Participation, Neutral Facilitation?

Taylor (1999) states, that it is not sufficient to equate empowerment with reporting the voice of disabled people. Instead a profound understanding of the reported experiences is needed related to wider social structures in order to combat oppressive structures with practical action. Thus, it is stressed that researchers should not overstate claims of empowerment (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005). Participatory research also offers possibilities for change related to individual power, authority and control (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005) as recommendations can be utilised in a non-academic sphere to reach a greater audience (Elden and Chisholm, 1993). This enables the wider disabled community, government bodies, voluntary agencies and service providers to act on the findings (Kitchin, 2000). However, claims to generate social change in practice are often technical and restrained (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005). One could argue that academic studies are merely interested in the research practice and not in the actual implementation of change as researchers return to their academic environments. As such, the
involvement terminates at the point of proposing recommendations (see for example Pedlar et al., 1994; Duckett and Fryer, 1998). This highlights dilemmas related to balancing academic goals of knowledge creation and practical requirements (Rapoport, 1970).

According to Kitchin (2000), research on disability is overwhelmingly tailored towards the research agendas of the able-bodied population. While able-bodied researchers seek to bring change for the disabled population, they reproduce unequal power relationships, which result in further oppression (Kerruish, 1995). Instead, disabled people should occupy 'expert' positions, offering individual experiences and practice-led information, while able-bodied researchers provide specialised skills and theory-led information (Kitchin, 2000). In this position, researchers provide discussions, while leaving the values to be acted upon to the participants themselves (Belsky, 2004). These arguments are often used to claim neutral facilitation. However, while able-bodied researchers might channel findings towards their own agenda, greater concern exists that individuals with different types of disabilities tailor the results towards their own interests:

"Because, you see again...certain self-interest groups within the disability field...would have a number of disabled people active within an organisation. And it [would be] a way for them to build their own empire" (Kitchin, 2000, p.40).

Hence, able-bodied researchers might have a more neutral position (Kitchin, 2000), dismantling the claim to neutral facilitation based on participatory research. Furthermore, claims to enable full participation need to be treated with scepticism as a fully balanced relationship is difficult to achieve. Kitchin (2000) stresses time constraints by disabled participants as major barrier. Also, no group of potential participants can be homogenous, which is likely to result in disagreement regarding key actions to be taken (Belsky, 2004). Hence, the development of an approach of full participation can never be completely fulfilled (Greenwood et al., 1993).

5.6 Interpretive Philosophy: Constructivism

In general, interpretivism seeks understanding of the world and meaning of experiences (Tribe, 2001, Cresswell, 2007), with qualitative research often being characterised as a site of multiple interpretive lines of approaches and practices (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, Hollinshead, 1996). Particularly the notion of multiple interpretive lines requires attention to be paid to different
interpretive communities. Constructivism is often combined with interpretivism (Cousins, 2002, Cresswell, 2007, Ayikoru, 2009). Both terms highlight that understanding derives from the lived experience, emphasising the way how individuals construct meaning (Ayikoru, 2009). Knowledge derives by interrogating the meaning that people attach to certain phenomena, highlighting the centrality of the people involved in the research (Cousins, 2002). Further, both terms focus on interpretation, which is necessary to understand how meaning is constructed by individuals (Ayikoru, 2009). Examinations into lived experiences often remain an under-researched field of study (Wijesinghe, 2009). The same can be argued for the social exclusion faced by disabled individuals as explorations into lived experiences are limited due to the over-reliance on positivist approaches.

Emphasising experiences, relativism underpins the ontological assumption of constructivism and is characterised by a process of identifying the development of identity constructs, outlining a range of realities that are socially constructed (Guba, 1990). Related to this study, the identity category of disability is regarded as constructed by and contains many different taken-for-granted meanings. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that a complete understanding of social exclusion cannot be reached, denying that there is a single reality (Small, 2004, Cousins, 2002). Instead, findings are context-specific (Guba, 1990) and bound to specific spaces over time (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004). This necessitates investigating the meaning that disabled people attach to the phenomenon of social exclusion. As a belief in multiple realities and meanings aims at examining the complexity of views rather than focusing on a number of categories (Cresswell, 2007), it is unlikely that this study establishes categories of exclusion. Instead, as outlined in section 1.4, the aim is to reach a better understanding of the complexity of social exclusion.

Moving away from an objectivist epistemology, constructivism is based on subjective meaning (Wijesinghe, 2009, Guba, 1990) and an interactive epistemology. Findings represent the result of the process between the researcher and the researched (Guba, 1990), similar to the participatory paradigm (Guba and Lincoln, 2005). As findings derive from interaction, the traditional boundary between ontology and epistemology becomes increasingly blurred (Ayikoru, 2009, Wijesinghe, 2009). This is because what is to be known and the process of how someone gets to know something is a social construction (Small, 2004).
While (post)positivist inquiries mainly draw on deductive approaches, constructivist research is entirely based on inductive approaches with the aim to reach theoretical understanding (Cresswell, 2007). Thus, the methodological base for any constructivist inquiry concentrates on hermeneutics and dialectics. Hermeneutics is defined as the theory and practice of interpretive work (Wijesinghe, 2009 citing van Manen, 1990). As experiences can never be captured without hermeneutical work (Wijesinghe, 2009), it is impossible to derive at ‘facts’ of experiences. It is not the objective reality that is claimed to be presented but a representation of it. It is a transformation of a particular experience because descriptions of lived experience are never identical to the experience itself (Wijesinghe, 2009). Consequently, knowledge and meaning are intrinsically linked to interpretation processes (Cousins, 2002, Kvale, 2009). Central to interpretation is that the researcher’s voice is one among many (Jamal and Hollinshead, 2001), which draws attention to dialectical aspects, comparing experiences between inquired individuals and the researcher (Guba, 1990). As interpretation is shaped by values and prior understanding (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005), the link to aspects of power becomes evident.

5.6.1 Interpretation and Power

Participants hold the greatest power in the data collection and research setting process (Karnieli-Miller et al., 2009), whereas the researcher has more power in deciding on methods (Hollinshead, 2004) and guiding the data analysis (Karnieli-Miller et al., 2009). Particularly the data interpretation stage makes investigators more powerful through the control over people’s stories (Jordan and Gibson, 2004, Aitchison, 2005, Butler et al., 2007). Here, individuals are turned from subjects into objects of research (Guba and Lincoln, 1989) and their stories are retold in a different context (Karnieli-Miller et al., 2009, Tribe, 2006).

Important in this context is the awareness that all processes of producing knowledge, when someone speaks on behalf of somebody else, needs to be interrogated (Hollinshead, 2002). Specific to disability, references are made to research ‘for’ and ‘of’ disabled people (Kitchin, 2000). ‘Speaking for’ someone else has been criticised as those efforts are said to never result in objective elaborations (Ateljevic et al., 2005). ‘Speaking for’ someone else has been criticised as those efforts are said to never result in objective elaborations (Ateljevic et al., 2005). However, Hooks (1990) argues that greater solidarity with regard to representation issues is required. As all experiences represent concrete practices that may influence other experiences, censorship with regard to who is allowed to write
for whom, is in fact counter-productive. Instead, what is needed is a general willingness to accommodate different experiences (Hooks, 1990). This is supported by Campbell Brown (2001), highlighting succinctly that disability studies claim that their investigations are based on society as a whole, which consequently necessitates the incorporation of able-bodied individuals. In addition, a constructivist position emphasises that everyone can be a ‘knower’ (Small, 2004).

Nonetheless, researchers need to provide an account in terms of who controls which stage of the process and how hierarchies are build, maintained and changed (Swain, 2004), hereby paying attention to the details of the interpretation process of experiences (Cresswell, 2007, Goodson and Phillimore, 2004, Jordan, 2004 cited in Aitchison, 2005). Researchers have to explain how their philosophy translates into applying hermeneutic research (Wijesinghe, 2009). Often, however, interpretive researchers fail to justify why and how their qualitative approaches are sound (Decrop, 1999). Interpretivists have responded to this criticism by establishing different truth criteria embracing transparency (Tribe, 2006), incorporating values and ethics and recognising the subjective and human aspects in the pursuit of doing research (Tribe, 2001).

As the value system of the researcher drives the decision which topic is worth investigating (Cousins, 2002), the choice of particular methods (Henderson and Bedini, 1995), the questions asked and the overall conclusion of the research (Zahra and Ryan, 2005, Cresswell, 2007), researchers are not value-free as all research output is influenced by their background (Gibbs, 2009, Cousins, 2002, Tribe, 2006, Wijesinghe, 2009). Hence, their work does not reach legitimacy per se. The only way to achieve legitimacy is by engaging in self-criticality, examining the procedures for evaluation and interpretation (Gibbs, 2009). Researchers who are conscious of this address their values and experiences as part of a reflective account (Cresswell, 2007). It also has to be noted that values should not only be identified but an account is needed on how these change in interaction with research participants (Zahra and Ryan, 2005). Scholars that are dismissive of reflexivity separate their values from the research process, together with their biases and emotions with the aim to reach objectivity (Feighery, 2006).

Butler et al. (2007) emphasise that the researcher’s role of being the expert needs to be questioned, with Hall (2004) stressing that researchers have to embrace an interpreting role instead of assuming full authoritative status (Hall, 2004). However, a more critical perspective is
necessary as all hermeneutic research projects contain a level of interpretive authority (Squire, 2008), which will always be present but is made explicit through reflexivity. Hence, reflexivity is important to inform the reader about the relative power held by the researcher and participants (Morrow, 2007), particularly in terms of representation issues (Morrow, 2005). Butler et al. (2007) add that inequalities of power are intensified by not disclosing transparent information.

5.6.2 Embracing Reflexivity

Reflexivity is related to self-awareness (Rennie, 2004) and agency of the researcher (Ateljevic et al., 2005). As such, reflexivity is linked to the process of self-conscious thinking, which also enables the recognition of the limits of ourselves (Hall, 2004). It provides information about the way individuals act and react in conducting their lives (Ferguson, 2003). More explicitly, it is an endeavour to make the researcher's world assumptions known to the audience (Feighery, 2006). Although it is claimed that reflexivity is crucial to all tourism research (Hall, 2004), reflexivity has only achieved limited attention (Ateljevic et al., 2005) and remains largely unacknowledged (Hall, 2004). However, increasingly tourism researchers are asked to become reflexive (Tribe, 2006) and understand reflexivity as an interactive, socio-political process regardless of their ontological, epistemological and methodological position (Ateljevic et al., 2005).

While Feighery (2006) outlines a number of strategies for reflexive practice, Swain (2004), highlights the need to include the corporal self of the researcher and the bodies of the researched individuals, which assists in moving away from the notion of disembodied research (Tribe, 2006). Hence, reflexivity encompasses an inward reflection, revealing the background of the researcher, and an outward reflection, investigating those that are researched and the relationship with them (Ateljevic et al., 2005). While the former can be seen as having an impact on the ontological stance, the latter embraces epistemological considerations.

By looking at inward reflection, the researcher's history, biography, gender, race, social class and ethnicity should be recognised (Ateljevic et al., 2005). As research processes are inherently linked to the identity of researchers (Wagle and Cantaffa, 2008), the researcher's identity needs to be reflexively contemplated on (Mountz, 2002). This leads to outlining the specific ideological context or belief system under which researchers operate (Tribe, 2006). Furthermore, personal politics need to be investigated (Cresswell, 2007) as being an academic is one of the key
influences impacting on any study (Mountz, 2002). Employing a critical perspective, Butler et al. (2007) emphasise that acknowledging the personal is not a means of achieving equality. Instead, it is a mean to recognise differences between perspectives, power and subjective understanding. Supporting this argument, Feighery (2006) highlights the need to incorporate writing about difference and Mountz (2002) speaks about “axes of difference and identification” (p.189). However, some authors warn against over-emphasising difference as common bonds between the researcher and research participants always exist (Raju, 2002, Pratt, 2002).

This argument links inward to outward reflection, in which reflexive processes should incorporate an acknowledgement of the ‘researched’ and the responsibility towards them (Ateljevic et al., 2005), particularly with regard to other persons that have their own professional, racial and cultural identity (Taylor, 1999). This is central for comprehending how understanding is derived at (Swain, 2004). Given that there is often an imbalance between the investigator and research participants (Feighery, 2006) concerns should be raised about the influence of writing on research participants (Cresswell, 2007). Here, attention is paid to accountability and in a wider sense to political commitment, which involves questions related to “who are we writing for, how, and why?” (Nagar, 2002, p.179).

Expressions in the first person do not appear regularly in tourism academic writings (Feighery, 2006). However, the ‘I’ is necessary when dealing with reflexivity (Hall, 2004), allowing researchers to write themselves into their interpretations (Ateljevic et al., 2005). Starting with an identification of myself, my perspectives derive from a position as a woman in her mid-thirties, white, German middle-class and able-bodied. I became involved in disability-related aspects when working for a National Tourism Board, providing information on accessible destinations and making the webpage accessible to a wide range of users. However, retrospectively, I acknowledge that this was done without in-depth knowledge or thorough engagement in the subject. This changed when working as research officer for accessible tourism. My decision to work in this area can be regarded as influenced by social and cultural values I grew up with. My mother worked with elderly people and since my childhood, I was made familiar with issues related to independent living. It can be stipulated that my belief system centres on equality, participation in society and self-advocacy. As reflexivity influences ontological assumptions (Hall, 2004), it can be argued that these worldviews guide my research.
As personal subjectivities of individual experiences determine the selection of research avenues (Hall, 2004), I decided to continue with disability as part of my part-time PhD. When considering goal-related issues, knowledge levels about disability held by able-bodied researchers need to be investigated (Kitchin, 2000). The fact that I have worked with disabled people in different environments can be regarded as a prerequisite (Kitchin, 2000). Nonetheless, the question arises if an able-bodied researcher can engage in research on disability. Kitchin (2000) highlights that disabled people might feel that able-bodied people misrepresent their experiences. While Gibbs (2009) simplistically notes that reflexivity addresses the act of giving a voice to research participants that would have remained unexpressed otherwise, researchers need to ask themselves if they are providing a voice to the research subjects or merely to their stories (Doucet and Mauthner, 2008). Hence, giving voice to marginalised individuals in tourism is easier said than done (Jordan and Gibson, 2004). It strongly depends on the researcher’s own subjectivity in knowing (Doucet and Mauthner, 2008) as all research actions, whether prior or during the research, replicate the nature of subject-centred knowledge (Feighery, 2006).

This argument accentuates that researchers need to be explicit with regard to their underlying epistemology (Gibbs, 2009). I regard the knowledge arising from this project as co-created, hereby emphasising produced knowledge (Kvale, 2009) acknowledging that the researcher influences the knowledge creation process (Swain, 2004). However, critically questioning what co-production of knowledge means and interrogating the impact of academia, Nagar (2002) links reflexive analysis of identity to “politics of fieldwork” (p.179). In this context, it is argued that academic goals and priorities are likely to remain dominant, necessitating the researcher to be involved in a process of continuous reflexivity (Doucet and Mauthner, 2008). This is addressed by providing different reflexive accounts throughout this work. Further, following Tribe (2006), while this research is rigorously planned, not all aspects of social exclusion as experienced by people with a disability can be brought to light, leaving gaps in the knowledge creation process.

While disabled people are incorporated in the data collection process, it is acknowledged that the choice of specific research goals and the need to contribute to academic research, impede the development of a full partnership approach (Karnieli-Miller et al., 2009). Further, the interpretation of research results represents an ethical concern (Swain, 2004). Thus, a discussion
on ethics as a quality criterion for research and the practical implementation of ethical procedures is included in chapter six. Furthermore, the voices of disabled people are brought into the writing. However, even if expressions are kept in the respondents' own words, any attempt to interpret these words can be regarded as a distorting approach to meaning making (Krauss, 2005). Adding to this, Feighery (2006) argues that the occurrences of respondents' voices are selected by the researcher, who has control over which voices are brought to the foreground and which are silenced. I have tried to minimise this concern by achieving a well-balanced account of narrative quotes. Furthermore, an attempt was made to follow Foucauldian thinking in that the researcher continuously explores background storylines or unprivileged representations, which stand in opposition to dominant tourism mainstream narratives (Hollinshead, 1999).

Critically reviewing my self-reflective practice, it is acknowledged that reflexivity is a valuable tool for the reader of this research to better understand the ways in which knowledge is embodied (Mountz, 2002). However, reflexivity is complex and always open to criticism (Cunliffe, 2003). While attention was paid to provide a broad account on the researcher's background, potentially hidden or unrecognised aspects that contribute to the research might still exist (Olesen, 2005), leading to partiality in my reflexive practice. It is also recognised that I was able to provide a self-reflective account, while socially excluded individuals were not involved in self-reflexivity as part of this research (Ferguson, 2003). Hence, while acknowledging my subjectivity and a transactional epistemological position, providing a chance for others to raise their voices is never a neutral act, but is instead guided by power relations (Hall, 2004). This leads to questioning the transformative potential of this study based on adopting an interpretive, constructivist stance.

5.6.3 Neglecting Transformative Possibilities?

Researching disability under a constructivist lens contains a number of advantages. These embrace viewing disability as an ideological construct which is rooted in negative attitudes towards disabled people (Gleeson, 1997), creating a negative social identity (Donoghue, 2003). Hence, a constructivist approach calls for examining the social processes that construct disability (Kitchin, 1998). However, among the most frequently stated limitations of constructivism is the lack of transformative potential. Guba (1990) outlines that constructivist research aims at reconstructing social life without the attempt to transform it. Further, Cresswell (2007) argues that constructivism does not take any steps towards facilitating actions for individuals. Similar
concerns are raised in disabilities studies as social constructionism is regarded as an obstacle for the social model of disability because it hinders any kind of change (Shakespeare, 2008), which reiterates the critique of the social model in chapter 2.6. Donogue (2003) argues that due to the assumption of social constructionism that any individual can resist a prescribed role, the social model has lost its importance and returned to individualising the nature of disability, failing to replace the medical model. It can be argued that the medical model can be placed into the positivist paradigm due to procedures based on medical laws and processes.

Asserting that disability is a social construct, does not bring any changes to the situation of disabled people and merely provides an explanatory account of social life, leading to political rhetoric in which everyday realities are removed (Dewsbury et al., 2004). This view is sustained by Donoghue (2003), arguing that failing to incorporate structural considerations, such as social relations of power, allows the social constructionist approach to redefine a group of individuals through actions of a few people. As such, it provides no possibilities for resistance to a re-definition of disability, offers no legitimate explanation among competing identities and fails to highlight differences of people with disabilities (Donoghue, 2003).

In order to overcome the apparent lack of possibilities for transformation, Dewsbury et al. (2004) propose that political rhetoric should be replaced by design recommendations, highlighting different experiences and needs of disabled individuals. Other authors see transformative possibilities arising by establishing a new social movement that focuses on the dialect between language and social structure, providing strategies to structural resistance (Donoghue, 2003). While Krauss (2005) stresses that meanings are essential elements within human social settings not only to provide insights into people's views of reality but also to ultimately define actions, it is anticipated that more attention has to be paid to possibilities of transformation and emancipation, while at the same time accounting for the influence of social relations of power, which leads to examining the critical theory paradigm.

5.7 Critical Theory

While some authors argue that critical theory is only starting to be employed by tourism researchers (Gard McGehee, 2009), Chambers (2007) points out that tourism has moved towards a greater incorporation of critical approaches, particularly by focusing on power and politics to
reveal hidden agendas, which represents the core of critical theory (Zahra, 2009). The critical turn, however should not be regarded as something new. Instead, it should be regarded as part of the evolutionary progress in tourism (Pernecky, 2009). Nonetheless, Chambers (2007) points out that paradigmatic insights are often missing or remain under-theorised in research that is characterised as critical. Hence, a central element of critical theory is related to being transparent in terms of ontological and epistemological underpinnings (Gard McGehee, 2009).

Critical theory is based on a ‘critical’ realist ontology (Chambers, 2007). While Ayikoru (2009) states that reality is comprehensible but shaped by certain forces such as political, economic, social, gender and ethnicity, to which disability could be added, Hollinshead (2004) argues that critical theorists acknowledge that reality can only be understood partially. Compared to positivism, critical theory rejects the notion of universality as it does not provide adequate justifications of societal issues (Chambers, 2007). The assumption that there is a reality, however one which cannot be fully understood, indicates that critical theory contains a normative dimension or value system (Chambers, 2007). The emphasis placed on norms is deemed important for this study as any identity construct, such as disability is regarded as influenced by external forces linked to normative ideals (Butler, 2007).

The epistemological base of critical theory is interactive (Guba, 1990), transactional in terms of coming to know together (Ayikoru, 2009) and subjectivist (Chambers, 2007, Guba, 1990). While constructivists ask questions as to ‘what’ and ‘how’ knowledge is assembled (Tribe, 2006), critical theory answers concerns as to ‘why’ particular types of knowledge come into play. At the core are interrogations why certain procedures, rules and concepts are accepted as ‘natural’ (Popkewitz, 1990). Popkewitz (1990) relates this to the “problem of social epistemology” (p.54), highlighting that what is known and the procedures for getting to know are interrelated. This leads to acknowledging that research becomes value-mediated by individuals involved in the inquiry (Hollinshead, 2004, Guba, 1990, Guba and Lincoln, 2005, Goodson and Phillimore, 2004) and values are acknowledged as formative element of the research and expose moral claims (Tribe, 2001). Thus, axiological considerations are regarded as necessary to overcome oppressing forces with the aim to achieve social emancipation (Guba and Lincoln, 2005).
Emancipatory claims are also reflected in the participative methodological base. Critical theorists work with processes of dialogue and depth hermeneutics with the aim to achieve transformation in terms of autonomy, empowerment and emancipation (Schwandt, 1990). Critical hermeneutics is strongly theory-driven to develop criticism by exposing power forces and posits that it is essential to understand the purpose and procedures of interpretation (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). In line with the transformative claims made by critical theorists, narratives are regarded as a way to achieve social change (Chase, 2005). Specific to disability, it is argued that narrative inquiry is a way to position disability research within emancipatory perspectives (Richards, 2009). As narratives portray an interest in the representation of self, while the self is not regarded as a fixed entity but is formed and shaped in interaction and discourse (Elliott, 2005), a narrative research strategy represent an opportunity for this research. It allows gaining an understanding of the lived experiences of social exclusion faced by disabled people, while being conscious about social and historical forces shaping these experiences. While narratives are regarded as the most opportune research strategy for this research, critical theorists emphasise that no methodology is faultless, thereby denying any type of authoritative knowledge (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005).

As part of the forgoing arguments, Popkewitz (1990) questions what is critical about critical science and argues that ‘critical’ can either refer to question theoretical reasoning, offering logical consistency, or to reformulate the issue of logic. The latter focuses on being sceptical of social institutions and taken-for-granted views of reality, hence examining social regulation, unequal distribution and power (Popkewitz, 1990). The first generation of critical theorists, the Frankfurt School, while originally being based on Marxist assumptions (How, 2003), later moved beyond Marxist thought as the new emerging social problems could not only be explained by factors related to the political economy, hence referring ‘critical’ to developing a critique of society (Chambers, 2007). The Frankfurt School did not believe that change in society can be caused by institutions (Chambers, 2007).

In line with this belief, critical theory endeavours to promote a renewed understanding of contemporary conditions and structures with the aim to achieve development and reform (Cousins, 2002). Hence, critical theory does not only criticise society but uses this critique to bring change and improvements to society (Chambers, 2007), hence transforming current social relations (Popkewitz, 1990). Supporting this view, Tribe (2001) argues that emancipation can be
achieved through the development of actions with the aim to change aspects in the social world. Thus, emancipation remains at the core of critical theorist claims (How, 2003). By referring to Horkheimer, Gard McGehee (2009) outlines that emancipation can be achieved by unravelling power relations. Central here is that all thoughts and actions are bound to power relations, with power representing an immensely ambiguous topic (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005).

With the aim to reach an improved understanding of power as part of critical theory thinking, it is necessary to review the constructs of hegemony, ideology and linguistics/discourse (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). First, Gramsci's ideas on hegemony relate to reaching intellectual and moral leadership (Crossley, 2005). Similarly, Tribe (2001) refers to hegemony to describe a condition where certain ideas do not only run through society's thinking in a dominant manner, but are also taken-for-granted and regarded as natural and accepted. Hence, knowledge is "structured by a limited exposure to competing definitions of the socio-political world" (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005, p.309). Opposing Crossley (2005), who emphasises that hegemonic status can be attained by groups forming alliances with points of view that are not 'natural' from their perspective, Chambers (2007) highlights that hegemonic consent can never be achieved as opposing opinions are always in place, which are in fact necessary to trigger social change. Related to the aim of re-conceptualising social exclusion, the entirety of opposing definitions of social exclusion can never be fully captured. As a result, a re-conceptualization of social exclusion will always be subject to challenge and contestation.

Second, as critical theory is based on ideologically oriented standpoints (Guba, 1990), ideology becomes a key concept. Central here are Althusser's ideas, arguing that different social structures achieve dominant status at different points in time (Crossley, 2005). Critical theorists challenge explanations of domination and status quo (Ayikoru, 2009) to investigate more nuanced struggles between different groups, which shape visions of reality (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). This in turn establishes the basis for emancipatory interests and action (Tribe, 2004, Hollinshead, 1994, Tribe, 2001). Hence, at its core, critical theorists aim at revealing which ideology influences a particular phenomenon and guides policies, actions and activities. Further, based on this analysis, it can be identified which interests are served by which ideology (Tribe, 2001). For example, Tribe (2001) accentuates that the underlying dominant ideology of the tourism curriculum promotes only certain types of knowledge, which are related to profit
maximisation and tourist satisfaction. Hence, emancipation can only be attained when moving beyond the controlling forces of technical interests (Tribe, 2001).

Related to social exclusion, different political ideologies dominate the debate (Silver, 1994). While some focus on economic dimensions, others highlight different class systems and resulting systems of social differentiation. These concepts derive from the historical background of social exclusion. Reviewing history and social conditions helps to understand the present with its related knowledge base (Popkewitz, 1990). Common to concepts employed within the social exclusion debate is the emphasis on ‘problem-solvers’ who tackle inequality based on regulatory government targets and goals. Hence, research into social exclusion is dominated by the use of indicators, employed within a positivist stance, to measure the quantifiable progress for reducing social exclusion (Koller and Davidson, 2008). The deriving type of knowledge can be characterised as norm-related as values dominating the discussion derive from the group that occupies the ‘inside’ status. It is anticipated that these insights into the underlying ideology, knowledge and values of social exclusion helps to reveal presuppositions that have not been made explicit as the inside/outside dichotomy reinforces marginality.

Third, and related to the debate on ideology, discourses, which are unstable and shift depending on different contexts (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005), are important as they act as regulating function, controlling what counts as ‘legitimate’ knowledge, who retains the authority to speak and who is denied of expressing ideas and interests (Tribe, 2006). As such, discourse is based on forms of rhetoric to achieve certain effects (Crossley, 2005), with different social values and political relations often remaining hidden or obscured behind rhetoric (Popkewitz, 1990). While Popkewitz (1990) focuses on pedagogical practice as form of social regulation, social work can equally be regarded regulatory tool as it governs personal lives, particularly of those individuals that are targeted by initiatives for reducing exclusion. This can be related to ‘disciplinary power’, where the development of social classifications make disabled people objects of power and knowledge (Foucault, 1991, Horsell, 2006). Hence, critical theory calls for continuous scepticism of ‘conventional’ social practices as these are always linked to aspects of power (Popkewitz, 1990). Power is associated with how knowledge about certain groups and individuals are circulated, which influence the construction of identity (Popkewitz, 1990, Diedrich, 2005, Rabinow, 1984, Best, 1994), reiterating the centrality of Foucauldian thinking for this research.
During this research, disability and social exclusion are singled out as discursive forces impacting on disabled individuals and their identity(ies). This is because both discourses reduce the complexity of lived realities and experiences through the development of binary systems, such as inclusion/exclusion. Critical theorists call into question the use of dualisms as oppositions are misleading (Popkewitz, 1990). Thus, key dichotomies need to be dismantled (Holt, 2008) with the aim to reach a better understanding of certain discourses and the effects that these have on individuals. As critical theory aims at isolating the forces that “prevent individuals and groups from shaping the decisions that crucially affect their lives” (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005, p.308), placing particular emphasis on empowerment, the victim-blaming approach is denied, aiming at exploring reproductive or transformative strategies as a response to essentialist identity categories currently dominating the disability and social exclusion debate. Further, as critical theory offers a critique confronting universal laws that preside over particular social phenomena (Ayikoru, 2009), this research challenges the assumption that approaches based on essentialist identity categories can lead to achieving emancipation.

5.7.1 Limits of Emancipatory Claims?

While Habermas proposes emancipatory interest as a complementary element to account for the shortcomings of empirical-analytical and historical-hermeneutic knowledge (How, 2003), a number of authors criticise the emancipatory potential. Morrow (2007) questions how research can be integrated with activism in service of social change. Specific to critical theory, Kincheloe and McLaren (2005) refer to the arrogance of researchers, claiming to emancipate other people. This concern needs to be addressed carefully as the researcher’s understanding of emancipation might be different to the perceptions of individuals with a disability.

Using the example of volunteer tourism, Gard McGehee (2009), examining critical theory and social movement theory, highlights that signs and images reinforce the control that volunteer organisations have over host communities. However, host communities should be given the opportunity to identify their meanings. This leads to critically questioning the activism inherent in volunteer tourism and raises questions about its emancipatory potential (Gard McGehee, 2009). Gard McGehee (2009) concludes that volunteer tourism can contribute a small part to the “greater idea of the emancipation of humanity that is so crucial to critical theory” (p.31) and
argues that critical theory can be regarded as a precursor for practical action inherent in social movements. As such, critical theory investigates how society can achieve emancipation while social movement theory provides the practical locus for its implementation so that the ‘powerless’ are given the chance to act as agents of change (Gard McGehee, 2009).

Hence, critical theory might assist in creating the basis for social change and emancipation but is not involved in the actual implementation. This is supported by Crossley (2005) arguing that social movements seek emancipation and critical theory assists in this quest by identifying and examining the unconscious forces that restrain liberty and autonomy. While it is argued that academics should be involved in political struggles beyond university life (Mountz, 2002) and that findings should not only advance theory but should equally help excluded people (Nagar, 2002), critical theory cannot enable emancipation per se, which leaves critical theorists to understand the impossibility of full emancipation (How, 2003). However, important in the claim to reach emancipation is enabling lay members of society, such as people with a disability outside academia, to raise their voices (Crossley, 2005).

While claims to bring voices of marginalised individuals to the forefront of the research is complicated (section 5.1.1), an acknowledgement has to be in place that interpretations might not lead to the emancipation of the lay public. Also, individuals may not agree to the interpretation (Crossley, 2005). In this context, emancipation should not be regarded as universal outcome (Denzin, 2005). Instead the emphasis should be placed on localised critical theory to explore meanings of the social world (Denzin, 2005) with the aim to continue and advance social criticism (Crossley, 2005). This provides the opportunity to enhance self-understanding and alternative world views (Tribe, 2001). As part of the self-reflective philosophy of critical theory (Chambers, 2007), and while this research can be seen as being related to political struggles of people that are deemed socially excluded, there is the need to continuously question any kind of transformative strategy that is suggested. With the complexity of critical theory in mind, the next section outlines the dual-paradigmatic framework adopted for this study.

5.8 A Dual-Paradigmatic Framework for Social Exclusion and Disability

Multi-paradigmatic approaches are not used extensively in tourism research, however these provide benefits as single paradigms might not be able to cover all dimensions (Zahra, 2009).
This is supported by Morrow (2007) stating that not all research projects can be placed neatly in one specific paradigm. Advantages of following a multi-paradigmatic framework include reaching conceptual clarity when dealing with complexity covering multiple dimensions (Zahra, 2009). Also Morrow (2007), referring to different paradigms, calls for new approaches, particularly when dealing with research related to marginalised parts of the population.

By referring to critical performative pedagogy, Alexander (2005) emphasises the benefits of a performative methodology in terms of acknowledging the body as a site of meaning-making, while providing insights into ideological struggle and performative resistance. Equally, Denzin (2005) highlights performative inquiry as combining indigenous epistemologies and critical pedagogy. In line with a performative framework, examining what social exclusion ‘is’ and what it ‘does’, this research embraces a dual-paradigmatic framework combining interpretivism/constructivism and critical theory (Figure 8).

![Figure 8: Dual-Paradigmatic Framework of Research](image)

It is anticipated that an interpretivist perspective is needed to capture the lived experiences of disabled people to reach an understanding of social exclusion. However, apart from coming closer to the meaning of experience that people attach to certain phenomena (Cousins, 2002, Tribe, 2001), an interpretive stance allows to gain insights into the complexity of views
(Cresswell, 2007), which is deemed important to highlight the heterogeneity of perceptions of social exclusion. Specific to constructivism as part of interpretive paradigms, ‘disability’ is constructed by society, which assists in understanding the development of identity constructs, central to this research.

While the relativist ontological base of constructivism is regarded as beneficial to underscore that reality is constructed and co-constructed (Guba and Lincoln, 2005), the ontological foundation of critical theory based on critical realism ties the investigation stronger into normative assumptions (Chambers, 2007), crucial to further advance the understanding of identity concepts (Butler, 2007). This is in line with Kincheloe and McLaren (2005) arguing that critical theorists question how social forces shape the construction of individuals by paying particular attention to oppressive forces based on social identity categories, such as disability.

Central for examining social practices and taken-for-granted views of reality is the realisation that power relations play an important role (Popkewitz, 1990, Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). Although power and politics shape methodological considerations in any research (Hollinshead, 2004), issues surrounding power and politics are even more crucial for this research as it is shown how certain discourses, such as social exclusion, (re)produce domination. Thus, the centrality of the power is highlighted by analyzing social exclusion as a site of power. It is anticipated that a focus on power and discourse assists in re-conceptualising social exclusion in tourism, following critical theorist’s claims to advance theory-building (Pernecker, 2009).

However, power constructs are not only deemed important for the re-conceptualisation process. As both paradigms focus on a subjectivist and interactive epistemology (Wijesinghe, 2009, Guba, 1990, Guba and Lincoln, 2005, Chambers, 2007), acknowledging the influence of the researcher in the inquiry, the research becomes value-mediated. This necessitates the researcher to make underlying power relations explicit by providing a reflexive account (section 5.1.2). Particularly with regard to the hermeneutics, researchers are required to outline the procedures of interpretation to reveal the power-laden aspects of this research. These dialectical insights further lead to the recognition that findings are context-specific (Guba, 1990, Goodson and Phillimore, 2004, Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005), which is in line with a performative framework, stressing
the importance of context and space for different identity performances (Holt, 2007, Coleman and Crang, 2002).

This context-specific thinking linked to social relations of power allows for the recognition of reproductive and transformative strategies of identity positions (Shildrick, 2005, Holt, 2008, Holt, 2007), which is crucial to gain an improved understanding into the effects of social exclusion. The insights into what social exclusion ‘does’ to individuals by investigating power processes is regarded as central to challenge and/or form political action to enhance agency, emancipation and transformative action (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005).

Here, narratives are believed to offer the greatest potential to investigate what social ‘is’ and what it ‘does’ as they focus on the self while accounting for external discursive forces (Elliott, 2005). Furthermore, narratives become active through performances which are embodied in a specific way (Franklin, 2004). A narrative inquiry represents an opportunity to resist dominant discourses (Tulloch, 1999, Oakes, 1999), with the aim to trigger social change and emancipation (Chase, 2005, Richards, 2009, Christians, 2005). Also Alexander (2005) emphasises the benefits of a performative analysis in terms of the provision of descriptive knowledge of individual lives while incorporating how participants see themselves in relation to others, hence offering emancipatory potential for social awareness and change. Critical performance is committed to include community members in the research (Denzin, 2005), with dialogue being key to engage with lay individuals (Crossley, 2005). However, emancipation and change through narratives should not be over-emphasised. Hence, it is acknowledged that the re-conceptualisation of social exclusion faced by disabled people in tourism and the identification of transformative strategies deriving from what social exclusion ‘does’ to people is unlikely to be accepted by all people with a disability and/or might not be implemented to cause social change in reality. However, it still contributes to the understanding of alternative world views and experiences (Tribe, 2001).

5.9 Summary

The chapter offered a discussion of different paradigms. After providing a general explanation with regard to the importance of paradigmatic debates and highlighting that paradigms offer different ways of conducting research, depending on research aims, the researcher’s
understanding of the world and the knowledge creation process, the chapter continued with an evaluation of different paradigms linked to the phenomenon being studied.

While acknowledging the merits of positivist research for technical purposes, it was argued that the over-emphasis on positivist approaches drawing on cause and effect relationships, using a quantitative methodology, which is evident in much current research on social exclusion, is counter-productive as it ignores the lived experiences of disabled people. In order to overcome this deficiency, it was anticipated that qualitative methodologies are more suitable for this research with the aim to facilitate a process of meaning-making, highlighting multiple perceptions of social exclusion faced by disabled people, while rejecting the categorical approach to disability as a homogenous identity category.

Moving on to paradigms that employ more qualitative research, the adoption of a postpositivist stance was deemed as inappropriate due to the negligence to account for values and ethics. As the topic has been decided by the researcher and is approached from an able-bodied perspective, values and ethics were held central to this research, acknowledging the importance of the context and the relationship between the inquirer and the inquired-upon. In order to investigate how disabled individuals can better be incorporated in the research, the participatory/cooperative paradigm was explored. However, concerns were raised with regard to participatory, emancipatory and facilitating claims. It was found that full participation can never be accomplished due to the incompatible opinions over actions. Further, different interests are likely to result in a situation where individuals tailor the research process to their own needs. In this context, an able-bodied researcher might occupy a more neutral position. However, this led to questions related to the representation of the voices of disabled people.

With this in mind, the exploration turned to interpretive paradigmatic approaches, particularly the constructivist perspective, recognising the social construction of identity concepts, such as disability and acknowledging the importance of multiple, lived experiences of social exclusion. However, as experiences can never represent facts, the discussion highlighted that knowledge is intrinsically bound to interpretation. This admits a subjective epistemological position, while at the same time highlighting unequal power relations between researcher and researched-upon. While remedies to reduce inequality in the research process have been outlined, it is
acknowledged that power relations continue to exist, but have been made explicit by providing a reflexive account. However, it remained questionable how an interpretive framework would assist in achieving transformative potential for individuals that are deemed socially excluded.

Drawing on this obstacle, emancipatory claims made by critical theorists were investigated related to power relations. Critical theory offers the opportunity to advance insights into the construction of identities by analysing social exclusion as a site of power, which is held to assist the theory building process, central to this study. A critical theory approach is also deemed as beneficial to challenge explanations of domination and status quo, established by discourse producers of social exclusion. It also allows accounting for more nuanced struggles of different disabled people, which provides the basis for social change and emancipation. While acknowledging the limits of emancipatory claims, the chapter concluded by outlining the reasons for following a dual-paradigmatic framework consisting on critical theory and interpretivism/constructivism. As narratives have been singled out as the most opportune research strategy for this framework, the specific approach to methods is explained in the following chapter.
Chapter 6: Approach to Methods

6.1 Introduction

The preceding discussion on paradigms highlighted the reasoning behind adopting a dual-paradigmatic framework combining interpretivism/constructivism and critical theory. The examination also resulted in the identification of a narrative approach as strategy of inquiry to deal with the research problem of this study. The adopted strategy of inquiry builds a bridge between the researcher and the methods for collecting empirical material, referred to as the process of relating paradigms to the empirical world (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

Hence, the aim of this chapter is to link the dual-paradigmatic framework, following a narrative research inquiry, to specific methods for collecting empirical material. As this stage is characterised by a focus on concrete research questions (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005), the chapter starts by reiterating the main research aim together with its five research questions, which are structured alongside theory building, empirical research and practice. Subsequently, a review on the theory-building process is provided followed by a debate on personal interviews as specific method adopted. The research design is discussed together with the pilot study, data collection tools as well as interpretation procedures. The chapter concludes by discussing criteria for quality with an emphasis placed on the practical implementation of ethical considerations.

6.2 Research Aim and Questions

Given that an in-depth understanding of social exclusion in relation to disability in tourism has not been achieved yet and as research on social exclusion faced by disabled individuals is deemed complex, this research analyses the theoretical concepts of disability, identity and social exclusion with the main aim to critically investigate the meaning of social exclusion in tourism and its influence on identity positions of individuals with a disability. In order to bring a systematic understanding to the thematic topics, the research is conducted following five research questions.
As starting point, the study deals with analysing the current understanding of disability and the social model of disability, which has gained widespread acceptance in contemporary society by paying particular attention to what is currently known, debated or contested. As the social model focuses on creating a categorical, collective approach to identity, the first question aims at reaching a more nuanced and critical understanding of disability:

**Research Question 1:**
What is the current understanding of disability and what are the inherent limitations?

The understanding gained from this investigation provides the basis for the second question as particularly by looking at the limitations of the social model of disability, a negligence to account for multiple identities linked to processes of power and knowledge is identified. Power plays a major role because the development of any identity concept is guided by a complex matrix of power relations. As the social model currently omits the importance of power, investigations are deemed necessary to explore different theoretical frameworks, which could potentially be used to address these shortcomings:

**Research Question 2:**
Which conceptual framework can be used to overcome limitations?

By reviewing the gaze, embodiment and performative perspectives, the latter is held to offer the greatest potential to deal with limitations of the social model, allowing for a multifaceted understanding of disability. As the social model equates disability with social exclusion, the use of a performative framework has not only implications for disability but also for social exclusion as it questions the use of categorical approaches in general. The third research question addresses these aspects as the remaining part of the theory-building stage of this research:

**Research Question 3:**
How can a performative framework assist the disability debate for re-conceptualising social exclusion?
The performative framework allows for investigations into what social exclusion ‘is’ and by incorporating power/ knowledge constructs, it can be used to examine what social exclusion ‘does’ to disabled people with regard to identity positions. Hence, the performative framework serves as theoretical model, guiding the analysis throughout the empirical research. Both, meaning and effect are addressed in research questions four and five.

The fourth question investigates what social exclusion means to different individuals with a disability by using narratives to capture lived experiences and subjectivities:

**Research Question 4:**
Using a performative framework, how can social exclusion in tourism be re-conceptualised?

Given the context-specific underpinnings of the performative framework, the identity category of disability is regarded as produced, which allows for the recognition of multiple identities linked to social relations of power. Hence, an investigation is required that analyses the effect of social exclusion, as a site of power, on identity positions, addressed in research question five. Particular emphasis is given to the reproduction and/or transformation of norms in tourism:

**Research Question 5:**
Using a performative framework, do individuals with a disability reproduce or transform identity positions in tourism?

Having gained insights into reproductive and transformative aspects depending on different contexts assists in suggesting practical solutions to overcome social exclusion in tourism. Hence, the outlined research questions operate alongside theory building, empirical research and practical implications. By following an inductive research approach, findings deriving from the final questions can be channelled back into theory building. The research process together with its research questions is illustrated in Figure 9.
In order to respond to these research questions, methods employed comprise secondary research and individual interviews as part of a narrative strategy of inquiry, which is outlined next.

6.3 Secondary Research: Theory Building

The conceptual process of building a theoretical framework for this research is guided by multiple secondary sources such as academic journal articles, book, reports and websites. Noteworthy is the multi-disciplinary approach adopted, drawing on research from a number of different disciplines (Veal, 2006), such as disability studies, social policy, political science, sociology, geography and psychology to advance the knowledge creation process in tourism.

Tribe (2004) argues that research is characterised as multi-disciplinary when a theory deriving from another discipline is applied to the field of tourism. While it can be argued that the performative framework is applied to investigate the social exclusion faced by disabled people in tourism, it is impossible to clearly locate the disciplinary origin of a performative framework. While some authors regard performativity as related to Goffman’s dramaturgical sociology (Haldrup and Larsen, 2010), here combining sociology and theatre studies, other research places performativity within feminist studies mainly due to the influence of Judith Butler’s work (Crossley, 2005). Again, other studies highlight the importance of different spaces and places as
part of the performativity framework (Crouch, 2007), which makes it relevant to geography. While this highlights that each discipline has its distinctive culture and privileges certain aspects, while excluding others (Tribe, 2004), it also helps to justify that this research can be deemed inter-disciplinary, as different perspectives, knowledge and insights deriving from a multitude of disciplines are combined with the aim to provide new perspectives in tourism (Tribe, 2004). This research not only discusses but also brings together different views on performativity, which is subsequently employed in a tourism context.

In line with Goodson and Phillimore (2004), the approach adopted hopes to offer new possibilities for cross-checking ideas, processes and practices. Insights deriving from the re-conceptualisation of social exclusion in tourism could potentially be employed or further investigated in a social policy or political science context. Further, applying a performative lens could also lead to a re-thinking in disability studies. However, it is acknowledged that the nature of multi- and interdisciplinary research remains contested due to the prevailing regulatory mechanisms for each discipline, indicating which modes of inquiry are accepted and which are moved to the periphery (Coles et al., 2009). This might explain why research into social exclusion in social policy focused mainly on cause and effect relationships based on indicators and indexes ignoring the lived experiences of people with a disability. Nonetheless, there remains a potential that findings from this research might advance ideas in other disciplines, or at least be considered as one perspective open to contestation. This could lead to the modification of and negotiation between disciplines, labelled deep interdisciplinarity (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005).

In sum, deriving from the desk research, using secondary data, is the theoretical framework of performativity that serves as guiding principle for the remaining research and establishes the foundation for questions four and five, which represent the empirical part.

6.4 Primary Research: Individual Interviews

The examination of different paradigms in chapter five has outlined the reasons for following a qualitative research based on a narrative inquiry. With regard to specific methods, Cousins (2002) accentuates that approaches are very broad and the existing possibilities are as multifaceted as human life experiences. Narrative methods are employed to gain an understanding of
people’s experiences, leading to new insights, perspectives and knowledge (Keats, 2009) or for studying a particular phenomenon (Lieblich et al., 1998). Related to this research, individual perceptions of social exclusion are regarded as crucial to unmask processes of inequality and to gain an improved understanding of the meaning of social exclusion and its effect on identity positions. Particularly with regard to the latter, narratives are often utilised for exploring identity constructs (Elliott, 2005, Frost, 2009).

As stated by Elliott (2005), narratives are to be regarded as discourses to understand people’s experiences and can be broadly grouped into three categories: temporal, meaningful and social. While ‘temporal’ refers to sequences of experiences, ‘meaningful’ highlights those elements of an experience that have evoked feelings and/ or are given most significance to. The final category, ‘social’, stresses that all experiences are embedded in a social context (Elliott, 2005). While ‘temporal’ aspects refer to the general situations where individuals experienced social exclusion, it is anticipated that ‘meaningful’ aspects assist in identifying those experiences which led to augmented feelings of marginalisation, possibly to be distinguished by investigating different contexts. The final category, ‘social’, is of importance as personal experiences need to be analysed by considering wider power relations, central to this research.

Narrative research can make use of a wide range of material, such as stories gathered in interviews (Lieblich et al., 1998). Interviewing encompasses a variety of forms including face-to-face verbal interviews, group interviews and telephone surveys and can be structured, semi-structured and unstructured (Fontana and Frey, 2005). According to Morgan (1988), interviews are better suited in cases where the collection of a large amount of ideas is the goal of the research. This is particular the case for unstructured interviews which reduces risks in obtaining more depth in the quality of data obtained (Morgan, 1988). Unstructured interviews can also counteract the risk of suppressing narratives, particularly when questions are asked that are straightforward, simple and related to people’s life experiences (Elliott, 2005). Furthermore, interviews offer rich data with regard to moral associations and activities that are linked to membership categories, which are time and space specific (McCabe and Stokoe, 2004). This can only be achieved by avoiding a rigid structure in terms of standardised questions (Elliott, 2005).
Interviews can aim at identifying a brief story about an event or encounter (personal narrative), a comprehensive account about a particular facet of an individual's life (life story) or a narrative about an individual's entire life (life history) (Chase, 2005). With regard to life histories, Elliott (2005) points out that it is sometimes difficult for participants to talk about their entire life and hence, it is recommended to talk about specific times and situations. Life stories are said to construct and reveal individual and cultural meanings (Lieblich et al., 1998) and have the ability to communicate a person's identity in relation to certain events and occurrences in their lives (McCabe and Foster, 2006). Oral history is a different type of unstructured interviews (Fontana and Frey, 2005) that similar to life stories focuses on a particular event in someone's life (Chase, 2005). In comparison to other types of unstructured interviews, oral history differs in its purpose but not methodologically. The main purpose of oral histories is the biographical memory to understand social processes (Fontana and Frey, 2005). Expressed differently, narratives deriving from oral history do not only focus on the historical event itself but also on the meaning that the narrator attaches to this particular event (Chase, 2005). Specific to exclusion and inclusion, narrative accounts are important to examine difference (Armstrong, 2003):

"People's experiences ... open up new ways of thinking about the policies of exclusion and inclusion. Historical analysis needs to take these voices seriously for they challenge both the homogeneity of experience and the social relationship that have constructed difference as 'abnormal'" (Armstrong, 2003, p.116).

From these arguments it is evident that interviews can be used for different types of narratives, while at the same time being characterised by overlapping dimensions. Hence, certain types of narratives are used interchangeably as in the case of life history and life story as well as personal narrative and life story (Chase, 2005). While the use of life stories is relevant to this research as it focuses on experiences related to identity, oral histories appear to be more applicable as the emphasis is not only placed on the meaning of social exclusion, but also on social processes which influence identity positions, highlighting the link to power inherent in this research. Furthermore, personal narratives seem to represent an overarching category as revealing experiences of social exclusion could be regarded as the first step to expose social relations of power. As a result, the terms personal narratives and oral histories are employed synonymously.
A new strand of interview techniques often employed when dealing with oppressed individuals, 'empathetic interviewing', relates to the researcher's desire to become a partner in the research process and to use the results in order to improve the conditions of the interviewee (Fontana and Frey, 2005). However, it can be argued that similar claims can be made for using personal narratives, following a dual-paradigmatic framework, as the researcher and the researched-upon interactively participate in the study (Ayikoru, 2009) with the aim to accomplish emancipatory interests and action (Hollinshead, 2004, Tribe, 2004).

An additional advantage for using personal narratives is that telling personal, traditional and historical stories is itself a performative action. These performances are forms of daily discourses that reflect on specific roles, rules and structures in the process of defining cultural experiences (Pollock, 1990). While the performance of personal narratives is firmly interwoven with experiences (Alexander, 2005), the 'voice' that is heard is not the main focus but serves as a starting point to reveal complex social and political processes in which particular voices are embedded. In this context, an advantage of personal narratives relates to revealing experiences with regard to reproducing or transforming identity positions, which are negotiated within a system of meanings. Supporting this argument McCabe and Foster (2006) argue that narratives are a way for respondents to reflexively construct their identities. The story teller does not only express individual experiences but indicates how this experience is socially embedded. It is an experience that is shaped, constrained or marked by society. It offers insights into cultural and social resources that are available to social actors and explains why certain constraints reduce the possibilities of lived experience for particular individuals (Chase, 1995).

Further, conducting personal narratives, using a performance-centred perspective, reorganises the hierarchy of voices in which the narrator's voice is dominant. As such, it enhances narrator's agency and reveals how and why a narrator tells a particular story (Pollock, 1990). However, critically examining claims for achieving agency, Tribe (2006) argues that any story that is reproduced is influenced by the researcher and the particular context, which legitimises some voices while others remain suppressed. Davis and Salkin (2005), investigating the experiences of two siblings, one able-bodied and the other with a physical and hearing impairment, acknowledge that the academic voice might always be dominant, particularly when presenting the results of the study. As such, displaying results in a neutral perspective is hardly possible
(Davis and Salkin, 2005). This limitation coincides with shortcomings for interviews in general as they can never be a neutral tool because researchers are connected to their own context involving different motives, feelings, desires and biases (Fontana and Frey, 2005). This reiterates arguments put forward in chapter five as the interviewer is an active participant in the research, even when trying to limit his/her direct involvement. As a result, findings cannot be separated from the context in which they were gathered, including the cultural origins of researchers and narrators, which impacts on the objectivity of data (French and Swain, 2006).

In addition, it is questioned why individuals would be willing to talk about their experiences and disclose information that might be in conflict with their interest, values and needs (Antonio, 1991). Related to this research, questions related to social exclusion and disability could be aspects of a person’s life that interviewees may not be willing to reveal. This argument could be combined with the concern about declining response rates for partaking in interviews (Fontana and Frey, 2005). Reasons for declining participation rates for interviews might be explained by intimidation, fear and suspicion. This problem increases further when differences in power relations between researcher and research participants are apparent (Kamberelis and Dimitriadis, 2005). Furthermore, narrative research has often been criticised as being more of an artistic activity rather than research (Lieblich et al., 1998). An additional limitation of using interviews is the time involved in conducting interviews and then transcribing them (Morgan, 1988).

By looking at the above limitations for using personal narratives based on an interview approach, some aspects have been justified as part of the dual-paradigmatic framework. For example, with regard to interviews never representing value-free research, it is acknowledged that reality can only be understood partially and that research is value-mediated by the researcher (Hollinshead, 2004). Hence, the construction of knowledge is highly influenced by the values and politics of the researcher (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004). Further, the assumption that narrative inquiries do not count as research is rejected due to their potential to achieve an improved understanding of the lived experiences while equally paying attention to external forces shaping these experiences (Elliott, 2005). Narratives provide possibilities for resistance (Tulloch, 1999, Oakes, 1999) which aim at social change (Chase, 2005, Richards, 2009, Christians, 2005).
The remaining limitations, such as the willingness to participate in interviews, response rates and additional power imbalances between the researcher and his/her interviewees, can potentially be overcome by carefully designing the research and adopting appropriate processes of collecting and interpreting data, which is discussed after providing an account on the research participants for this study.

6.4.1 Research Participants

For this research, participants for the interview process comprise individuals with mobility and visual restrictions. People with cognitive, speech and hearing impairments are not interviewed due to communication difficulties. Although the use of interpreters (for sign language) could be an option for overcoming communication obstacles, it is anticipated that this would add a new layer of meaning to the process, potentially leading to misunderstandings. Electronic interviewing through instant messaging tools could be employed to overcome the problem arising from interviewing speech and hearing impaired individuals. Advantages of virtual interviews include that interviewees and the researcher have more time to respond to questions or to phrase follow-up questions respectively. However, major disadvantages arise due to lack of observable non-verbal behaviour (Fontana and Frey, 2005). Thus, interviews will focus on individuals with mobility and sight restrictions.

6.4.2 Research Design

Narratives from mobility and sight restricted individuals are collected based on a semi-structured, in-depth interview technique. A semi-structured interview strategy allows for flexibility which is regarded as important to account for changes based on emergent themes (Morrow, 2005). Given the nature of semi-structured interviews, an interview grid with some key questions is developed in order to overcome problems associated with the free elicitation of stories (Elliott, 2005). However, the researcher’s influence remains minimal, only intervening in cases where narratives diverge entirely from the topic under investigation (Elliott, 2005).

The checklist focuses on four main themes deriving from the literature: social exclusion, collective identity, self-identity and initiatives to overcome exclusion. These themes further relate to the overall research aim and research questions. Findings deriving from the narratives
are also used to endorse the conceptual results from the theory-building stage and to inform suggestions with regard to practical implications.

After warm-up questions related to the participant’s latest holiday experience, the first theme, social exclusion, is divided into 5 sub-themes (Table 4). Sub-theme one aims at identifying the meaning that interviewees attach to social exclusion. This is regarded as important to allow for subjective perspectives on social exclusion, which is currently neglected. Sub-theme two and three aim at eliciting personal experiences of exclusion in everyday life and in tourism to obtain information about particular ‘stages’. This helps to identify the context-specific nature nurtured by the performative framework. With the aim to identify transformative and reproductive strategies, sub-theme four interrogates reactions to experiences of social exclusion. The final sub-theme links social exclusion to disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme:</th>
<th>Sub-Themes:</th>
<th>Potential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Exclusion</td>
<td>Individual understanding of social exclusion</td>
<td>• What does social exclusion mean to you? / How do you understand social exclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are dimensions of social exclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal experiences of social exclusion</td>
<td>• Have you ever felt socially excluded? / What are your personal experiences of social exclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can you tell me some examples, when you felt socially excluded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal experiences of social exclusion in tourism</td>
<td>• Have you felt socially excluded in tourism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can you give me (an) example(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you think there are differences when you compare your experiences of social exclusion between being on holiday and being home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to social exclusion/ Resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• How do you react in situations of feeling excluded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are your reactions different when comparing being on holiday or at home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between social exclusion and disability?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you think that there is a relationship between your experiences of social exclusion and having an impairment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you think that this applies to all individuals with a disability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It is claimed that ‘disability’ and ‘social exclusion’ are terms that can be used synonymously – what do you think?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second and third themes aim at obtaining information in relation to collective identity and self-identity (Table 5). Crucial for the former are questions related to the distinction between disability and impairment as well as the participation in disability organisations, which provides insights into strategies of identity politics following a collective identity approach. For self-identity, questions centre on how interviewees define themselves and external influences on self-identity.

Table 5: Interview Grid – Second and Third Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme:</th>
<th>Sub-Themes:</th>
<th>Potential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Collective Identity – Social Model of Disability | Disability – Social Model - Collective Identity | • Do you make a distinction between having an impairment or a disability?  
• What does disability mean to you? |
|                                    | Identity Politics                     | • Are you a member in any type of disability organisation?                             
• Why                                                                               
• Why not?                                                                           |
|                                    | Self-identity                         | • When people refer to individuals with an impairment – how would you like them to talk about it (individual with a disability? / disabled person?)  
• How do you see yourself (Who are you?)                                               
• When you think about yourself – what comes to your mind?                             
• Does your impairment play a role for identifying who you are?                        |
|                                    | External influences on self-identity | • What shapes you as a person?  
• What role do norms and expectations play in telling who you are?                     |

The last theme returns to the concept of social exclusion and elicits information related to initiatives that are deemed successful to overcome social exclusion (Table 6). The interview finishes with warming-down questions with regard to future holiday plans.

Table 6: Interview Grid – Fourth Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme:</th>
<th>Sub-Themes:</th>
<th>Potential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overcoming Social Exclusion        | Initiatives – structural constraints of existing programmes? | • What are current initiatives that help to reduce exclusion?  
• Why these? / Why aren’t there any? |
The research follows Elliott’s (2005) suggestion in that simple questions are used with the interests of the researcher not immediate recognisable from an interviewee’s point of view. In addition, Morrow (2005) recommends asking few questions as this increases the likelihood of obtaining in-depth stories and deeper meanings. The importance of this was realised after having conducted a pilot study.

6.4.3 Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted with individuals either having restricted sight or restricted mobility as testing the research instrument with other parts of the population, which are, for example, able-bodied, would have led to invalid assumptions (Mason and Zuercher, 1995). The pilot study included four male and two female interviewees. Out of the total of six individuals, four were mobility-restricted and two were registered as blind.

Conducting a pilot study was important for the following reasons. First, subject acceptability needed to be tested, which involves the willingness of participants to take part (Mason and Zuercher, 1995). Taking into account that participants were thought to be recruited with the assistance of disability organisations, gaining the trust of various disability organisations has been the greatest challenge to be overcome as these organisations were very protective of their members and were not easily willing to inform members about this study.

Second, during the process of conducting the pilot study, the length of the interview was evaluated, resulting in altering the design of the research questions (Veal, 2006). Some questions were taken out completely, for example ‘What does social exclusion mean to you?’, as insights into the meaning of social exclusion were deemed to be obtainable based on the actual experiences. Other questions were re-phrased in lay terms, for example by avoiding expressions such as ‘synonymously’. The ordering of the questions was also revised to ensure a better flow of the interview and additional examples and storylines for different impairment groups to prompt responses were incorporated. Nonetheless, the revised interview grid (Appendix A) still contains a number of questions. However, not all questions were asked in each interview, as the researcher tailored the questions to the experiences narrated by individuals, hereby ensuring an appropriate interview length. Furthermore, the data obtained was judged as making sense to provide enriching new insights into the given topic (Mason and Zuercher, 1995).
Third, in addition to the research design, the pilot study provided a valuable opportunity to practice the interviewing technique and “get a feel for the conduct of research” (Mason and Zuercher, 1995, p.13). After the first few interviews, levels of confidence increased and the initial nervousness, particularly when entering the private houses of participants, disappeared. The researcher also became more observant, for example in identifying if a participant has mobility in his/ her hands to be able to sign the consent form and became more experienced in handling emotional moments. With greater confidence, questions in the interview grid were handled with greater flexibility, which allowed capturing emergent issues (Morrow, 2005).

Fourth, apart from gaining more experience, the researcher was also made attentive to characteristics or sensitivities of the interviewees (Veal, 2006). For example, interviews were not scheduled before 11am as especially mobility-restricted individuals require more time to get ready. The researcher also found that being a non-native speaker works as an advantage not only to obtain rich data but also because it helped to transmit the feeling that the participant is the expert, possibly because not speaking English as the first language was regarded as a type of restriction by participants. Overall, and in line with Mason and Zuercher (1995), the pilot study was essential to confidently proceed with the remaining interviews.

While this research was originally designed with the intention to employ snowball sampling, this idea was abandoned during the pilot process as the majority of participants seemed to be unwilling to be associated with other disabled individuals. As the snowball technique is one sampling strategy, the following section outlines the approach to participant sampling as part of the data collection process.

### 6.4.4 Sampling and Data Collection

Qualitative sampling is always purposeful as participants are selected on the basis of being able to inform the understanding of the specific research problem and to provide information-rich data with regard to a particular phenomenon (Morrow, 2005, Cresswell, 2007, Flick, 2009). As this research aims at enhancing the understanding of what is meant by social exclusion faced by people with a disability, mobility and sight restricted individuals are chosen as research participants (section 6.4.1). However, this group was still deemed to be too large in size. Hence,
random purposeful sampling, applied when the potential purposeful sample is too large (Cresswell, 2007), could potentially be used. However, given the general difficulties in obtaining participants that are disabled, convenience sampling seemed to be better suited. When convenience sampling is chosen, it is important to outline the convenience factor (Veal, 2006) which related to this study embraces disability organisations that are willing to inform their members about the possibility of partaking in this research. While convenience sampling is often criticised (Flick, 2009) due to time, money and effort savings impacting on credibility claims (Cresswell, 2007), it is regarded as most appropriate sampling type for this research. This is due to the problems of setting-up more directed ways (Flick, 2009) of sampling people with mobility and sight restrictions and reaching marginalised individuals (Cresswell, 2007).

Apart from convenience sampling, criterion sampling is employed as additional sampling strategy. Often, researchers make use of more than one sampling type (Cresswell, 2007). Also Morrow (2005) argues that purposeful sampling is often used in conjunction with other sampling strategies. Criterion sampling is based on selecting participants on the basis of key criteria which provides opportunities for comparisons (Veal, 2006). It is chosen when individuals have experience of the phenomenon being studied (Cresswell, 2007), which can be regarded as the case for social exclusion. The criteria set in this study relate to age and disability. Participants need to be between 18 and 70 years old as this is the age bracket of people most active in tourism (World Tourism Organization and European Travel Commission, 2010) and need to identify themselves as either having restricted mobility or restricted sight.

In sum, the sample of this research is purposeful and focuses on criterion and convenience sampling strategies. In line with Sandelowski and Barroso (2002), calling for evaluating the sampling strategy adopted, this sampling plan fits the purpose of reaching marginalised individuals, with sites of recruitment being located by collaborating with disability organisations. Similar to Mountz's (2002) research, to achieve collaboration, the researcher had to contact different organisations and explain how this research might help the disability community.

For the interview recruitment process, the researcher made use of established contacts to ENAT (European Network for Accessible Tourism). This network, tailored towards the needs of the accessibility requiring market, provides a unique opportunity for reaching disabled individuals as
the agglomeration of people with similar interests represents a good option to retrieve information (Veal, 2006). In addition, disability organisations in the UK such as Tourism for All, The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association, RADAR, Action for Blind People, Disabled Go as well as regional and local access groups were contacted with the aim to encourage organisations to include a short editorial on social exclusion into their newsletter. This editorial contained the practical rationale for this research (Appendix B), which was subsequently to be distributed to members of that organisation. As the way how the researcher presents him/herself is crucial (Fontana and Frey, 2005) and given that disabled people could potentially be suspicious when able-bodied people conduct research on disability, giving presentations at dedicated access group forums further assisted the interview recruitment process by establishing personal contacts.

Once the leading UK organisation ‘Tourism for All’ offered its assistance, the process became easier and numerous other organisations followed by informing their members through e-mailings and chat forums. As a result, potential participants came forward and indicated their willingness to participate in the interview, which allowed for the compilation of a list of volunteers. Interviews were scheduled at the respondents’ convenience and participants themselves decided on the specific place of the interview or were opting for a telephone interview, in line with ethical regulations (section 6.6).

The actual interviews took place from June to August 2010 and a total of 34 individuals were interviewed (Appendix C), with baseline data of the interviews provided in Table 7.

Table 7: Baseline Data of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total of 34 Interviews:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male/ Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Male: <strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Female: <strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility Restricted/ Sight Restricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mobility Restricted: <strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sight Restricted: <strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Home of Participant: <strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Area: <strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Telephone Interview: <strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While stating the sample size and baseline information is necessary, it is equally important to collect extensive details about the interviewees (Cresswell, 2007). Providing the reader with sufficient information about the life circumstances of the participants assists the audience to make an evaluation of the appropriateness of the sample (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002, Morrow, 2005). However, it has to be kept in mind that the researcher was not allowed to ask any questions with regard to the medical history of the participants. Nonetheless, it could be noticed that the severity of people’s impairments ranges from sight-impaired individuals with some residual vision to blind people and from mobility impaired persons relying on a walking stick to severely impaired people, having no mobility apart from being able to speak.

All interviews took place in a public area, at the home of participants or were conducted over the phone, with the majority of sight-restricting individuals opting for phone interviews. Fontana and Frey (2005) emphasise that the lengths of interviews vary considerably, whereas Elliott (2005) maintains that 90 minutes represent an optimal time. The timing was made clear to each participant at the beginning of the interview as this information provided a signal in terms of the level of detail expected (Elliott, 2005). Interviews of this study lasted on average 67 minutes, ranging from 39 to 105 minutes. During the interview time, each participant narrated his/her story in relation to social exclusion guided by the researcher’s interview grid.

Apart from the 34 actual interviews, ten potential interviews did not materialise. In some cases, this was due to changing personal circumstances of the participants, for example becoming a father or having experienced the death of a close family member. In other cases, time constraints were mentioned as reason for not being able to participate as potential interviewees have been informed that the study would involve in-depth interviews, likely to last for approximately 60 minutes. Drop-outs comprised mainly individuals with a mobility restriction, whereas in contrast, sight-restricted people welcomed in-depth interviews as they reported on having problems with surveys due to the inaccessible design of many questionnaires.

Providing information with regard to the sample size and the configuration of the sample is essential to substantiate claims for informational redundancy (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002). The interview process terminated at the point of theoretical saturation (Cook and Crang, 1995). At this point, the researcher obtained data redundancy (Morrow, 2007), as indicated by the depth
and breadth of opinions needed to analyse the data sets. Furthermore, key arguments raised by interviewees became sufficiently repeated that continuing to explore the subject further with more people was considered not necessary. However, it should be noted that true redundancy is impossible as every individual contributes unique experiences. Instead, analytical themes or categories became theoretically saturated (Morrow, 2007).

All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim. In addition to verbal records obtained from narratives and although this research emphasises the importance of data that is obtained dialogically, non-verbal behaviour (Fontana and Frey, 2005) such as body language, intonations, laughter (Elliott, 2005) as well as moments of silence (Charmaz, 2005) are equally important. Therefore, field notes were taken during and after each interview to capture non-verbal behaviour as these elements produce additional meaning (Elliott, 2005), providing information with regard to the context of the interview (Decrop, 1999).

6.4.5 Data Analysis and Interpretation

In general, there is no single type for analysing narratives (Elliott, 2005) and the literature offers a wide range of approaches to analyse narratives. With the aim of following a critical hermeneutical approach, this research employs three types of analysis as proposed by Elliott (2005). First, ‘content’ focuses on meaning of experiences, second, ‘structure’ investigates how the narrative is assembled and third, ‘interactional context’ examines contextual perspectives of interactions and institutions in which narratives are produced, consumed and recounted (Elliott, 2005), hence offering a performative perspective for analysing data.

The combination of all three types of analysis and interpretation is deemed relevant for the following reasons. First, analysing the thematic content of people’s stories (Gibbs, 2009) leads to considering a story in a holistic manner, investigating meaning (Lieblich et al., 1998). This enables reaching a comprehensive understanding of a particular issue (Flick, 2009). Kvale (2009) supports this argument, highlighting the possibility of obtaining rich descriptions of a phenomenon studied. Further, an analysis based on content focuses on experiences and deals with those aspects that inform about the social world (Elliott, 2005). Related to this study, it is important to reveal how participants perceive social exclusion and comprehend different
reproduction and transformation strategies with regard to identity positions as responses to experiences of social exclusion.

Theoretical coding is used with the intention to derive at analytical categories, followed by setting up a coding hierarchy, which enables comparisons (Gibbs, 2009). The main bases for comparison for this research relate to individual case comparisons as well as comparisons between male and female participants and mobility restricted and sight restricted individuals. As themes and categories come to light, these are compared and contrasted with existing and new data sets (Morrow, 2007). As researchers need to expose information about the way data was coded (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002), it should be noted that both, concept-driven and data-driven coding (Gibbs, 2009) has been employed. Concept-driven coding derives from having reviewed the literature, investigating the current understanding and dimensions of social exclusion. However, as one of the aims of this research is to offer a re-conceptualisation of social exclusion, particularly in the sphere of tourism, the research needs to be open for new and emerging theoretical codes and categories deriving from the data itself.

Second, investigating the structure involves building structural models. One commonly cited structural model to data analysis was developed by Labov and Waletzky, focusing on abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution and coda (Labov and Waletzky, 1967). Despite offering a valuable approach for short sections of an interview, the model has been criticised due to the difficulty for defining boundaries between categories, accommodating sub-arguments and its inadequacy for longer, holistic narratives (Elliott, 2005). As an alternative model, particularly suitable for analysing holistic accounts, is the use of development of plot over time (Lieblich et al., 1998). Crucial here is the identification of series of “chapters” or the “development of plot” (p.48), either indicating progressive or regressive parts of the narrative (Elliott, 2005). As analogy to this research, the structural technique is employed to detect parts of the narratives that either point towards reproduction or transformation. Here, attention is paid to statements, indicating whether or not interviewees resist norms, contest dominant representations and challenge pre-determined principles.

Third, the interactional context is examined based on a performative dimension. This analysis technique takes into account that stories narrated are linked to local contexts and are also
connected to the wider social world (Mishler, 1995). It is the latter that highlights the social role of narratives in terms of revealing new types of stories that have previously been hidden. However, these hidden types of stories are regarded as essential to either maintain the status quo or to expose emancipatory, transformative roles (Plummer, 1995). It can be argued that while the second category, structure, especially when using Labov and Waletzky’s model is applicable for research positioned in the constructivist framework, the third approach to analysis is better suited for critical theorists. Supporting this, Elliott (2005) highlights that the interactional context analysis pays attention to interrogating society and the wider fabric society is made of, with the aim to reveal processes of discourse production (Frost, 2009). It is the performatve level of analysing data that moves beyond what social exclusion ‘is’ and instead focuses on what social exclusion ‘does’ to people with a disability, particularly with regard to identity positions.

By looking more directly at the relationship between narrative and identity, a key issue of this research, Freeman (2001) refers to the rhetorical dimension when elaborating on the narrative performance of identity. Similar to the interactional context analysis, the rhetoric perspective approaches identity as performative struggle, investigating what is ‘done’ (Freeman, 2001). It recognises the existence of multiple identities according to different contexts. Different identities come to life through narratives but are always bound to discursive conditions (Freeman, 2001). In relation to this, the meaning of experience, as outlined in the first narrative analysis technique, is taken to a discursive as well as embodied level (Langellier, 2001), which is the aim of the third analysis technique.

Employing a three-layered approach to data analysis, attention is not only paid to categorical content, but also to the context for each theme, moving the analysis to a holistic level. It is argued that words reach meaning from the specific context in which they originate (McCabe and Foster, 2006), with Keats (2009) referring to a particular place as part of a context-specific analysis. While Sandelowski and Barroso (2002) argue that findings can be presented episodically, emphasising key moments of an experience, this study focuses on examining different contexts instead of episodes and compares the everyday life with tourism.

In sum, for answering research question four, an emphasis is placed on analysing the content to derive at meaning what social exclusion ‘is’ by establishing conceptual categories. Moving the
analysis to a holistic level, different experiences of social exclusion in the everyday life are compared with tourism, with the aim to highlight context-specific differences. In addition, the performati ve level of analysis explores the social role that narratives play and moves the interpretation towards what social exclusion ‘does’.

The performative angle to data analysis continues to be employed for research question five, concentrating on identity constructs. While categorical and holistic approaches are also used, the focus rests more on identifying progressive and regressive parts of narratives by examining different strategies of either reproduction or transformation and exploring these in the holistic context of home and away. Hence, different approaches are employed to obtain as much meaning as possible from the stories, which leads to exploring a topic from multiple perspectives with each perspective providing new research avenues (Frost, 2009).

For all three levels of analysis, it can be argued that attention needs to paid to three types of voices, which are the voice of the interviewee, the voice of the theoretical/conceptual framework established and the reflexive voice (Lieblich et al., 1998). Particularly with regard to the voice of the interviewee and in order to support findings and their analytical value, examples of narrative abstracts are brought into the discussion, paying attention to representing narrators fairly as opposed to relying on sensational value only (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002). While examples in form of quotes are brought in to elucidate conceptual categories, they are also used poly-vocally to contrast different opinions (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002), thereby highlighting the inherent complexity for reaching an understanding of social exclusion. In line with the three levels of analyses, detailed transcribing is employed, which includes non-lexical utterances such as ‘uumms’. It is argued that clean transcripts are only used for analyses that focus on content (Elliott, 2005). However, as this research incorporates all three levels of analysis, more details are required to investigate how narratives are performed (Elliott, 2005).

6.5 Considerations of Quality

The last two decades were marked with discussions on quality criteria for qualitative research (Rolfe, 2006, Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002, Torrance, 2008). Of particular concern are issues related to the legitimacy of qualitative research (Cousins, 2002). Many ideas of quality in research stem from debates in quantitative research, focusing on validity, reliability and
generalisability (Gibbs, 2009). Initially, qualitative research tried to evaluate research according to the same criteria (Gibbs, 2009, Seale, 1999, Hope and Waterman, 2003), which is supported by examples deriving from action research, where validity and reliability are used as key quality criteria (Greenwood and Levin, 2005). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) propose credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability as quality criteria. This means that credibility works in a similar vein than internal validity, transferability corresponds to external validity or generalisation, dependability is related to reliability and confirmability to objectivity (Morrow, 2005). As this can be regarded as duplicating terminology (Morse et al., 2002), Morrow (2005) questions if this approach reaches the same goals to ensure quality in research.

Thus, while some authors maintain the view that quality standards should follow positivist perceptions, others call for establishing standards for qualitative studies (Hope and Waterman, 2003). Whereas positivist quantitative approaches seek internal and external control, qualitative research does not aim for control but places an emphasis on description and interpretation (Cousins, 2002). This is supported by Elliott (2005), arguing that reliability and validity belong to positivist assumptions. In a similar vein, Feighery (2006) reiterates that an emphasis on validity has concealed the researcher’s role as part of the research. Further, Morrow (2007) questions the use of validity and reliability for qualitative studies and Flicks (2009) argues that these criteria do not underlie any standards in qualitative research.

This discussion relates back to the paradigmatic debate about different perceptions of truth and knowledge (section 5.4.1). For example, the nature of knowledge is dissimilar when comparing a rationalist, quantitative paradigm with a naturalist, qualitative approach, which in turn has an impact on selecting quality criteria (Morse et al., 2002). This is supported by Gibbs (2009) arguing that the way how knowledge and truth is perceived has an impact on quality criteria, in particular claims for validity. While validity can be regarded as a key quality criterion for realist researchers, when adopting an idealist or constructivist stance, where multiple views and interpretations are acknowledged, validity seems of little value (Gibbs, 2009). Hence, Seale (1999) accentuates that different quality criteria have to be employed to indicate different paradigmatic conceptions, supported by Morrow (2005, 2007) arguing that quality criteria are bound to specific paradigmatic assumptions.
Looking at constructivist/interpretivist approaches to enhance quality, numerous authenticity criteria, such as fairness as well as ontological, educative, catalytic and tactical authenticity, are regarded as paramount to enhance trustworthiness (Morrow, 2005, Morrow, 2007). While these quality criteria show a significant overlap with criteria employed in critical/ideological research, the latter also embraces criteria of “consequential validity” (p.253), which measures the success of creating social and political change through research. At the core, action-related issues, such as revealing processes of power, oppression and inequality as well as empowerment, constitute quality criteria for research following a critical paradigmatic stance (Morrow, 2005).

Moving beyond the debate of quality criteria related to specific paradigms, Sandelowski and Barroso (2002) argue that the debate should concentrate on aesthetics and rhetoric. Attention should be paid to the research outcome, which should represent “a dynamic vehicle that mediates between researcher/writer and reviewer/reader” (p.75). Following this argument, the authors reiterate that the report itself remains the only basis for evaluating research as it is difficult to disentangle the production from the consumption of knowledge (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002). Aesthetics has been outlined as important to provide the reader with the possibility to anticipate and experience the research (Wijesinghe, 2009 citing Piantanida and Garman, 1999). It is said to represent a quality criterion as the researcher shows the capacity to establish a connection with the audience so that the reader’s understanding of the phenomenon under investigation is clarified based on the material presented (Morrow, 2005). A related concept is vitality, which highlights the importance of immediacy and identification in that the research becomes alive for the audience (Wijesinghe, 2009 citing Piantanida and Garman, 1999).

Deriving from these arguments is a proliferation of quality criteria which form the basis for an ongoing discussion on which criteria to apply. As a result, the establishment of an overarching system to inform about quality issues is very difficult (Seale, 1999) as there is no consensus on quality criteria (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002). Also Cousins (2002) emphasises that criteria still undergo a period of experimentation, leaving the subject of good qualitative research open to debate. Sandelowski and Barroso (2002) go as far as questioning whether such as consensus is worthwhile achieving. This is supported by Rolfe (2006) casting doubt on the appropriateness of pre-determined categories for evaluating qualitative research and argues instead for a continuum of quality criteria specific to each individual research as consensus in terms of quality criteria is
unlikely to be achieved. Particularly with regard to interviews, quality has to be judged based on each specific study in terms of form, topic and purpose as there are no fixed criteria (Kvale, 2009).

In line with Rolfe (2006), it is anticipated that individual criteria are needed for judging the quality of this research. While some of these criteria derive from reflective accounts (Rolfe, 2006), others correspond to quality mechanisms outlined by Morrow (2005). These criteria are chosen because they are applicable to qualitative research and cut across paradigms (Morrow, 2007), which is important as this research has adopted a dual-paradigmatic framework.

### 6.5.1 Social Validity

Sandelowski and Barroso (2002) claim that qualitative studies need to embrace different kinds of "validities" (p.102). Social validity is regarded as a standard for achieving trustworthiness in qualitative research mainly related to enhancing social justice (Morrow, 2005). While Morrow (2005) highlights that this criterion can be applied to different paradigms, it can be argued that it is particularly relevant for this research embracing critical theory due to inherent assumptions to change aspects of the social world (Tribe, 2001, Chambers, 2007) with the aim to achieve emancipation (How, 2003, Gard McGehee, 2009). Hence, social validity can provide the justification for this research topic as the aim is to overcome exclusionary practices faced by disabled people. Of importance in this context is the concept of utility, referring to the advancement of knowledge in the field (Wijesinghe, 2009 citing Piantanida and Garman, 1999). It is anticipated that reaching a better understanding of social exclusion does not only lead to advancing knowledge but also leads to changes in practices, such as in the field of policy.

Social validity can be compared to the “problem appraisal parameter” (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002, p.94). Specific to this study, the discernible problem is depicted by having provided evidence that tourism studies have followed a rather uncritical acceptance of the term social exclusion deriving from social policy, which prevents the development of a more inclusive tourism industry. This problem also coincides with gaps in the literature (section 1.5.1) and is also of practical relevance (section 1.5.2), reiterating the social validity of this study.
Traditionally, validity is approached through the process of triangulation (Gibbs, 2009), which is held to lead to breadth and depth (Cousins, 2002) and greater rigor in validating the accuracy of data (Cresswell, 2007). However, it is also criticised as it assumes that there is a single reality which can be captured (Gibbs, 2009). Following Morrow (2005), it is argued that a different procedure for evaluating the adequacy of data is needed, moving away from triangulation.

6.5.2 Adequacy of Data

When discussing adequacy of data, authors agree that purely looking at the numbers is not a quality criterion (Morrow, 2005, Elliott, 2005, Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002). Trying to bring a number-based argument forward is seen as an attempt to ‘fit-into’ traditional postpositivist research (Morrow, 2005). Furthermore, statements made by the researcher with regard to the impossibility of generalising from qualitative studies gives an indication that the researcher has not fully understood the purpose of qualitative research as the main aim is to derive at analytic generalisation and not statistical representation (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002).

Despite the relative small sample of qualitative interviews, it is possible to reach an understanding of different meanings that is shared by a particular community (Elliott, 2005), with each individual interview having the capacity to provide insights into the interviewee’s identity and his/ her social context (Chase, 2005). Specific to this study, narratives provided an opportunity to gain insights into different strategies or responses to social exclusion, highlighting individual approaches with regard to identity positions. Further, the re-conceptualisation of social exclusion might achieve partial consensus among people with a disability, while at the same time being cautious with the experiences of individuals with different impairments or other socially excluded groups that could not be captured. Hence, findings deriving from a small number of narratives cannot be transferred to different populations or different research contexts (Morrow, 2005, Chase, 2005, Gibbs, 2009).

Adequacy of data also refers to appropriate sampling procedures, quality, length and depth of interview data as well as a variety of evidence (Morrow, 2005). With regard to the first four aspects, it is anticipated that the pilot sample followed quality criteria as it was conducted with people with mobility or sight restrictions, which led to improvements in the research design. The data obtained from the interviews is deemed as information-rich as can be seen from an example
of the interview transcripts (Appendix D). Specific to interviews, Kvale (2009) argues that length of respondents’ answers, its relevance and richness as well as clarifications of respondents’ answers translates into qualitative valuable research. As information-richness represents an important quality criterion (Morrow, 2005), the point of theoretical saturation was reached with the 34th interview with sufficient analytical themes to provide insights into the specific research problem.

Examining the variety of evidence, it is argued that a single data source contains limitations (Morrow, 2005). Hence, this study uses multiple data sources including secondary material, field notes and reflective journal entries apart from the data sets obtained through the actual interviews. Specific to secondary material, Sandelowski and Barroso (2002) emphasise the importance of quality of the literature review in terms of highlighting what is currently wrongly mistaken as ‘known’ and rectifying it. The critique of tourism following assumptions made in social policy and trying to correct this error by establishing a different framework for analysing the phenomenon of social exclusion would possibly fall into this category. Using multiple sources of data is deemed beneficial to not only enhance the richness, breadth and depth of data but also to improve the “interpretive status of the evidence” (Morrow, 2005, p.256). This is linked to the quality assurance mechanism of “adequate disconfirming evidence” (p.256), which refers to reporting on how initial thoughts are disconfirmed with emerging findings (Morrow, 2005). Evidence of this is provided as part of reflective journal entries (Appendix E).

6.5.3 Adequacy of Interpretation and Coherence

Adequacy of interpretation, referring to data analysis, interpretation and representation, is an important quality aspect relevant to the outcome of the research (Morrow, 2005). Crucial here is the development of an analytical framework that systematically builds on the concepts established at the beginning of the research (Morrow, 2005). Specific to this research, evidence how this was achieved is mirrored in the interview checklist (Appendix A). Further, emerging themes and categories should continuously be captured by analytic memos (Morrow, 2005). Following Gibbs (2009), analytic memos have been prepared by the end of each interview to secure initial ideas for codes in order to avoid a “definitional drift in coding” (p.98). This assisted in the establishment of emerging themes and categories used during the interpretation process.
As part of adequacy of interpretation, coherence is added as it is not sufficient to discuss themes or categories deriving from the data, but also to highlight the complexity among these categories (Morrow, 2005). Coherence is said to be a part of aesthetics criteria (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002) and can further be linked to integrity, investigating the soundness of the conceptual structure (Wijesinghe, 2009 citing Piantanida and Garman, 1999), reiterating the importance of evaluating the outcome of any research. Attention was paid to a well-balanced incorporation of direct quotes for representational purposes (Morrow, 2005). Also Guba and Lincoln (2005) highlight the importance of ‘fairness’ by ensuring that all voices of the inquiry find representation in the text. The fair presentation of subjects is also an ethical principle (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002), which is discussed later.

While using quotes can shape and control the reading by the external audience, it is also a seen as a way to convince readers of the quality of the study by providing a reflection of reality (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002). Important here is the provision of context-specific information (Gibbs, 2009), which can be linked to the concept of verisimilitude, which means providing sufficient details to represent human experiences (Wijesinghe, 2009 citing Piantanida and Garman, 1999). This is supported by Cresswell (2007), arguing that verisimilitude ensures that the complexities are outlined accurately with the aim to engage the reader.

6.5.4 Subjectivity and Reflexivity

Reflexivity is regarded as a key criterion for assessing quality in research (Gibbs, 2009, Cresswell, 2007) as it contributes to the trustworthiness of the study (Morrow, 2007). It is argued that particularly external readers gain from reflexive accounts, allowing them as consumers of research to judge the quality (Rolfe, 2006) and to evaluate the researcher as “situated actor” (Feighery, 2006, p.271).

While a reflexive account is provided in section 5.6.2, it should be noted that additionally, a self-reflective journal has been kept as part of this research process and an example can be found in Appendix E. As reflexivity involves making the researcher’s assumptions and biases explicit to the audience (Morrow, 2005), it is strongly related to subjectivity. Subjectivity can be regarded as a quality criterion that is partly paradigm-specific, as certain paradigms draw greater attention to revealing the researcher’s subjectivities, and partly seen as a standard for qualitative research,
necessary to be able to judge the outcome of the research. It is often acknowledged that qualitative researchers embrace subjectivity as part of the research process (Morrow, 2005) and interpretivists and critical theorists attempt to manage subjectivity by regarding the researcher as co-constructor of meaning, influencing the interpretation, which represents a political act, instead of trying to limit or control it (Morrow, 2005).

6.5.5 Ethics

With the above discussion in mind, subjectivity and reflexivity aim at improving the final outcome of the research. While Morse et al. (2002) emphasise that researchers should not place responsibility with the external readers but instead carry responsibility themselves, Sandelowski and Barroso (2002), argue that both parties have certain obligations: the writer to write well and the reader to read well. Ethical considerations can be seen as essential to warrant quality doing the research, which subsequently improves the tangible outcome for the external audience. Hence, ethical considerations are deemed crucial for the entire research process, representing a key quality criterion (Cresswell, 2007, Gibbs, 2009, Flick, 2009, Cousins, 2002). Ethical aspects refer to the researcher's sensibility (Wijesinghe, 2009 citing Piantanida and Garman, 1999), which is important when approaching the subject of disability from an able-bodied perspective.

While ethical considerations are regarded as a standard for qualitative research regardless of the adopted paradigm, sections dedicated to ethics are usually absent in research reports (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002). Ethical procedures expand beyond obtaining ethical consent from an institution and transcend all stages of the research process (Cresswell, 2007). Following these arguments, the next section provides information about the ethical conduct of this research alongside different stages of the research process.

6.6 Practical Implementation of Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations embrace the entire research process (Cousins, 2002). Starting with the design stage, Sandelowski and Barroso (2002) highlight the need to specify the benefits and risks distinctive to the study. This has been addressed as part of the application procedure for obtaining ethical approval, which was granted in December 2009. Central documents to receive favourable ethical opinion include a detailed protocol cover sheet (Appendix F), a summary of
the project (Appendix G) and information with regard to semi-structured interviews (Appendix H), which led to a thorough examination of the proposed research questions (Flick, 2009). In addition, a risk assessment was provided, outlining the potential risks for interviewees and researcher, including measures to reduce risks for both parties (Appendix I).

Of further ethical concern is how much detail is provided to the participants prior to the interview as too much detail is likely to result in irritation or false expectations (Flick, 2009). As already stated, disability organisations were sent a short editorial for the inclusion into their newsletter (Appendix B). Once potential participants expressed interest in this study, they were provided with key information about this study based on the participant information sheet (Appendix J), which comprises the aim of this research and main categories of questions asked. The participant information sheet was also supplied in different formats for different impairment groups (Appendix K). In some cases, potential interviewees asked for more information, which was provided by the researcher via e-mail.

During the actual interview procedure, consent techniques are vital to deal adequately with both, the sensitivity of the subject matter (social exclusion) and vulnerability of subjects (individuals with a disability) (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002). As confidentiality and privacy is of utmost importance (Gibbs, 2009), informed consent was obtained (Appendix L). In line with Flick (2009), it outlines the purpose of the research, data collection handling and ensures participants the right to withdraw at any time. In order to account for sensitivity issues in the data collection process (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002), the consent form was also available in different formats, similar to the participant information sheet and was approved by interviewees either through signature or by a verbal recording, depending on the type of impairment.

Gibbs (2009) stresses the importance of developing trust in the researcher/ interviewee relationship, with Fontana and Frey (2005) emphasising that trust is one of the key prerequisites for successful research. Central for establishing trust in this research was taking the time to get to know interviewees apart from following the questions as set by the interview grid. Given the background of the researcher, the data collection process was informed by a respectful and empathic approach, with communication skills being crucial. Dressing casual was seen as an advantage when dealing with mobility-restricted individuals. When interviewing visually
impaired individuals, advice by Richards (2009) was followed in that attention was paid to providing a comfortable and unintimidating environment by ensuring that, where possible, people with sight restrictions take a seat with the back facing the light in order to allow for optimising their potential to make out the researcher. In addition, visual gestures have been verbalised and names were used more often (Richards, 2009).

After the research, the preservation of anonymity is a key ethical issue when conducting research with disabled individuals (Richards, 2009). While Gibbs (2009) highlights that ensuring confidentiality and privacy is difficult in qualitative research, results in this study were anonymised by using pseudonyms instead of the real names of interview participants (Flick, 2009). Overall, the research process with disabled individuals was accompanied by mutual agreement, accessible communication and information as well as anonymity (Richards, 2009).

### 6.7 Limitations

Deriving from the review on quality criteria for qualitative research are certain limitations, which should be explicitly stated to further contribute to quality claims (Morrow, 2005). Section 6.4 on interviews as narrative research strategy has already outlined general limitations. Some of these were justified as part of the dual-paradigmatic framework adopted, while others were reduced by having outlined the details of the research design, sampling procedure, participant recruitment procedure as well as data collection and interpretation processes. Nonetheless, it is anticipated that the study would have benefited from employing a variety of methods, which is termed "symposium research" (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2005, p.575) by for example incorporating focus groups to further reduce shortcomings of using interviews.

While all limitations of this study are brought together in the overall conclusion chapter of this research, the use of theories deriving from different disciplines can be regarded as a way to overcome the shortcoming of forgoing on employing multiple empirical methods as this helped to achieve rich and comprehensive interpretations with regard to the given research aim (Decrop, 1999). Even so, it is questioned if qualitative research assists in policy-making processes as it is often characterised as a "cottage industry" (p.508) due to its focus on small-scale applications (Torrance, 2008).
6.8 Summary

This chapter outlined the main research aim and its related questions corresponding to different stages of the research, such as theory building, empirical research and practical implications. After outlining the theory-building stage, individual interviews as specific method as part of the narrative research inquiry were discussed at a generic level to provide a justification together with its limitations. The individual interview technique was deemed suitable as it allows focusing on lived experiences while at the same time revealing social processes influencing the development of identities. The use of narratives also enhances the agency of narrators.

Having outlined 'what' the adopted interviewing technique aims at obtaining, the following sections delineated 'how' the information-gathering process was accomplished, by focusing on research design, based on an interview grid with 4 themes, allowing for interviews to be in-depth and semi-structured. Findings deriving from the pilot study were reported that led to changes made to the research instrument. Research participants embrace individuals with mobility and visual restrictions and the related sampling technique is based on criterion and convenience sampling strategies. After outlining details regarding the participant recruitment process, it was outlined that the data collection process took place between June and August 2010, leading to a total of 34 interviews lasting for approximately 1 hour. Interviews took place in either the homes of participants or public areas, while some were conducted over the phone.

Individuals with a disability were interviewed until the point of theoretical saturation was reached. At this point, analytical themes and categories became sufficiently repeated. While some themes derived from concept-driven coding, supporting the current understanding of social exclusion in tourism, other themes formed the basis for the establishment of data-driven categories. Particularly the latter led to an enhanced understanding of social exclusion as well as transformative and reproductive strategies employed by disabled people. All narratives were tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Non-verbal behaviour was captured by field notes on body language, intonations and moments of silence. The data analysis and interpretation process involved three stages comprising content, structure and interactional context. The chapter concluded by considering quality criteria applied to this research, with particular emphasis placed on outlining the practical implementation of ethical guidelines.
Chapter 7: A Re-Conceptualisation of Social Exclusion

7.1 Introduction

The following chapters present the findings related to the narratives collected during the fieldwork, providing an answer to the last two research questions, focusing on re-conceptualising social exclusion in tourism (chapter seven) and examining transformative and reproductive strategies linked to identity (chapter eight). These chapters are linked as chapter seven aims at understanding the meaning of social exclusion as perceived by individuals with a disability, while chapter eight investigates the different effects that this understanding has on identity positions, as such following claims of a performative framework.

This current chapter draws on people’s experiences of exclusion and proceeds by discussing conceptual categories related to the meaning of social exclusion. As knowledge and meaning deriving from analytical processes are intrinsically linked to interpretation processes (Cousins, 2002), the results of this study are integrated into a discussion to highlight where findings sit in agreement with the literature or in contrast, deviate from it, hence delivering new insights into how to understand social exclusion in tourism. Conceptual categories are juxtaposed with the existing literature throughout and theoretical arguments brought into the discussion derive from chapter two on disability and barriers to tourism participation and chapter four on distributional and relational aspects of social exclusion. Towards the end of this chapter, concepts and ideas from chapter three on power/knowledge constructs are brought into the debate.

In order to support findings, conceptual categories and their analytical value, narrative abstracts are brought into the discussion. Quotes are also used poly-vocally to contrast different opinions (Sandelowski and Barroso, 2002), hereby highlighting the inherent complexity for reaching an understanding of social exclusion. All quotes derive from interviews with 34 individuals of all ages, either having a mobility or sight restriction.

In order to elicit information about their travel background, warm-up questions were related to participants’ last holiday experiences. It was found that while some individuals are very travel
active, for example having had 34 trips abroad over the last ten years or travelling three to four times a year, others travel only once a year to a destination within the UK. Based on these insights, follow-up questions established the link to social exclusion, extracting experiences of social exclusion at home and while being on holiday, as well as soliciting interviewees to reflect on the differences between exclusionary situations in different contexts.

Elaborating on the meaning of social exclusion in general, all participants highlighted that there is no single form of social exclusion. Instead social exclusion exists at different levels with different facets, leading to the identification of a number of theoretical categories. While some of these categories derive from concept-driven coding, classifying themes according to the current understanding and dimensions of social exclusion, other categories are data-driven, allowing for new and emerging categories that assist in gradually working towards re-conceptualising social exclusion. Among the concept-driven codes are different barriers as interviewees hold the belief that social exclusion is strongly bound to the notion of barriers:

"it’s all to do with overcoming barriers ... And it’s either physical barriers or mental barriers, um or attitude barriers. Basically barriers, is the key, the key element” (Julia/Mobility)

7.2 Supporting the Current Conceptualisation of Social Exclusion

The next sections offer a discussion on theoretical categories originating from concept-driven coding, hence supporting the current conceptualisation of social exclusion. As barriers to tourism participation faced by disabled individuals were held to be related to distributional and relational aspects of social exclusion, they are discussed alongside each other.

7.2.1 Poverty: Distributional Aspects of Social Exclusion

The lack of financial means has been identified as a structural barrier, which occupies an ambiguous position as it does not affect all disabled people equally. In relation to perceptions of social exclusion, a small number of interviewees mentioned structural constraints as leading to social exclusion. Their arguments focus on the additional costs required for holidaying at ease,
particularly with regard to expenses for support persons. Adam, referring to blind individuals, highlights:

"they find it a bit unfair that they have to pay extra ... they couldn’t financially afford paying more than a normal price for a holiday, then they’d feel excluded, full stop"
(Adam/ Sight)

This opinion reiterates Darcy’s (2002) findings, highlighting that any extra requirement adds to the financial burden involved in tourism participation. However, participants stressed that considerations of affordability often leads to feelings of social exclusion in the everyday life as well. While it can be argued that this affects everyone in society regardless of ability, specific to disability, economic concerns and constraints are often associated with a lack of employment opportunities (Darcy and Daruwalla, 1999, Shaw and Coles, 2004). This coincides with a number of interviewees’ comments. Hence, while inclusion is said to be achieved through access to employment, this is difficult for many disabled people relying on welfare benefits (Collins and Kay, 2003). This is supported by Sam, who highlights that the lack of financial means deriving from limited access to employment is a key pertaining feature of the everyday day:

"money makes a big difference here, so if you are entirely dependent upon the social system for your income and for your housing ... I can see the frustration building up over that sort of thing and feeling excluded as a result" (Sam/ Mobility)

Specific to tourism, an additional argument covering financial aspects relates to the inability to make use of facilities that are offered at lower prices due to the limited accessibility that these places entail. Hence, individuals are forced to accept higher prices to ensure that facilities meet their access requirements in order to enjoy their holidays, supporting Darcy’s (2002) argument. Coupled with the pressure to pay higher prices is the lack of choice and flexibility in the selection process of tourism facilities (Murray and Sproats, 1990), representing a major concern to interviewees:

"there are things like that that you can’t do, that exclude you. Cheap deals exclude... you’re excluded from ... it’s also a con and a rip-off; everything gets charged more”
(Daisy/ Mobility)
This statement is indicative for exclusion being generated due to limited opportunities to take advantage of cheap deals. Baum (2006) argues that in particular low cost airlines work against principles of social inclusion due to specific booking and payment facilities as well as limited flexibility (Baum, 2006). However, while these arguments could be applied to all individuals who do not possess a credit card, disabled interviewees highlight exclusionary effects as low-cost offers do not fulfil access requirements.

While Collins and Kay (2003) emphasise that financial aspects linked to disability are not addressed adequately in the social exclusion literature and narrative comments indicate that there is a financial element that leads to exclusion, it has to be taken into consideration that economic concerns have not been mentioned frequently. Related to studies investigating financial barriers in tourism, Darcy and Daruwalla (1999) and Daniels et al. (2005) also emphasise that the impact of economic barriers on travel experiences was found to be minimal. Further, financial arguments put forward in this research derive from individuals with low to moderate support needs, which opposes Darcy’s (2002) findings that people with severe disabilities are more affected by financial issues. All interviewees who, for example, rely on a 24 hour support person, did not refer to any economic basis of social exclusion. It can therefore be assumed that social exclusion might originate in the lack of financial means, however, relational and spatial elements were more pressing to participants, leading to postulate that social exclusion is not necessarily poverty-based (Berghman, 1995, Kenyon et al., 2002, Duffy, 1995).

7.2.2 Environmental Aspects of Social Exclusion

All interviewees focused on spatial exclusion by referring to physical access barriers in tourism and the everyday life. Physical barriers were related to the infrastructure of places, making exclusion a space-bound experience that limits access. This coincides with arguments put forward in the chapter on disability, discussing environmental constraints. Participants felt that the geography of places is prohibitive, especially when compared to able-bodied counterparts. Talking about his holiday experience in Cornwall, Joe recalls that:
“I was the only one who couldn’t get into any of the shops ... I’m sitting in that street and I really felt... that’s when I felt excluded because everybody else was walking around going in and out of shops” (Joel/Mobility)

In contrast to the literature on barriers, focusing on the relative importance of accessible accommodation, attractions and transport (Sen and Mayfield, 2004, Takeda and Card, 2002, Card et al., 2006), only very few interviewees stressed the importance of one sub-sector over another. However, participants pointed out that the nonexistence of continuous accessible pathways (Darcy, 1998) contributes to experiences of exclusion. In line with Israeli (2002), the significance of pathways increases with travel frequency. Joshua, a regular traveller, highlights the link between the absence of accessible pathways and exclusion:

“I have a wheelchair ... But sometimes it’s just not practical to take it. There’s no point if the pavements are non-existent ... the infrastructure just isn’t cut out for it ... So ... there’s an element of exclusion” (Joshua/Mobility)

While a number of narratives emphasise aspects of spatial exclusion in tourism, space-related exclusion was also identified by all interviewees as a central experience that transcends everyday activities. Here, the emphasis was not placed on an agglomeration of poor people as in the social exclusion literature (Berghman, 1995, Room, 1995b), but on the physical inability to enter buildings or facilities. Spatial exclusion is held to be the most visible and evident type of exclusion (Byrne, 2005), which Joe accentuates by referring to physical disabilities:

“talking to you is not going to solve it; you’ve still got a physical ... So in some ways it is a more, um, more obvious exclusion because it’s a physical exclusion by its very nature” (Joe/Mobility)

While spatial exclusion is a key feature, a number of interviewees stressed that certain places cannot and should not be made accessible for everyone. Given the incompatibility of access objectives and conservation policies of old buildings (Goodall, 2006, Goodall et al., 2005), disabled people in this study give precedence to preservation issues, while at the same time arguing that alternative access strategies depend on the attitude of providers. By giving priority to conservation, Jack, wheelchair-bound, draws attention to acceptance levels:
"I have felt excluded ... I accept some of it in part because ... you cannot ask ... whoever’s responsible for the infrastructure to completely replace a lot of old buildings ... with modern day equivalents" (Jack/ Mobility)

While most interviewees with a mobility restriction emphasise the lack of physical access leading to exclusion, blind or visually-restricted individuals also experience exclusionary spaces. However, their form of spatial exclusion is found to be related to the negotiation through space in tourism and at home:

"the problem that somebody with a sight impairment might have ... is to actually, perhaps, negotiate their way around the, the areas" (Tilly/ Sight)

The origin of the difficulties to negotiate through space and the resulting feelings of exclusion can be found in design features that do not correspond to people’s needs. However, references made to erroneous design structures were also narrated by mobility-restricted people. Hence, it is suggested that while space-related experiences of exclusion differ, both, visually and mobility restricted people face exclusion due to design arrangements that do not allow for diversity. However, these inadequate design structures lead to different types of exclusion, either resulting in the lack of physical access to places or difficulties in negotiating through space.

While it is argued that principles of Universal Design have to be implemented to overcome access barriers (Sen and Mayfield, 2004) as they support the widest range of individuals in many different situations (Veitch and Shaw, 2004b, Horgan-Jones and Ringaert, 2001, Rains, 2008), reality shows a different picture. Analysing interviewees’ comments, visually-restricted persons refer to design errors as no alternative forms of signs are provided for orientation purposes:

"the Universal Studios ... it’s very visual and it’s dependent on being able to read the signs and follow things like that to negotiate your way around the place" (Tilly/ Sight)

The tendency of society to overemphasise visuality was regarded as central in creating design errors for sight-restricted individuals, corresponding to critiques of the visual dominance of the
gaze framework (Franklin and Crang, 2001, Veijola and Jokinen, 1994). It also supports Richards et al. (2010) calling for moving beyond the emphasis on vision when investigating experiences by sight restricted individuals. In contrast, mobility-restricted interviewees stressed the lack of grab-rails as design structures that cause hindrances, while the absence of ramps and lifts entirely impede access. These design faults seem to be rooted in the negligence by service providers to account for bodily differences. Exclusion can also occur when facilities are in place but are inappropriately designed, leading to additional frustration and anger:

“They have a ramp to get into it. I couldn’t get up this sodding ramp ... people think if there’s a ramp that solves the problem for a wheelchair. Well, actually wheelchairs are much harder to use than you think ... I tried three times to get up this bloody ramp” (Daisy/Mobility)

Related to this, all interviewees questioned if planners have considered different needs and involved disabled people in the planning process, which highlights the need for consultation to overcome exclusion (Sehgal and Edwards, 1999, Imrie and Kumar, 1998). In line with Kitchin (1998), participants also recognised a strong interrelationship between spatial and interactional forms of exclusion, encapsulating exclusion as a socio-spatial process.

7.2.3 Interpersonal Aspects of Social Exclusion

Analysing the narratives, numerous comments could be extrapolated that highlight the interplay between interactive and spatial aspects. While some interviewees hold the belief that both sets play a role in creating exclusion, others focused on the importance of people:

“But because it’s society, and people in general that create exclusion, rarely is it environment” (Caitlin/Sight)

Specific to tourism, a number of participants highlighted that people and service personnel in general can make a great difference when it comes to feelings of inclusion. This coincides with the social exclusion literature, highlighting that particular attention should be paid to the quality of relationships between individuals and groups (McCracken, 1998). Interviewees stated that
limitations in the physical environment can be accepted when people are accommodating, friendly, trained and behave in an understanding and welcoming manner:

“they overcome that again with manpower and very willing manpower who are more than happy to help you ... get you into a place, um, where they can’t obviously put in a ramp. So, the social exclusion ... abroad ... would literally very much depend on the ... willingness of the people” (Jack/ Mobility)

The above argument relates to the debate on barriers, comparing the relative importance of physical access barriers and interpersonal constraints. With regard to the latter and as shown in chapter two, tourism studies focus on attitudes. While the analysis of narratives also revealed that negative attitudes lead to feelings of exclusion, it is anticipated that a more differentiated view is necessary. Triggering negative attitudes, participants elaborated on the general lack of knowledge and understanding of disability:

“This country does not understand disability and it’s not until someone in the family is in a wheelchair ... that family realises what it’s like” (Alex/ Mobility)

At the core, it was felt that able-bodied individuals believe that disability is an infectious and contagious disease (Table 8).

Table 8: Narrative Abstracts: Perceptions of Disability as Infectious and Contagious

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Mobility</td>
<td>‘It’s almost as if you’re infectious ... It’s as if you’ve got an infectious disease rather than a mobility problem ... they don’t know what to say to you, they don’t know what to do to you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Sight</td>
<td>‘It’s almost like you’ve got a disease ... and there’s a big, big draw back there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Mobility</td>
<td>‘and this little boy just said ... he said, um, oh, that man’s only got one leg. Yes, come on, come on [laughs] as if it was some contagious disease’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Mobility</td>
<td>‘sometimes they just avoid you completely because it’s almost as though they, kind of, catch something from you ... it’s discriminatory because...for whatever reasons, whether they feel negatively about disabled people, or they feel like they’re going to catch something’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan Sight</td>
<td>‘I think it goes back to the human contact side of things, someone making you to feel...making you feel like you’re being a pest’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These narrative abstracts provide evidence that disability becomes a stigma that is profoundly discrediting. In line with Kurzban and Leary (2001), participants perceive the attributes assigned to them as the origin of social exclusion. Related to the process of stigmatisation, particularly the belief that disability is contagious, is the fear of disability. While some interviewees relate fear to levels of insecurity on behalf of the able-bodied population, others outline how disability-phobia initiates the rejection of disabled people in service encounters:

“a lot of people fear disability, they don’t want to be disabled themselves; they don’t know how they’d cope with it ... they can’t talk to them but you just talk to them like an ordinary person and look at them in the eye and you say, hello” (Alex/ Mobility)

“most of the time it’s fear from the people ... oh my goodness what am I going to do with this person so try and put them off. That’s the easiest way out of it” (Scarlett/ Sight)

Scarlett’s comment highlights succinctly how stigma and the fear of disability lead others to judge on the participation of disabled people. Here, misperceptions of abilities and skills play an important role (Elliott et al., 1982). This was supported by narratives from other sight-restricted interviewees, highlighting that people do not understand what ‘blind’ means and how it can affect someone. Often, the assumption is made that blind means no vision. In contrast, other participants reported that blindness is not accepted as a disability. The failure to understand the construct of blindness leads to the inability to recognise the abilities of visually-restricted people. Many interviewees reported that they felt socially excluded due to the fact that they were denied access to activities and attractions because service providers “having no regard to, uh, our abilities” (William/ Sight). From the provider’s point of view, this was often justified from a health and safety perspective:

“they’ve got no experience of people who are visually impaired so they’ve got no idea what you’re capable of and how to deal with you. So the easiest way is to either throw health and safety at you or, we haven’t got the facilities” (Scarlett/ Sight)

Following on from this argument, an insufficient understanding of abilities leads to inattention paid to different needs, which is mirrored by a number of comments made by visually-impaired
people, pointing out that different needs are not recognised by service providers in the tourism industry, leading to feelings of exclusion:

"the help we need is very different to the help you need if you are wheelchair bound ... it's not rocket science that your eyeballs don’t affect your ability to place one foot in front of another" (Dylan/ Sight)

However, specialised hotels catering for the needs of blind people were held to provide positive exclusion and positive discrimination as it fosters the idea that blind people need greater levels of assistance. Hence, not catering for specific needs can lead to exclusion, while paradoxically, specialised service providers, which do embrace a strong differentiated needs perspective, can also create exclusionary structures. In contrast to sight-restricted individuals, only a few mobility-impaired individuals focused on the negligence of considering different needs. A possible explanation might be that society tends to concentrate on mobility-impaired individuals when debating disability. Also, most academic articles in tourism focus mainly on mobility restrictions. Further, the International Symbol of Access shows a wheelchair user (Figure 5), instigating the assumption that disability is associated with mobility-restriction only:

"if you look at the symbol ... it's that of a wheelchair ... that’s something that people’s perceptions are already fully tuned in with ... The first thing that they think of as, in terms of accessibility - oh, well, we can put a ramp at the door" (Tilly/ Sight)

This lack of differentiation between wheelchair users and people with sight problems manifests itself in a number of aspects in the travel planning process. For example, it was noted that there is often no possibility to specify on flight booking websites that assistance is needed for being guided to the gate. Instead, only the wheelchair sign can be ticked, which means that the airport provides a wheelchair, which is not required by visually restricted individuals. Often, respondents felt that being forced to use a wheelchair sign augments feelings of exclusion. Insufficient consideration paid to different needs is also apparent once individuals arrive at the destination. Talking about city tours, Jacob states that:

"the guide, ah, ignores my special, ah, needs ... they do not come to the idea that I, ah, I will need to touch to any objects” (Jacob/ Sight)
The focus on the wheelchair does not only lead to the inattention paid to different needs, but particularly for mobility-restricted individuals results in the denial of the 'human' element. Numerous comments were made that highlight that disabled people felt that they were not treated as human beings, resulting in extreme feelings of social exclusion:

"if you’re with someone else, people quite regularly talk to the other person rather than you ... which is immensely irritating and very socially excluding ... And also being talked to as if you’re an idiot ... Because you’re not in their eye line ... there is something about looking down on somebody in a wheelchair, that then affects people’s attitudes, that they’re not only physically looking down on you, they’re looking down on you socially" (Daisy/ Mobility)

The focus on the wheelchair instead of the person has been reported by Darcy (2003) and equally for this study, it can be argued that this leads to reinforcing existing stereotypes in that disabled people are dependent on others and cannot speak for themselves. Also, visually-restricted people have highlighted that often they are not addressed directly. Instead questions are asked to the sighted companion. As this type of exclusion arises due to the lack of eye-contact, sight-restricted individuals often have no other choice than to wait until someone else instigates a dialogue:

"I have to wait that somebody starts talking to me ... And that’s also a part of exclusion, or of feeling excluded" (Henry/ Sight)

By comparing narratives, it has been found that exclusion, caused by the lack of communication possibilities, has different effects on different individuals. Whereas some simply refer to being unable to ‘join in’ certain activities, others emphasise that it can lead to complete isolation. The problem seems to be intensified in a travel context due to the perceived distance between disabled individuals and other holiday-makers. Specific to mobility-restricted individuals, the most extreme form of interpersonal elements of social exclusion is the actual verbal denial of access to tourism facilities. However, even when they were encouraged to use facilities, feelings of exclusion remain as they were not been given equal treatment when compared to their able-bodied counterparts:
"I've heard hoteliers say, oh we treat everyone the same, whether you're in a wheelchair or not, and yet they don't. They simply don't, um, because you've only got to walk in, um, and see how you're treated and you can very quickly feel ill at ease, uncomfortable, unwelcome" (Alex/ Mobility)

Often, the problem was seen to be related to inappropriate support provided by staff employed in the tourism industry, which creates more obstacles while on holidays. Of particular concern was a type of behaviour that was labelled ‘showcasing’ by interviewees. Individuals elaborated on being forced to use the buggy with flashing lights, which intensifies exclusion as “that, in itself makes you feel far more disabled than you really are” (Dylan/ Sight).

While the above mentioned points refer to service providers, such as hoteliers and airline/airport staff, similar comments were made about travel agencies. Participants believed that travel agencies want to keep disabled people away due to the fear of upsetting their regular clientele. In addition they were found to be of limited use when it comes to the holiday planning process as:

"they can’t advise the people ... I am sure that many people are disadvantaged ... they don’t have the information they need before they plan a holiday" (Alice/ Mobility)

The last comment supports arguments deriving from the disability debate as travel agencies are unable to provide information that meet the needs of disabled people (Cavinato and Cuckovich, 1992). The statement also links into the question to what extent the lack of information actually creates exclusion. There was a general agreement among interviewees that limited information leads to exclusionary experiences due to the inability to access information, concerns over its reliability or the general lack of details with regard to the availability of potential support at the destination, all supporting arguments of chapter two.

The preceding examples highlighted interpersonal aspects of social exclusion in tourism, however, it is anticipated that negative attitudes derive from society in general, which are subsequently mirrored in a travel context. While these can have multiple origins, Daisy focuses on disability benefits, offering two poles of condescending attitudes:
“it [tax on incapacity benefit] affects attitudes, wider social attitudes and social exclusion is mediated by attitudes ... so people are either conning the system or deserving of our patronisation and being looked after” (Daisy/ Mobility)

Daisy’s distinction concurs with arguments put forward in the social exclusion literature, where institutional instances establish a hierarchy of people affected by social exclusion, labelling some as the deserved socially excluded, whereas others are judged to be worth-while helping out (Democratic Dialogue, 1995). While Daisy refers to people’s judgments in general and not only to institutional organisations, it has to be stated that, even if people with a disability fall into the category of deserving the merits of protection, there is often a demeaning underlying postulation, highlighted by the word ‘patronisation’. This confirms the argument that disabled people are exempted from common obligations, while at the same time being excluded from normal pleasures in society (Donoghue, 2003), such as the enjoyment of tourism experiences. Further, while welfare benefits are regarded as essential to achieve social integration (Berghman, 1995), for disabled people this leads to greater stereotyping and stigmatisation.

Reviewing interpersonal facets of social exclusion, it can be argued that findings of this study expand the scope of exclusion triggering factors. Whereas the literature on barriers to tourism participation focuses on attitudinal aspects, this study highlights the complex interplay of stigma, fear of disability, misperceptions of abilities, inappropriate attention to different needs, the denial of humanity and the lack of accurate information provision. Providing a more comprehensive view with regard to a wide range of interpersonal factors and their interrelationship could potentially help to progress arguments of the social exclusion literature.

7.2.4 Intrapersonal Aspects of Social Exclusion

In contrast to negative attitudes of others leading to exclusion, this analytical theme refers to intrapersonal factors, examining the inherent belief of disabled individuals that their impairment inevitably excludes them from societal life or touristic activities. Specific to tourism, statements that support this assumption are:

“I have felt excluded, purely, um, because of my physical limitations” (Joshua/ Mobility)
“they [people] think the sight loss will start to exclude them” (James/ Sight)

This can be linked to intrapersonal barriers to tourism participation, which embraces physical functioning levels that are directly connected to an individual’s disability (Smith, 1987, Daniels et al., 2005). In line with Burns and Graefe (2007), participants highlighted that the type of disability together with demographic factors, such as age, contribute to higher perceptions of intrapersonal barriers. For example, Caitlin emphasised that she felt excluded because she could not engage in activities that are deemed ‘normal’ for her age group:

“In a nightclub I can’t hear anything, and when you take away my hearing, you’ve effectively taken away my eyes. So I couldn’t go clubbing, I don’t get drunk, why, because you can’t walk a guide dog when you’re drunk. There’s a lot of social exclusion, particularly with the younger group” (Caitlin/ Sight)

However, in line with the literature embracing tourism and disability, the level of exclusion is not only dependent on the type of impairment, but also on available support structures (Darcy and Buhalis, 2011b). Interviewees stressed that it is the responsibility of people belonging to the intimate social circle to ensure that individuals are encouraged to participate in activities. Crucial here are positive attitudes that are supportive and bestow confidence. It can be argued that this accelerates the process of becoming and remaining travel active (Packer et al., 2007). With regard to confidence, Tilly argues:

“And if they’re not [confident], then that in itself is giving a barrier to that person who might have enjoyed going on a trip” (Tilly/ Sight)

These confidence levels, which can be placed under emotional constraints, adding to cumulative stress (Daniels et al., 2005) vary not only between different types of impairments but also according to whether the disability is congenital or acquired later in life. Participants highlighted that someone who has been affected later in life perceives exclusion to a greater extent due to different emotional processes. The argument that disability itself is intrinsically bound to experiences of exclusion was echoed by a number of interviewees, however, participants also stressed that individuals, who do not take a committed stance, actively exclude themselves.
While it is impossible to draw generalisations from a sample of 34, a greater number of female participants conveyed narratives pointing towards the existence of voluntary exclusion. The following general statement pulls together the key tenet pertaining to this phenomenon:

“I think in certain instances, people choose to be voluntarily excluded ... They opt for that” (Julia/ Mobility)

Employing a more differentiated perspective, voluntary exclusion is thought of from a variety of angles. Central among these is the lack of individual effort and initiative. Caitlin offers the most detailed explanation covering this aspect:

“when it comes to exclusion, it’s going to be very hard to hear, because I am very straight-laced, I think you’re only as excluded as you allow yourself to be ... If you take a back seat, and you don’t get included ... it’s your fault” (Caitlin/ Sight)

The lack of individual effort and initiative is hence regarded as the origin of voluntary exclusion. Personal initiative has also been brought to the forefront as necessary condition to overcome internal barriers, reiterating the fundamental link between barriers to tourism participation and experiences of exclusion. In addition to personal initiative, Yau et al. (2004) and Packer et al. (2007) draw attention to self-acceptance as part of the travel engagement process. This coincides with the views presented in this study as not accepting disability is regarded as an additional cause of voluntary exclusion:

“I think a lot of people who find they're excluded it’s because they're angry with themselves because of their disability” (Ella/ Mobility)

Whereas the intrapersonal challenge of accepting disability appears to reside at the core of this debate, voluntary social exclusion is strongly interrelated with interpersonal aspects. Interviewees stressed that the preconceived fear related to perceptions by the wider public leads to the act of withdrawing from social activities. While the social exclusion literature focuses on differentiating between total and problematic exclusion (Burchardt et al., 1999), findings from this study reject this categorisation as individuals still experience distress arising from what has been labelled ‘problematic exclusion’ due to the fear of having to face negative attitudes. This
supports Barry’s (1998) argument related to quality of choice. Participants often opt for voluntary social exclusion due to their wish not to be seen as dependent on other people, which triggers negative attitudes. It is hence the complex interplay between dependence, the fear of negative attitudes and voluntary exclusion that reiterates the importance of paying attention to the context from which experiences of social exclusion emerge.

Looking at context-specific aspects, most participants made no distinction between voluntary exclusion at home or while being away. However, Jacob puts forward an extreme argument as he states that “it’s not the project to, to be a good friend with every, every fisherman” (Jacob/Sight). He explained that on holidays, he does not aim to be integrated, pointing towards a form of voluntary exclusion. While this stance prevents him from being disappointed during his holidays, the situation is different when talking about his everyday life. Here, the importance of being accepted as normal part of society is stressed.

### 7.2.5 Contextual Synopsis: Social Exclusion in Tourism

Overall, distributional, environmental, interpersonal and intrapersonal perspectives of social exclusion coincide with barriers to tourism participation faced by disabled individuals. Examining the holistic context from which experiences of exclusion derive, some interviewees highlighted that all dimensions are related to the everyday life and tourism:

> “there’s all sorts of things that can be sort of there, out there in, in the real world ... that can be exclusionary ... all these are relevant in terms of tourism” (Tilly/Sight)

Specific to environmental barriers, participants asserted that while the location changes, physical access barriers remain the same. A more nuanced understanding derives when analysing other stories as some interviewees made a difference between the travel process and actually being on holiday, with the former often leading to greater feelings of exclusion:

> “you can feel more socially excluded getting away on your holidays or getting back from your holidays” (Dylan/Sight)
"not so much on holiday, but when I travel. I’m going to tell you straight ... if I had a gun I would shoot the Paris and Brussels taxi drivers” (Ben/ Sight)

This distinction is helpful for setting up necessary mechanisms to overcome social exclusion during the travel process. Overall, the lack of physical access is an exclusionary principle for mobility-restricted people, whereas sight-impaired individuals focus on difficulties in negotiating through space. In agreement with the literature on spatial barriers, exclusion penetrates the social world by not following principles of Universal Design. While the non-enforcement of rights might play a role in this context, interviewees did not pay attention to the institutional perspective of citizenship rights, although this is emphasised in the disability debate. Only one participant made reference to rights by using the expression of ‘non-citizens’, when talking about the public transport system. However, while legal acts are not brought up as important as part of experiences of exclusion, they are used as mechanism to counteract feelings of exclusion, which forms part of the debate in chapter eight.

While the literature on disability and social exclusion draws attention to interactive and interpersonal aspects, the stories revealed additional elements that contribute to feelings of exclusion, which were all found relevant to tourism, hence offering a more comprehensive understanding. While the origin of these interpersonal elements can be positioned in the general lack of understanding by society at large, resulting in stigmatisation and stereotypes, tourism is not only affected, but, in some cases, interactional facets of social exclusion are experienced in an amplified manner in a holiday context. Often, interviewees made comparisons to the able-bodied population, highlighting that social exclusion is perceived as relative to able-bodied counterparts, supporting arguments in chapter four (Knight and Brent, 1998, Richardson and Le Grand, 2002). Further, despite the belief of some participants that their disability per se excludes them from certain touristic activities, voluntary exclusion is strongly intertwined with interactional aspects. However, individual efforts and accepting disability also play a role in becoming and maintaining travel active.

Financial constraints are rooted in the exclusion from employment possibilities, which is in line with arguments from the disability debate (Braddock and Parish, 2001), and as such might influence the ability to afford a holiday. However, overwhelmingly participants held the opinion
that, specific to tourism, social exclusion is not necessarily related to income, supporting Darcy and Daruwalla (1999). Still, holidaying does add to the financial burden as additional equipment and attendance costs need to be accounted for. However these costs also represent an inherent feature of the everyday life. Hinting towards the potential of exclusion in tourism are disproportionate charges for accessible facilities and the lack of low-budget options. Yet, taken as a whole, findings of this study support the assumption that social exclusion has to be conceptualised beyond the focus on income, highlighting instead the complex interplay of spatial and interpersonal factors.

7.3 Towards a Re-Conceptualisation of Social Exclusion

Apart from theory-driven coding, the next section offers a discussion related to themes deriving from data-driven categories, which contribute to an enhanced understanding of social exclusion. All themes are strongly bound to interactive aspects of exclusion, but differ from interpersonal elements discussed earlier in that they highlight the central position of norms and social power.

7.3.1 Non-Performance in Shared Spaces

While spatial exclusion deriving from environmental barriers supports the current conceptualisation of social exclusion, inappropriate planning structures and resulting design errors lead to the emergence of an additional, problematic area, where the conflict over shared spaces leads to experiences of exclusion. This conflict relates more to interactive elements than purely spatial aspects. Analysing these tensions over spaces, it is recognisable that different parties are involved. The first set of parties involves disabled people and the able-bodied population. Participants affirmed that suffering defeat in the conflict over spaces generates exclusion. In this context, they often refer to able-bodied people abusing the facilities that have been put in place for disabled individuals, such as disabled parking spaces and accessible toilets.

The conflict between these two groups also emerges when disabled people are marginalised due to spaces being created by the values of able-bodied individuals, which confirms Kitchin’s (1998) assertion. Participants referred to the problematic situation in shared pavements, where a blind person alone or with a guide dog is not able to detect the white line distinguishing between the cycle lane and the pedestrian area. While this already creates tensions, interviewees were far
more apprehensive when referring to spaces that are shared with pushchairs and prams. The conflict arises due to the fact that disabled people were refused access to buses as the available accessible spaces were already taken by pushchairs. Bus drivers were held reluctant to enforce pram users to make space for wheelchair users:

“one person, five times in one week, ah, has, um, been excluded from 5 buses ... because, um, there’s been too many pushchairs on and the driver wouldn’t let them on” (Sara/ Sight)

While these situations often provoke anxiety and feelings of disempowerment, they also lead to frustration over the use of spaces. Exemplifying the resulting frustration, interviewees emphasised their belief that accessible areas are designed for disabled people and are ‘taken over’ by the able-bodied population. In this case, space reproduces forms of exclusion, which is an argument put forward by Imrie (2001). Hence, space can be seen as a determinant for granting or denying access, with the initial planning often in the hands of the able-bodied population. However, in contrast to Imrie (2001), who argues that the absence of lifts in the built environment leads to “architectural apartheid” (p.232), the narratives of this study move away from a focus on exclusionary physical design and towards conflicts centring upon who gets priority when spaces are used by more than one group of people. This belief is regarded as problematic as the notion of accessibility is often emphasised as supporting a wide range of users regardless of their abilities. Parents with pushchairs are stressed as an example of people with access needs to convince the industry to move away from regarding accessibility purely on the basis of disability (Darcy and Dickson, 2009). However, findings stress that it is particularly the notion that everyone benefits from accessibility that causes controversies with regard to the lack of consensus about who comes first in making use of a spatial area, denying the first come, first serve principle.

Moreover, conflicts do not only arise between able-bodied and disabled individuals but also between disabled people themselves, struggling over the use of spaces, leading to zones of ambiguity. Tilly elaborates on this conflict by referring to shared spaces with no kerbs:

“Now, that’s terrific when you’re in a wheelchair ... However ... this then sort of provides a very difficult situation for somebody with a sight impairment ... Decide
whether or not they can, with safety, carry on walking ... those kind of areas have created sort of socially excluded areas" (Tilly/ Sicht)

Having elaborated on the two sets of parties involved in the conflict over shared spaces, it becomes apparent that the heterogeneity of individuals’ values and attitudes leads to conflicting interests and competing ideas over and within spaces (Harvey, 1990). Viewing spaces as stages for the performance of individuals (Harvey, 1990), it can be suggested that the non-performance in shared areas leads to feelings of social exclusion. Further, emphasising the link between spaces and power relations, which are always existent in multifunctional spaces (Edensor, 1998), social exclusion can be seen as manifested in spaces which do not only serve different purposes but are also desirable to be accessed by different groups. While it is anticipated that with multiple users and limited space, someone is always excluded, it is questioned why disabled people are often to be found in the exclusionary sphere.

Linking the argument to the power debate, the study provides evidence that space is regarded as crucial for establishing power mechanisms. While power can be both, repressive and productive, space remains created, recreated and contested (Soja, 1989). Particularly the contestation of space has been underlined by interviewees. Central to this understanding is that space per se does not necessarily lead to exclusion. Instead, space is constructed by social processes, revealing how interactions occur in spaces (Davis, 2001b), which accentuates the importance of interactional elements of exclusion. This can be supported by arguments from the embodiment debate, where bodies are always connected with other bodies, constantly interacting with the world and changing over time and space (Herring and Chau, 2007). By highlighting the dynamic character of social exclusion, a re-conceptualisation focusing on the interactional context follows pleas by Byrne (2005) arguing that social exclusion can only be understood by paying attention to the multiple components of social space and order through which individuals live their lives.

7.3.2 Non-Performance of Roles

Mobility and visually-restricted persons highlighted that interacting with other individuals often triggers reflective thoughts related to their position in society. Realising that they are not always able to pursue certain social activities augments feelings of exclusion:
“interacting with the world gives you a reflection ... if I'm sort of seeing all these people rushing about, it makes me more aware of what I'm not doing” (Daisy/Mobility)

Central to social activities is the ability to perform or enact certain roles in society. The denial of the enactment of social roles was found to be a decisive factor leading to experiences of social exclusion. A key principle expressed by interviewees embraces the desire to live a ‘normal’ life:

“I suppose society builds up what is normal and what’s expected of us ... get a job and have a house and get married and have children and these are all normal things ... so it is important and I don’t know if that’s more important to me, because potentially I could be excluded or not” (Joshua/Mobility)

In Joshua’s account, ‘being normal’ is considered as necessary to avoid exclusion. This is supported by Alice, highlighting that she does not feel excluded because of her ability to live her own life:

“for me, it’s, um, a little bit different ... I studied .... went to university ... made good friends ... I have my own apartment ... what I can do, um, live a life like any other ... I don’t feel excluded because I have my own life” (Alice/Mobility)

Based on these narrative abstracts, it can be argued that people with a disability desire to fulfil societal norms. This stands in contrast to Gleeson (1997), making the case that disabled individuals do not wish to comply with standards of ‘normality’, but instead seek fuller participation in life. However, based on the comments from interviewees, it is suggested that by endeavouring to follow the norm, disabled people are able to participate in social life and to enact social roles, leading to feelings of inclusion being maximised. In contrast, accepting that disability leads to the inability to perform normal roles in society generates feelings of exclusion. It is recognisable from the narratives that being given the status of ‘abnormal’ causes feelings of exclusion.

Expanding on this aspect, by elaborating on the difficulties to perform the role as student or friend, participants highlighted that the resulting exclusion was based on belonging to a different
social group. Disability, as a marker of social identity, was often mentioned as the characterising feature of this social group. Particularly within an employment context, it was underscored that the existence of an impairment leads employers to reject disabled people as members of the labour market:

"she said that I was the best candidate for the job ... I know it was a direct factor, in why I didn’t get the job ... I mean, that obviously is I’m being excluded because of my sight" (Anna/ Sight)

Reasons for being rejected as employee were thought to be related to perceptions of not being able to deal with the work and representing a health and safety risk. As an analogy to the gender debate (Butler, 2007), normative judgements made by employers can lead to exclusionary practices affecting disability people. Adding to the complexity, individuals that are in full or part-time employment reported that exclusionary situations were created by society’s assumption that all disabled people are unemployed. However, not only able-bodied employers create exclusionary conditions. Similar to the debate on the conflict over shared spaces, participants reported that disabled people try to exclude other people with different impairments from pursuing their employment role:

“I used to run a charity ... until I was excluded out of it [laughs] ... even in the world of disability there’s this thing called power and ... people get power crazy ... people looked to me and they wanted a bit of that power ... so, they were working against you, rather than with you” (Sara/ Sight)

Linking exclusionary practices in social life to tourism, Edensor (2000) highlights that habits and norms of the everyday life are reflected in tourism. Eva’s narrative supports this belief by referring first to the enactment of social roles in general and then relating the denial of performing a role to an occurrence while on holiday:

“that’s social exclusion to me. It’s not so much the fact that as a wheelchair user ... It’s more that I feel I’m part of a family, or I’m mother of children, or I’m a friend, or I’m a partner, and I can’t fulfil my roles ... if only I could have sat next to the
swimming pool ... I couldn’t have gone into the water with them, but watching them from behind the fence felt very horrible” (Eva/ Mobility)

While Eva’s story combines spatial forms of exclusion with not being able to fully fulfil the role of a mother, Sophie draws attention to the role of a tourist:

“a lot of people probably resent you ... Like last year I think people thought I was holding them back. I was right up front usually” (Sophie/ Mobility)

By focusing on the concept of performance, Goffman (1959) offers an insight into how individuals perform roles when interacting with the social world. Specific to tourism, Edensor (2001) draws attention to non-conformist behaviour, referring to performances that move away from normative assumptions. Findings from this study indicate that social exclusion manifests itself in the denial of performing specific roles due to the existence of normative ideals, with denied access to employment representing a specific area of concern. Braddock and Parish (2001) have already identified employment as a contemporary subject within the disability debate. However, achieving social inclusion through employment has been deemed to be of limited success (Collins and Kay, 2003). It also has to be noted that denying the performance of roles in the labour market can have an impact on exclusion from tourism due to the resulting financial implications.

Normative judgements deciding over the exclusion of an individual were found to be central regardless of the context. This supports the assumption that discrete specifications of cultural and social norms are reflected in tourism (Carlson, 1996). While Chen (2001) postulates that an individual might take up various life and work roles throughout his/ her life, disabled people appear restricted in the performance of social roles by interactional components of exclusion, which are rooted in ‘normative’ beliefs. What might play a role in this context is the normalising gaze that turns individuals into subjects of objectification (McIntosh, 2002).

7.3.3 Non-Performance through the Exclusionary Gaze

The gaze on people with a disability, which leads to sentiments of exclusion, was described by persons with a mobility restriction rather than by sight-restricted individuals, confirming Reeve’s
(2002) argument that people with more obvious impairments face the power of the gaze due to the greater visibility of their impairment. Examining the narrative abstracts that fell under the conceptual category of the exclusionary gaze, agreement seems to exist among female, mobility-restricted individuals that the gaze from others generates feelings of exclusion:

“And the looks from people who are ... Well you have to say they’re ignorant, um, but yes, it can be hurtful, very hurtful ... it provides exclusion” (Julia/Mobility)

Linked to interactive components outlined earlier, Jack feels that the gaze on disabled people originates from not frequently seeing individuals in a wheelchair in the everyday life as they are still ‘institutionalised’. By recapitulating the importance of norms, it was also felt by narrators that gazing is employed by the able-bodied population to judge on people’s abilities:

“people are looking at me wondering what I can do ... and think, oh she won’t be able to do anything that we’re doing ... they think you can’t do anything, that’s the problem ... So, it’s excluding really” (Sophie/Mobility)

Sophie’s narrative provides an example of bio-power in tourism as the able-bodied population is said to form knowledge about disabled people, which is influenced by stereotypes and prejudices (Reeve, 2002). The resulting judgements were often perceived as negative, triggering fear of disability, condescending attitudes and misperceptions about abilities. Being compared to the norms of able-bodied people causes distress to disabled persons. This possibly results in forms of self-surveillance by which disabled people try to comply with the norm to escape from the gaze. In addition, while some interviewees accept that the ‘normalising’ gaze is a habitual feature of today’s society, the most detrimental feature relates to the ‘gazer’ not acknowledging the gaze, looking away and avoiding any interaction:

“the thing that winds me up the most is when someone stares and then looks away ... Whereas if somebody stares, they catch your eye and they smile at you, I don’t have a problem with that ... I stare at people; everybody stares. It’s a normal human thing; you see somebody, they’re a bit different. You do look but if you acknowledge you’ve looked, interact with the person, that’s completely different” (Daisy/Mobility)
From this comment, it can be conceded that bodily differences initiate the gaze on other individuals. The gaze on the 'other' has been highlighted as Urry's (2002) main contribution (Hannam, 2002) and also the disability literature has elaborated on either the clinical gaze (Reeve, 2002) or the normalising gaze (McIntosh, 2002). However, deriving from this study is an additional constituent of the gaze that affects people accompanying a disabled person. Yet, the gaze on the companion has a different effect as it does not lead to feelings of exclusion but inclusion instead:

"what some people have said when they've been with me is that they get treat... looked at differently as well in terms of, you’re so good being with that poor person in a wheelchair ... There's a patronisation about it ... the assumption is that they must be in charge because they're not in a wheelchair ... the impact isn't excluding ... it's excluding me but including her. It’s saying to her, you’re one of us, being very good, doing something with this other" (Daisy/Mobility)

Particularly the last word of this narrative underlines that the 'other' is becoming the object (Weaver, 2005), supporting the assumption that disabled people are turned into objects for the gaze, resulting in exclusion. Related to this, MacCannel's (2001) invisible second gaze might be of relevance as it invites all individuals to question the constructed nature of objects. While MacCannell's second gaze can be seen as response to the criticism of over-relying on the first gaze, it is worth re-calling that Urry's account was also disapproved due to the static nature between home and away. Whereas some interviewees mentioned that they have to confront the gaze in their everyday life and on holiday, supporting arguments by Veijola and Jokinen (1994), other participants highlighted that they experience a more detrimental feeling when exclusion deriving from the gaze occurs in their everyday life. In this case, tourism might reside outside wider social processes, as feelings of exclusion are minimised despite the existence of the gaze.

### 7.3.4 Non-Performance as Collective Entity

While the impact of the gaze is perceived differently when analysing different contexts, the phenomenon of collective exclusion has been identified as a conceptual category that was mainly said to occur in a tourism environment. Incidences of collective exclusion were narrated by mobility and sight-restricted individuals alike. Some of these experiences are linked to the lack
of a sighted travel guide, which creates dependency on other people. For example, Scarlett talked about a holiday with her sighted husband and their plan to participate in different tours. However, due to the fact that there was no guide for Scarlett, her husband was ultimately excluded from pursuing his wishes. While in this case, dependency has created the condition of collective exclusion, other narratives point towards the assumption that collective exclusion is produced by perceptions of disability, which affects able-bodied companions as well:

"assume that we making that trip, um, very often people are in... excluding not only the person with the disability, but also, uh, his companion, because they, um, see them as a mini-group" (Henry/ Sight)

For sight-restricted individuals, the collective exclusion is also triggered by the guide dog which is often denied access to restaurants, pubs, shops, taxis and busses, attraction facilities as well as accommodation establishments. In some cases, not being able to access an establishment with a guide dog meant that interviewees had to leave the facility. However, even when they were granted access, a form of spatial exclusion occurred:

"No dogs! But it's a guide dog ... then ... they wanted to park us in a, in a corner, away from everybody, exclude us with the dog" (Scarlett/ Sight)

Often, it was reported that once the owner of a facility did not allow access to the guide dog, accompanying friends or family members, who were affected by this exclusionary act, would decide not to visit this place again. While this appeared to be acceptable to the blind person, the situation was found to be far more problematic when people are involved that do not belong to the social circle of friends and family:

"if you joined a group of 20 people who you didn’t know, and it was you who was being excluded from somewhere ... you wouldn’t want to feel that the other 19 were excluded ... it then becomes a different sort of thing" (James/ Sight)

In this case, James would have decided not to participate in order to avoid that the anticipated exclusion affects individuals that he does not know. Hence, it can be assumed that collective exclusion has an impact not only on the disabled individual and accompanying friends and
family members but also on people not belonging to the intimate social circle. The latter seems to have a slightly more detrimental effect on individuals as it links back to negative perceptions of disability. By investigating contextual differences, it was also accentuated that a holiday situation is more likely to result in collective exclusion:

“When it happens on holiday, it usually affects not only you but your entire family, whereas when it happens at home ... it affects only me and not my children, my friends, my...my partner” (Eva/Mobility)

The conceptual category of collective exclusion stands in contrast to the understanding emanating from the social exclusion literature. For example, collective exclusion is linked to public and private services, either not available or suitable to everyone in a particular geographical area (Scullion and Hillyard, 2005). However, findings of this research highlight that collective exclusion is not necessarily linked to the availability of services, but rather to the denial of access, which does not only affect the person with a disability but also friends, family and unfamiliar persons. The origins of the phenomenon of collective exclusion are deemed to be rooted in the lack of understanding of disability and stigmatisation, providing the basis for interactional components of exclusion. In addition, interpersonal aspects of exclusion were also held partly related to the paradox of (in)dependence.

7.3.5 Non-Performance as Paradox of (In)Dependence

All experiences by interviewees pointed towards the assumption that the lack of independence leads to greater feelings of exclusion. Room (1995b) has pointed out that social exclusion has to be investigated in terms of relational issues, including autonomy and dependency. Specific to disability, dependency is not perceived as physical inability to perform life tasks. Instead, independence relates to self-direction, self-determination and participation in decision-making processes (Asch, 2001), terms that are closely related to autonomy. This is in line with Brisenden (1989 cited in Fine and Glendinning, 2005), who argues that independence is the control function to decide what help in needed, leaving the actual reliance on assistance irrelevant.

By referring to spatial elements, mobility-restricted persons stress that the need to plan extensively to overcome physical access barriers takes away their independence, which limits...
self-determination as it reduces flexibility and spontaneity. However, in line with Asch (2001), interviewees mentioned that dependency is not entirely related to personal care issues but also spans across the ability to make decisions in the everyday life and in tourism. The feeling of powerlessness related to not making one’s own decisions is exemplified by Ruby:

"you’ve got to depend on whether they’re going on holiday or where they’re going ...
I usually go with my brother in law and, um, his partner and ... all the decisions are made by them" (Ruby/ Sight)

The dependency on other people is often reported as a dilemma, not only for sight-restricted individuals but also for people with mobility impairments. Eva stressed that it is very difficult to remain autonomous when having to rely on the help and said:

"talking about social exclusion, I am a lot of effort, that’s the feeling you get, and I know I am, because I need help" (Eva/ Mobility)

One could argue that there is a danger of falling back to the medical model, where disability is seen as personal tragedy which creates dependency. While people with disabilities appreciate the help provided, not having to rely on assistance would result in greater feelings of inclusion. Hence, independence was regarded as key to feeling included for all parts of social life. Specific to tourism, interviewees repeatedly explained how the reliance on assistant services, lead to feelings of exclusion, marginalisation and humiliation. Furthermore, the entire absence of accompanying persons was thought to be a determining feature of exclusion:

"she was by herself and the air crew wouldn’t let her on without an accompanying person because she used a wheelchair. So, the flight went without her ... That is exclusion" (Chloe/ Mobility)

It is recognisable that the dependence on accompanying persons actually prohibits disabled persons to engage in tourism opportunities. This can be linked to findings reported in another study, where airport policies played a crucial part in taking away the independence of people with visual impairments (Richards et al., 2010). Similar to the narrative abstract above, Adam argues that the lack of independence creates exclusion even before embarking on a holiday:
“before even going on holiday, I felt excluded because, um, I would contact group holiday companies, and they’d say, well, you’re blind, so you can’t come with us unless you bring somebody with you. Then you look around ... my friends are busy ... do I take a family member? ... do I take my mom? Do I take my dad? Do I need to take somebody with me? Why can’t I just choose somewhere and go?” (Adam/ Sight)

The general dependency that permeates the everyday life and tourism is also related to choice, which further impacts on feelings of exclusion. Whereas some interviewees employed the words ‘choice’ and ‘independence’ in a synonymous way, others maintained the view that greater levels of dependency lead to fewer choices. For wheelchair users, the lack of choice manifests itself in having to decide on an accessible hotel first instead of making a decision based on the destination they would like to visit. In this case, the mobility-restricted person is actively engaged in the decision-making process, however, the dependency derives from not choosing from the same pool of options when compared to able-bodied counterparts. Often, the emphasis was placed on planning a trip in the same way as ‘normal’ people do, which links back to the debate on norms. However in this context, norms relate to having the same choices as able-bodied people. Joe illustrates this argument by referring to the term ‘exclusion zone’ to highlight that he has to base his holiday plans on the availability of hotels that are equipped for his physical needs and that, in his own words: “Excludes me from 99.9% of the hotels in the country” (Joe/ Mobility).

While it has been argued that the lack of independence leads to exclusion, the paradoxical nature of the dependency/ independence construct derives from statements that draw attention to the phenomenon that being with other people, such as friends and family members reduces experiences of exclusion. However, one could argue that the presence of other persons still creates a condition of dependency or imposed dependency (Gignac and Cott, 1998). Analysing the stories revealed that predominantly in tourism, feelings of exclusion are reduced when an accompanying person exists. Usually, these accompanying persons include either non-disabled family members or friends who enable disabled individuals to enjoy a destination. Key to feeling included in these instances is that friends and family members are aware of the limitations of the other person and “just get on with it” (Joshua/ Mobility). Some participants stressed that it is usually an advantage to go on holiday with a larger group of friends as this reduces the pressure
put on just one or two individuals. There was a general agreement that excessive help from able-bodied friends or family members would negatively impact on their holidays. Apart from friends and family members, interviewees reported that for some specific types of holidays, assistance is needed from other persons that understand disability and the resulting limitations:

"when I'm going on holiday ... a ski holidays ... when I'm doing that I need assistance ... a group with persons that are familiar to deal with people with these disabilities ... Then I do not feel excluded" (Henry/ Sight)

The paradox of (in)dependence generates a number of challenges for conceptualising social exclusion in tourism. On the one hand, the lack of independence is thought to represent a factor leading to exclusion, while on the other hand, being with friends, family members or a group, and depending on their help and assistance, reduces incidences of exclusion. A possible explanation for this dilemma can be found when reviewing Fine and Glendinning's (2005) account on the discourse of dependency. In general, dependency is a contested concept and is often connoted negatively. However, in the private sphere of an individual, dependency is said to bring people together. It is only in the public environment where dependency contains negative attributes denying agency (Fine and Glendinning, 2005). In a similar vein, it can be argued for this study that relying on friends and family members is part of the private life. While dependency in the private realm exists, one could assume that mutual understanding underlies these relationships, hence making the case for speaking about interdependence instead of dependence. Interdependence is regarded as bringing positive value to all individuals involved (Fine and Glendinning, 2005). This might explain why interdependence assists in avoiding feelings of exclusion. On the contrary, when looking at the public realm, having to rely on assistance from other people not belonging to the private life turns dependency into an undesirable state, closely related to feelings of social exclusion. In this case, independence and autonomy become key goals to move towards inclusion.

7.3.6 Contextual Synopsis: Social Exclusion in Tourism

These findings assist in re-defining and expanding on exclusionary aspects when compared to the current conceptualisation. While theory-driven themes led to the recognition that social exclusion experienced by disabled people manifests itself in the relationship between spatial and
interpersonal factors, the category related to shared spaces has highlighted that space alone does not lead to exclusion. While an inaccessible environment might lead to exclusion, spaces that follow accessible design features can equally lead to feeling excluded. Here power structures play an important role, which influence which user group is given priority in multifunctional, shared areas. These power conflicts, existing not only between the able-bodied population and disabled people but also among individuals with different disabilities, have not been extensively dealt with in the prevailing literature. However, it is anticipated that tourism needs to pay attention to power over spaces as the current focus on ‘Access for All’ or ‘Design for All’ triggers feelings of exclusion instead of providing the predicted inclusive environment.

The omnipresence of power over spaces, pointing towards the importance of interactive facets, does not only have an effect on disabled individuals but penetrates the entire collective level. While the social exclusion literature focuses on collective exclusion linked to the unavailability of services in a specific area, this study revealed that collective exclusion is perceived as the denial of access that embraces not only friends and family members belonging to the intimate social circle but also unfamiliar persons. Collective exclusion is said to have a more detrimental effect in a holiday context.

Collective exclusion was found to be rooted in stigmatisation processes related to norms. The importance of norms was further stressed when elaborating on the denial of performing specific roles in society, a conceptual category not reported in the literature so far. Normative ideals influence individuals in the everyday life and tourism, with the normative gaze drawing attention to bodily differences, turning disabled people into objects for the gaze. The experiences narrated by disabled people highlighted that the gaze prompts exclusion. In this context, the gaze can be regarded as an example of bio-power as it triggers normative judgements, leading others to form knowledge about an individual with a disability.

It is the produced knowledge that disabled individuals are dependent on others, that is tried to be evaded, resulting in the paradox of (in)dependence. While the lack of independence in the public realm creates feelings of exclusion, it is dependence or interdependence on people belonging to the intimate circle in the private sphere that leads to greater feelings of inclusion. The
dependence/independence dilemma is held to represent a predominant feature affecting people’s experiences of exclusion outside their home:

"you can try and create a living environment, this being your own house ... where you can be as independent as possible. As soon as you leave the house, then that’s it, so it doesn’t really make a difference if you want to go to the theatre or go on holiday" (Eva/Mobility)

Specific to tourism, disabled individuals have to rely on more assistance from other people, especially since the location is not familiar:

"There can be a feeling of dependency more overseas ... you feel more dependent on people, because it’s an unfamiliar place ... they don’t like that, but back home they’re familiar with an environment and they’re independent" (Adam/Sight)

While it has been highlighted that the problem of dependency is also apparent in the everyday life, there seems to a consensus among interviewees that the magnitude of the problem is amplified during peoples’ holidays. Participants highlighted that a tourism environment creates a greater distance between someone with a disability and other people:

"home ... people are quite helpful ... they’re used to seeing me around ... they’re not embarrassed by it or they’re not preoccupied with their own thoughts ... on holiday, um, people tend to be in family units or, or groups of people, and they tend to be preoccupied ... with their own thoughts and intentions ... some times that, that it’s easier to overlook somebody ... as if you don’t exist" (Harry/Mobility)

There seems to be an agreement among participants that a holiday environment causes additional barriers as part of the dependency debate as other holiday-makers seem less willing to provide assistance. Among the reasons that have been reported to rationalise this behaviour are feelings of embarrassment by able-bodied people, being preoccupied with themselves due to their desire to enjoy their holidays and a lack of knowledge about how to approach a person with a disability.
The above discussion drew further attention to different connotations attached to the discourse of dependency. It highlighted that interdependency in the everyday life and tourism alleviates experiences of exclusion, while, in contrast, feelings of exclusion are greater when dependency is generated in tourism environments. Furthermore, participants made numerous and frequent references made to conceptual space-related categorisations, which urges an additional layer of analysis, focusing on the social role that narratives play.

### 7.4 Social Exclusion in Tourism: A Space-Related Normative Framework

Looking at interpersonal elements of exclusion, participants made use of words and phrases that indicate a conceptual space-related categorisation or distance between disabled and able-bodied people (Table 9). Based on the interviewees’ descriptions, disabled people are placed in a group that is connoted negatively. This is expressed by words such as ‘the leper’, ‘the unclean’ or the ‘exception’, which indicates that they are unwanted. This coincides with arguments put forward in chapter four, discussing that the ‘outside’ group is often labelled as undesired and problematic.

Table 9: Narrative Abstracts: Perceptions of Disability as the ‘Outside’ Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>‘you can feel very much like the leper, you know, you’re, you’re the unclean, get out, we don’t want you in here. And, you know, and certainly do feel excluded’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>‘it’s all the fact that people’s attitude you know we are seen as an exception and not as an inclusion. And we’re only seen as an inclusion when someone else in the family has a similar disability and that’s the thing that makes the difference ... I think that would be a fantastic message that able-bodied people are the exception’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>‘Because you feel sort of... you feel singled out’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>‘almost like writing somebody off and saying that’s it, you’re, you’re not good, you’re not wanted’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>‘So she’s, she is then seen as one of the main group whereas the person in the wheelchair, me, is seen as outside the main group, lesser somehow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>‘you really feel, uh, like the odd one out’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Henry draws on the term "unknown majority", indicating that the group of people that are
demed to be included is much larger in size when compared to the 'outside', comprising people
with disabilities:

"when I'm, uh, coming in, um, an environment where I'm not familiar with ... I am
alone and I see the others as, um, an unknown majority. That means that I feel much
more... or I feel really marginalised" (Henry/ Sight)

While Henry's experience above derives from an individual perspective, recalling his latest
tourism experience with his wife, he also felt that other travellers ask themselves how a sighted
female person could go on holiday with a disabled husband. These feelings do not only create a
greater distance, but also leads to the exclusion of the wife as both are regarded as 'mini-group',
emphasising that able-bodied companions are automatically classified as belonging as well to the
'outside' group. Apart from collective exclusion, the problem of being given the 'outside' status
is held to be intensified if an individual has multiple disabilities. Molly, who is mobility-
restricted, explained that she has also acquired a hearing impairment over time, which results in
the following sentiments:

"it does make you feel a bit on the outside and, well, as I say, that's not a comfortable
place to be" (Molly/ Mobility)

While Molly argues that the exclusion comes directly from having multiple disabilities, Julia,
reiterates that people voluntarily exclude themselves. For expressing her point of view she refers
to the dichotomy of 'in' and 'out':

"I think some people consciously opt out. Others can't get in, because there are things
in the way" (Julia/ Mobility)

While these quotes derive from different angles examining social exclusion, they all have in
common that they deal with perceptions of different conceptual spaces and different groups or
categories. Central is the dichotomy of 'in' and 'out' and the terms used by interviewees concur
with arguments put forward by Koller and Davidson (2008) viewing social exclusion as
conceptual metaphor indicating a space-related, normative framework, being comprised of the
‘inside’ and the ‘outside’. This framework allows action to be directed at people who are deemed to be socially excluded. Without referring to particular instances responsible for bringing people back to the ‘inside’, Julia highlights:

“so they are on the edge, looking in ... so this is what inclusion is all about, it’s making sure that people are not on the edge looking in” (Julia/Mobility)

This discussion underlines that the discourse of social exclusion can be regarded as a site of power, in which individuals are placed into categories. These categories, deriving from the inside/outside dichotomy is upheld by pre-defined norms (Vobruba, 2000). By referring to space-related normative judgements, participants highlight these power forces. However, it can be assumed that they are utilizing these words in a rather subconscious manner, probably not being aware of the discursive power involved in the concept of social exclusion. Further, people do not only feel excluded when they are placed in the ‘outside’ category, they can also feel excluded when they are not. Joshua highlights the intrinsic complexity:

“I would feel excluded by being bracketed in that ... But ... by the same token you can be excluded if you’re not included in that category” (Joshua/Mobility)

Given these multifaceted insights, an investigation is needed that questions the categorical approach to social exclusion by examining responses to experiences of social exclusion. Also, as the space-related normative framework denies agency, leaving individuals with a disability being portrayed as ‘passive victims’ (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001), responses to social exclusion could potentially lead to the identification of counter-discourses.

7.5 Summary

This chapter has offered a discussion related to the feelings and lived experiences of social exclusion as narrated by mobility and sight-restricted individuals. Narratives were analysed using a three-layered approach, moving alongside categorical, holistic and performative elements. All levels of analysis have contributed to highlighting the complexity entailed in the concept of social exclusion, which was reiterated frequently by interviewees:
“It’s a very complex web of a mixture of circumstances of situations that, that creates all of these social exclusions ... it’s an extremely complex area and, and there are no single or simple answers to it at all” (Tilly/ Sight)

Acknowledging this complexity, the categorical analysis of theory-driven themes revealed that social exclusion in tourism can be understood as a complex interplay of spatial and interactional factors, with financial constraints and citizenship rights only playing a minor role. By adding data-driven categories, the debate emphasised interactive elements as central to understanding social exclusion by incorporating the importance of norms and social relations of power. Normative ideals influence the enactment of roles in multifunctional spaces, such as performing the role of a tourist, with the gaze contributing to normative judgements.

Apart from reconceptualising social exclusion in tourism on the basis of norms, which have an effect on a person at the individual level, exclusion is also experienced as a collective entity, drawing attention to the need to embrace a multi-personal perspective. While exclusion can be subjected to numerous people involved, the overall interactional process requires further attention being paid to the paradox of (in)dependence. As higher levels of dependency are apparent in tourism, the challenge for the tourism industry is to find ways to provide holiday breaks with the potential for providing positive change, which is discussed in the next chapter.

While the above insights are regarded as central for re-conceptualising social exclusion in tourism, the performative analysis has added an additional level by reiterating that the concept of social exclusion can be seen as a discursive force. While interviewees were most likely unaware of the power inherent in this discourse, the words employed by participants confirmed the existence of a normative, space-related framework, which places disabled individuals in the ‘outside’ group. As this denies agency granted to disabled people, it is of vital importance to investigate responses to experiences of exclusion as this allows accounting for heterogeneous experiences linked to identity. With this in mind, chapter eight investigates how individuals either reproduce identity positions or alternatively challenge norms and transform dominant identity representations.
Chapter 8: Reproduction or Transformation?

8.1 Introduction

While the previous chapter was based on a re-conceptualisation of social exclusion in tourism, the aim of this chapter is to critically discuss the effects that the meaning of social exclusion has on people with a disability and their identity positions. Central for providing an answer to the fifth research objective is an investigation into how disabled individuals reproduce marginalised identity positions, or contrarily, transform or deconstruct norms. To elucidate reproductive or transformative elements, participants were asked to elaborate on their reactions or responses to experiences of exclusion. Based on this, progressive and regressive parts of the narratives were identified and themed categorically.

In line with the performative framework adopted for this research, subjective experiences are accounted for and multiple identities acknowledged, which underlines that individuals do not necessarily employ only one set of responses but fluctuate between different strategies according to different contexts. Context-specific differences are explained by scrutinising disparities between the everyday life and tourism. It is anticipated that the identification of transformative approaches could potentially enhance possibilities for self-identity and agency in tourism.

The majority of participants experienced social exclusion and elaborated on their responses to feeling excluded. However, some interviewees stated that they do not feel excluded either in tourism or in their everyday life. While this points towards a purely transformative approach, equally, the same individuals provided evidence for employing reproduction strategies. Hence, overall it could be revealed that all participants use a mix of reproductive and transformative strategies. Some interviewees were consciously aware of the existence of different strategies without explicitly referring to either reproduction or transformation:

“there’s two types of disabled persons, the one that says, the world’s terrible and look what it’s done to me and the other disabled person that says, I can’t do anything about yesterday but I can do something about tomorrow” (Alex/ Mobility)
Further, some participants did not only refer to two types but identified an additional category. This third category occupied a controversial position between the two main poles, pointing at reproduction and transformation at the same time, which is labelled ambiguous territory. Caitlin summarises succinctly different strategies embracing all three categories:

"I would split the blind community into what I call, super blinks who can do everything for themselves and will only ask for help if their left leg is hanging off and they need to walk six miles to get somewhere in a blizzard, and then you have the other ones who are kind of in the middle somewhere, who will ask for help if they need it and don’t really mind people coming and asking them, do they want help, but they can get a little bit like, come on, leave me alone. And then you have the people who ask for help to tie their own shoelaces and can’t imagine life without help for everything. I’m not disparaging any of them because everyone has their place, but I think that will depend on how inclusive you find tourism" (Caitlin/ Sight)

The chapter proceeds by offering a discussion related to all different strategies employed, accompanied by an investigation as to what effect different strategies have on the identity concept of a person.

8.2 Reproduction

In general, reproduction occurs when individuals repeat marginalised identity positions ascribed to them. It is strongly related to restrictions imposed by norms and negative representations, which are internalised. In these cases, counter-discourses are absent. The narrative analysis led to the identification of two reproductive elements, which comprise ‘resignation’ and ‘restraints imposed by other individuals’.

8.2.1 Reproduction through Resignation

The conceptual theme ‘resignation’ was found to be related to the act of admitting defeat in situations where exclusion occurred, regardless of whether exclusion was triggered by the denial of physical access or negative attitudes. Interviewees narrated responses following resignation principles in the everyday life and in tourism, typically expressed by “we actually gave up”,
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“there was nothing we could do about it” and “we just had to accept it”. People also emphasised that they get used to these situations. Max, being denied a table in a restaurant due to his blindness while being on holiday, referred to his response in terms of:

“I just shrug my shoulders and say so be it” (Max/ Sight)

Max’s comment was accompanied by stressing that the resignation was also based on the anticipation that the service would have been of minor quality. This coincides with a number of statements referring to the predicted poor standards and service in these establishments and the need to find a place which is welcoming and that deserves the custom of disabled people. By referring to exclusionary situations, Scarlett makes reference to the effect of her resignation on those operating the facility:

“it works out in their favour because obviously I just didn’t go” (Scarlett / Sight)

It is recognisable from Scarlett’s account that the act of surrendering leaves the individual in a powerless situation. Related to this assumption are Foucault’s studies on how power relations are played out on the body (Mills, 2003). It can be suggested that certain practices, such as being denied access due to bodily differences, influence individuals’ behaviour and actions. Related to the examples provided above, interviewees follow a repressive stance to power relations due to the fact that the body remains relatively passive. The passivity is often accompanied with the demand for help from other people. In a tentative way, it can be argued that the passive position is forced on disabled people as society ignores external factors, such as political, cultural and social constraints, which have to be dismantled to ensure individuals’ participation in life following claims of the social model (Aitchison, 2003). For example, Joe refers to:

“I think, that people feel about people in wheelchairs, is they’re always moaning. And the reason why we’re always moaning is because you’re not doing anything to help us” (Joe/ Mobility)

Focusing on the need for help and referring to passive victims and their attitudes could also set off debates related to self-exclusion (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001), with individuals representing agents of their own exclusion (Koller and Davidson, 2008). However, opposing this claim for
this study, it is anticipated that passive reproduction strategies are triggered by disciplinary mechanisms that aim at regulating human beings (Rabinow, 1984). Through categorisations, such as ‘disability’, norms are imposed on individuals that consequently turn people with a disability into objects of power/knowledge and targets for control (Tremain, 2005, Foucault, 1991). The classification of disabled people as being vulnerable plays an important role in this context, as this knowledge can subsequently be internalised, despite a level of resistance:

“I’m vulnerable, so... I mean, I don’t feel vulnerable, but I’m classed as a vulnerable adult” (Joe/ Mobility)

“I don’t feel that I am vulnerable. I mean probably some blind people do” (Ruby/ Sight)

These quotes can act as an example to highlight the knowledge/power dyad, as terms such as ‘vulnerable’, which are related to norms and expectations, have an effect on an individual’s self-identity. Following a Foucauldian analysis, disabled individuals become objects for research and categorisations of bodily differences represent privileged discourses about objects (Dickens and Fontana, 1994). In this case, privileged discourses centre on the notion of vulnerability, which is upheld by reports and documentations circulated in the social realm. These knowledge structures about disabled individuals, created by other individuals or institutions, do not only provide the base for subtle power relations to keep people with a disability in a marginalised position but also contribute to influence identity perceptions of the self. The impact on self-perception seems to be strong in cases where disability is acquired later in life:

“Because what they’ve lived with is a societal norm ... what the perceptions are that they would hold, their family would hold, their friends would hold, of ... somebody who is visually impaired ... How they think they should behave in terms of what society would accept and what they would perceive as what they were, what they think would have been acceptable” (Tilly/ Sight)

It can be argued that disabled people still wish to engage in pursuits that are regarded as the normative ideal. The related prescribed norms place individuals under continuous surveillance and self-surveillance as the body becomes a site of knowledge production (Best, 1994), which is
then the target for a wide range of social power relations (Foucault, 1991). In a tentative way, it can be suggested that these imposed norms prevent people to adopt resistance strategies. Zoe emphasises this argument by saying:

"I want to tell them that I've been like it all my life and I'm used to how it is and I kind of want to tell them to stop doing that. I don't always" (Zoe/ Sight)

The act of remaining passive has an impact on individuals at a psychological level. Many participants stressed that they experienced feelings of anger and emotional pain because of adopting principles of resignation:

"Probably I should, um, take it on ... and say, you're not allowed to do this, and make a bigger fuss than I do but ... I let them get away with it ... I feel hurt ... I feel cross with myself for not saying and I think to myself, well the next person that does that I'm going to jolly well tell them that they're not allowed to ... I just want to scream at them and say, I'm not stupid, I'm just blind" (Ruby/ Sight)

In contrast, other participants, who attempted to resist, highlighted that they questioned their actions later, particularly in cases where they could not change the situation. Moving away from situations at home, Ruby provides an example of how acts of resignation are augmented when thinking of the idea of a holiday. By referring to her being a widow, she acknowledges:

"even sometimes when you'd feel, you know, like it would be nice to get away ... I don't go ... I know that I'd probably be very miserable on holiday ... I am totally blind so I can't do that" (Ruby/ Sight)

In this case, disability or blindness as an identity concept can represent a mode that reproduces exclusion and disadvantage (Holt, 2008). Yet, Ruby's rejection to engage in tourism experiences is not only related to her blindness, as being a widow adds to her inertness. The narratives also revealed that pride plays an important role in the reproduction debate. While the literature review has drawn attention to the link between pride and resistance (Ben-Moche and Powell, 2007, Johnston, 2001), interviewees stressed that pride can equally lead to reproducing powerless identity positions. By referring to not wanting to use the cane, Jessica says:
“pride stands in the way of you moving forwards and you’re then building up barriers you then have to try and break down and I know, I’ve been there” (Jessica/ Sight)

This example stands in contrast to the prevailing literature as pride, representing an embodied experience, does not necessarily lead to a positive identification of the ‘self’, but can also reinforce normative ideals, which in this case means following the norm of not using a cane. The choice of identity is hence tailored towards the able-bodied population instead of acknowledging a positive identity as someone with a sight-restriction.

The arguments presented so far underline that disability, as an identity concept, is guided by complex power relations (Coles and Church, 2007, Butler, 2007). Particularly disciplinary forces were found to be connected to employing a reproductive stance as the knowledge created about disabled people about they can or cannot do led to resigning from certain activities, which in turn keeps them in a marginalised position. Here, perceptions of others play an important role, linking the debate more closely to restraints imposed by either the intimate circle or wider society.

8.2.2 Reproduction through Restraints by Intimate Circle and Wider Society

Analysing the narratives related to restraints that lead to reproducing marginalised identity positions, it was found that while potential for resistance is noticeable, it is severely constrained by individuals and groups, either belonging to the intimate circle of friends and family members or the wider society. Starting with the former, interviewees accentuated that they avoided confrontations due to the likely embarrassment caused to people that are close to them. Sophie highlights how she often foregoes to employ any defence mechanisms due to the anticipated discomfort brought to her husband:

“I should’ve said something maybe. But I think it would be awkward for my husband ... My husband was so embarrassed that I asked to see the manager about it. He looked at me as though it was mad ... He couldn’t see it ... It’s different and he doesn’t feel the same as I do because he’s not disabled” (Sophie/ Mobility)
Similar incidences occur in a tourism environment. For example, Joe, recalling what has been categorised as collective exclusion, was close to tears when he disclosed that his wife feels embarrassed when he attempts to rectify exclusionary situations while being on holiday:

"my wife isn't always happy to keep drawing attention to ourselves ... I don't mind. I've got to the age when it doesn't really bother me what people think ... but other people around me ... it could be embarrassing for them ... you get all these kind of conflicting emotions bouncing around all over the place ... it affects my wife and whoever I'm travelling with. So I get angry because it's my own inadequacies that are causing the problem. It's my inability to get into somewhere that's causing upset to other people and I don't like that; I feel guilty about that" (Joe/ Mobility)

Using words such as 'my own inadequacies' and 'my inability' seems to follow the medical approach to disability, which defines disability in terms of deviance, lack and personal tragedy (Shakespeare, 1993, Donoghue, 2003, Shelton and Tucker, 2005), denying agency. In line with Holt (2007), the narrative abstract above illustrates a reproductive stance by accepting inferiority. In this case, disability and related norms might become internalised by an individual's self-identity (Holt, 2008). Drawing on performance theory, this example also highlights that conflicts play a crucial role for investigating how individuals perform certain roles (Hochschild, 1983). While arguments related to roles were discussed in the previous chapter, expanding the line of reasoning, it is argued that roles, embedded in wider social processes, have an influence on either reproducing or transforming identity positions. For example, in his role as husband, Joe abstains from employing transformative strategies with the aim of not causing upset to his wife. As outlined earlier, the denial of the enactment of roles represents a factor leading to experiences of exclusion. However, the wish to perform certain roles might also force people to follow reproductive identity positions.

While some individuals are constrained by friends and family members, other interviewees highlighted that resistance strategies are in place when close individuals are around as they would help to challenge perceptions of normality. However, individuals seem to sacrifice transformative potential, when they are surrounded by people, which do not belong to the intimate circle to prevent that "they get drawn into something" (Sara/ Sight). Here, the inability to engage in resistance strategies is triggered by perceptions held by the wider society, hence
highlighting larger social and cultural systems, which prevent transformative approaches. Jack, referring to people that are restraint by wider societal perceptions, draws a precise distinction between two groups of people, indicating transformative and reproductive elements respectively:

"Some are very positive ... very accepting of the situation. Regrettably, they’ve had a car accident ... They are now in a wheelchair ... They’re full of self-confidence and, okay, they’re on four wheels as opposed to two feet. Nevermind, that’s the way things are. Let’s get on with it ... Regrettably, others will be very timid, very shy, very lacking in self-confidence ... and regrettably, will be very aware of their image and how they feel and how they’re made to feel and, for example, if being pushed around a swimming pool or into a restaurant with many, many gazing faces will feel quite intimidated” (Jack/ Mobility)

Also visually-restricted people refer to constraints by the wider society, incorporating aspects of the gaze, highlighting that disabled people become the object for the gaze of others (Reeve, 2002). Particularly for sight-impaired individuals, resistance through gazing back is denied, making the power of the gaze a one-sided phenomenon, leading to following a reproductive strategy. By referring to ‘would-be’ situations in tourism, Ruby verbalises her concern by saying:

“some of it’s inbuilt in me because I feel nervous to do it because I’m a failure, sort of being on my own, sitting on my own and, you know, then you really do feel people look at you” (Ruby/ Sight)

Both narrative extracts point towards the importance of norms and the disciplinary gaze. Individuals are likely reproduce marginalised identity positions and refrain from certain activities if they feel that being pushed around in a wheelchair or sitting alone, which is monitored by the surveillance of others, is not regarded as normal. While these examples point towards approaches related to reproducing marginalised identity positions, other narratives offer an insight into the employment of resistance strategies, which can represent a major challenge for disabled people:

“I’m trying to do more now and if I don’t do anything, there’s actually no point in living. Seriously. Um, but it is all so hard; it all requires so much effort” (Daisy/ Mobility)
8.3 Transformation

Overall, transformative potential refers to acts of resistance, which manifests itself in challenging norms, contesting representations, developing counter-discourses and questioning fixed identities as outlined in chapter four. The narrative analysis identified five transformative approaches, which relate to norms, discarding disability, challenging terminology and altering symbols. These approaches are held to be essential for the recognition of self-identity. Self-identity is recognised when references are made to internal features and self-image (Chen, 2001), such as "that’s part of my nature". While interviewees highlighted elements of their personality, it has to be taken into account that this process was found to be intrinsically related to action words, such as "to force" and "to fight". According to Holt (2007), verbally hitting back represents a transformative strategy, illustrated by Sara:

“I’ve had to toughen up ... there’s only so much one can take ... I wouldn’t say boo to a goose ... wouldn’t stick up for myself. But I’ve got to... I will stick up for myself now ... please or offend. And that’s what I’m like now” (Sara/ Sight)

The narrative analysis revealed that the recognition of self-identity often leads to greater agency, hereby establishing the link between transformation, self-identity and agency. Julia offers an example of agency regardless of the context:

“I try fiercely hard to make sure that I’m not, um, excluded ... I won’t allow the situation to exclude me ... Whatever the situation is ... I’m there, determined to break down the barriers. I’m not having it” (Julia/ Mobility)

While Vobruda (2000) refers to political intervention that empowers individuals to take their own actions, participants of this study provide evidence that resistance strategies originate at the individual level:

“It’s down to me. If I didn’t insist on doing what I want to do, then, um, nobody’s going to make me do it. Nobody’s going to say, oh, look, we’ve sorted it out for you, Chloe. That won’t happen, so it’s down to me to bring about the change that allows me to stay a part” (Chloe/ Mobility)
In a tentative way, it is suggested that people following a transformation strategy emphasise personal strengths and individual action, whereas reproduction manifests itself in viewing obstacles over opportunities, which leads to acts of resignation.

8.3.1 Transformation through Resisting Norms

By analysing the narrative comments, participants challenged the notion of norms and normality and resisted normalisation practices, in line with Watson (2002) and Reeve (2002). Some participants denied the existence of norms in general, accentuating that they are not influenced by societal norms and explicitly expressed the wish to remain outside the norm:

“I don’t do norms. I am not normal [Laughs], I don’t want be normal” (Julia/Mobility)

Julia’s statement can be related to the inside/ outside dichotomy. As it is the notion of normality that defines who resides in each part of this dichotomy (Vobruba, 2000), the rejection of norms can hence be interpreted as a resistance strategy, where people make the conscious decision to occupy the ‘outside’, which is usually connoted as undesired (Koller and Davidson, 2008) and labelled as the ‘other’. Hence, by not aspiring to fit into the concept of normality, individuals take on board the ‘otherness’ status as a counter-discourse and reject any belonging to the ‘inside’, which is often regarded as a homogenous group and its diversity is not questioned (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001, Koller and Davidson, 2008). Instead, the emphasis is placed on heterogeneity and difference as “no one’s really that normal” (Zoe/Sight). Thus, diversity is valued over homogeneity, which leads to the assumption that counter-discourses based on the rejecting norms are strongly related to resistance through valuing diversity, which confirms Holt’s (2007) assumption that a positive appreciation of difference is part of transforming identity positions:

“I don’t really believe in norms. I don’t think there’s any such thing as normal. I think we’re every one of us different ... I welcome that diversity” (Molly/Mobility)

Participants who valued diversity, heterogeneity and difference rejected group membership categories. This leads to endorsing Goodin’s (1996) claim that instead of asserting one single
membership category, multiple and overlapping membership categories should be acknowledged that allow for recognising multiple forms of identity, which is in line with contentions laid out by a performative approach. However, given multiple sources of identity, Goodin (1996) also affirms that multiple sources of claims are in existence, which links the debate to underlying power structures. Linked to norms, Chloe summarises her view as follows:

"Norms shape all our lives. I don’t like them ... It doesn’t bear any relationship to the world we live in ... all sorts of things are attached to mythical norms, that only exist in the heads of people who have them. So if you are a white middle class male, then you want to keep power ... by making sure the world is suitable for you ... They’re more dominant. They are the accepted norm. Never mind whether they’re really the norm. It’s this accepted bit, so they are given authority and power simply because they fit in ... if you’re in charge, then you want to pass laws for your government that keeps thing as they are, so that you remain being able to do what you want to do. And so that’s where it stems from, that a group of people make laws that actually allow the minority to be powerful and say, this is the norm. And it isn’t" (Chloe/ Mobility)

In contrast to Koller and Davidson’s (2008) ‘inside/ outside’ argument, Chloe highlights that the ‘inside’ is actually the minority. It is this particular group that determines what the ‘norm’ is and subsequently tries to bring the outside back to the inside based on dominant normative ideals (Bowring, 2000). Interviewees stressed that this phenomenon can also be observed in the tourism industry, where leading managers ‘fit’ into the norm and are very reluctant to change their normative ideals, which would be necessary to achieve change. As such, actual needs of those remaining at the outside are ignored and a form of governance is established by which certain individuals are placed under surveillance by the so-called ‘experts’ of the inside. In order to avoid becoming objects of power/ knowledge (Foucault, 1991), individuals form counter-discourses that challenge normality (Vobruba, 2000), by taking on board the ‘other’ status.

Other participants challenged the existing boundaries that define normality (Fisher, 2007). It was felt that the word ‘norms’ contains negative connotations and hence interviewees spoke of norms in quotation marks, hereby questioning what ‘normal’ actually means and who is allowed to define normality. Referring back to the dichotomy of the ‘other’ and the ‘same’, Veijola and Jokinen (1994) highlight the need to pay attention to who defines difference in the first place, as
this might lead to reinforcing the subordination of the ‘other’. Interviewees that challenged the boundaries that define normality do not resist norms, as they have an intrinsic desire to do what everyone else is doing. For example, Joshua admits that he aspires to live a normal life to fit into the norms of his social group:

“I guess that’s why normality means something... It means a lot to me ... even in its mundaness [sic] ... It sounds a bit lame because you don’t want to just follow everybody and be the same as everybody, but in a way that is important” (Joshua/Mobility)

The emphasis placed on ‘normal’ is also mirrored in individual’s talk on help and assistance. Several interviewees referred to “I want to be treated in the same way” in order to maintain the image of a normal family (Eva/Mobility). In these cases, the desire to be ‘normal’ means not asking for or accepting the offered help:

“would you have done that if I wasn’t blind? Would you have done that to any normal person? No, well, bugger off, don’t do it to me either. That makes you paranoid because a lot of blind people have the impression that we are almost expected to not do well, we are expected to fail and need help ... that reflects badly, whenever you do need help, because you don’t want to ask for it because ... you’re confirming what they think rather than going against it. So it’s a bit of a vicious circle in that way” (Caitlin/Sight)

These examples highlight that norms are linked to judgements by others that trigger the desire to form part of the dominant perception of normality. Contrary to resisting norms, these stories illustrate that disabled people aim at adapting their behaviour to fit to the norm. Yet, various interviewees seem to ignore external forces that produce ‘normative ideals’ (Butler, 2007). Further, individuals that follow the norm do not use counter-discourses in terms of valuing diversity and difference. Instead, difference is denied to accommodate the notion of ‘normality’:

“I’m not different from anyone. I’m just Mr. Normal ... okay, the only thing I’ve got to convince people is that I can still drive, but I can’t see. So I don’t drive [laughs]” (Ben/Sight)
Other sight-restricted participants did not only deny difference but intrinsically yearned that other individuals do not recognise their difference, often accompanied by expressions, such as: “I don’t look blind”. While this is often used as a mechanism to negate experiences of exclusion, two contradicting perspectives with regard to identity positions can be singled out. For example, by engaging in leisure and tourism activities, Anna wants to camouflage difference with the aim to show other aspects of her personality and to avoid being defined by her sight, while paradoxically acknowledging that the same difference can add a different feature to her personality:

“I want to sort of blend in, and I don’t want ... people to, to realise there’s something different. But then, in, in some ways [laughing] I do quite like to be different ... I think it can make me a more interesting [laughing] person” (Anna/ Sight)

8.3.2 Transformation through Over-Performing Norms

According to Lester (2008), norms cannot only be resisted but also over-performed, providing equal potential for social transformation. By analysing the narratives, the over-performance approach was found to be a common counter-discourse employed by disabled people and manifests itself in the perceived need to working harder, pushing one-self and constantly proving that perceptions held by others are wrong. The need to over-perform is triggered by other people’s judgements:

“They [norms] affect massively, because most people will make a judgement on a person based on a norm that they have been predisposed to ... there’s always a norm. Minority groups are judged more on a norm because they’re less common ... so norms for me, mean that I am constantly, tirelessly working to overcome people’s judgements of the stereotypical blind person” (Caitlin/ Sight)

Narrative abstracts embracing resistance in terms of over-performing norms could be found overwhelmingly when investigating employment contexts. For example, Jacob emphasises the importance of performing well at work to avoid that any potential mistakes are accredited to his disability. Hence, the wish to follow normative ideals through over-performing is strongly linked to expectation and acceptance levels, as expressed by Scarlett:
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“To be accepted you have to prove constantly ... who is your role model, and ... it wasn’t the norm to have a blind person ... So, you were having to prove constantly that you were quite capable of doing the job” (Scarlett/ Sight)

In contrast to situations, where people follow a reproductive strategy through resignation, individuals that over-perform roles reiterated constantly that the word ‘cannot’ does not exist and instead focused on the notion of ‘how can I’. Predominantly, these individuals realise that there is always something that can be done to improve any given situation, also with the aim to counter-act feelings of exclusion. This has an effect on identity perceptions and prospects of agency. Whereas resignation strategies can be seen as related to the ‘welfare subject’ that lacks agency due to alleged deficiencies (Frost and Hoggett, 2008), such as limitations deriving from having an impairment, approaches that rely on over-performances embrace possibilities for bringing change to social surroundings. It is the latter that highlights ‘self-identity’ that acts, modifies and influences social processes (Wearing and Wearing, 2001). By denying the group membership of being disabled due to being part of the workforce, Alex stresses this succinctly:

“I don’t look at myself as disabled. I have a brain, I still work fulltime, I run my own business ... I don’t see why, um, a wheelchair makes me disabled ... however society classes me as disabled” (Alex/ Mobility)

Continuing to draw on performativity theory, the above quote can be related to Lester’s (2008) categories of identity, power and agency. In Alex’s case, the over-performance approach enables him to challenge norms in an employment context, hereby demonstrating agency. This potential for agency is achieved by resisting regulatory power structures that try to assign a disabled identity to him. Instead, through resisting dominant discourses of disability, Alex consciously highlights his individual identity. It is particularly the employment context that appears to play a crucial role for the formation of self-identity. This can be exemplified by a quote from Daisy:

“I don’t work anymore. Um, I suppose it’s to do with what is my identity now ... wider political policies have a big role to play, um, and I think the attitudes to disabled people are getting a lot worse and are encouraged by the government” (Daisy/ Mobility)
Hence, by not working anymore, individuals feel that the self-identity is denied by regulatory policies that form people’s attitudes towards disability. It appears that employment gives people the chance to shape an individual ‘self’. Of assistance here are qualifications and education:

“it also helps that I’m Doctor [B] ... Because it changes people’s mindset ... If somebody is seeing you as somebody with a qualification ... they will automatically see you in a different light ... then the treatment is different ... being Dr [B] helps them to see that I am a real person, not just a wheelchair” (Chloe/Mobility)

Mobility-restricted interviewees continuously reiterated on the importance of seeing the person instead of the wheelchair. Hence, the over-performance approach is employed to counteract negative perceptions and representations. While this approach has been singled-out as a key feature in the everyday life, particular in the contexts of education and employment, evidence of this transformation strategy can also be identified in tourism. Ella, for example, accentuates that she pushes herself while being on holiday, but admits that she suffers afterwards as she feels exhausted when returning home. Nonetheless she highlights that this is part of her self-identity:

“That’s just the type of person I am ... I can’t change the person I am ... that is me”
(Ella/Mobility)

In addition, Sophie’s account highlights a number of interesting arguments related to the transformation debate. Apart from over-performing in a tourism context, she stresses that disability is not central to her identity and denies difference:

“I want to prove to them that I can do it ... push myself more ... to prove the others are wrong ... I don’t think of myself as disabled really. I don’t feel inside I’m disabled ... I don’t really feel any different ... when you get disabled you don’t think of yourself as anything other than normal. But people do look at you in a different way”
(Sophie/Mobility)

In contrast to interviewees who resist norms, participants that over-perform norms oppose the valuation of difference and diversity, similar to challenging the boundaries that define normality:
“I don’t want to be an honorary non-disabled person. I want to be me ... I don’t want to be seen as being special or different. I want to just be a part of the mix” (Chloe/Mobility)

Overall, individuals that resist or over-perform norms have in common that they highlight self-identity and agency and discard the idea that disability plays an important role for defining their identity, which coincides with other interviewees that did not explicitly refer to norms.

8.3.3 Transformation through Discarding Disability

As part of the conceptual category of discarding disability, numerous interviewees emphasised that they ignore their limitations in order to “go on with my life as I always have done” (Ella/Mobility). Also Ben states:

“I mean just go on and just go and live your life, damn it! But then again, as I say I’m a one-off” (Ben/Sight)

Similar to McCabe and Stokoe (2004), Ben’s narrative can be regarded as a form of identity work to resist membership categories and to highlight self-identity. Central to all narratives in this category is the denial of seeing oneself as disabled, which does not only highlight evidence of reflexive self-analysis skills (Wearing and Wearing, 2001) but also agency by acknowledging a different identity (Watson, 2002). By referring to not wanting to spend time with other people with multiple sclerosis, Joe highlights:

“my life is not defined by my disability, but it’s part of me ... the first time you meet somebody, you see, it’s a bloke in a chair, so you see the chair, really. So you have to, kind of, project yourself out of the chair, make a positive impact, so that people treat you as a person and not a chair-sitter. So... but, of course, not many can do that” (Joe/Mobility)

Joe’s comment clearly stresses the rejection of a disability identity, while at the same time admitting that it is a part of him. He also emphasises that the projection of a different identity or personality is difficult for some people due to pre-formulated opinions by others that focus on
the chair and not the individual, which has been a repeatedly mentioned concern among participants. Thus, the identity formation process is accompanied by situations of conflict:

“I don’t see myself as a wheelchair user. Um, that's not me; that's not my identity ... but other people start to see it as my identity ... people started to define me in terms of my back, which I always resented. They wouldn’t say to me, how are you; they’d say to me, how’s your back? ... And comment about how I was walking as if I was a prize cow; oh, you’re walking much better today ... your identity is Daisy is a person with a bad back ... I suppose there's self-identity but there's also ... how other people perceive you and yes, how you perceive yourself affects how other people perceive you. Um, but other people have their own preconceived ideas that are independent of you ... I'm more aware of how I'm defined by people” (Daisy/ Mobility)

While it is argued that embodiment perspectives helped to overcome the mind/ body dichotomy, with the mind no longer occupying a dominant position (Wang, 1999, Veijola and Jokinen, 1994), the narrative statement above draws attention to the danger of privileging the body over mind as it might harm the self-identity development process. While Daisy highlights self-identity, hence supporting a phenomenological account, where the body is regarded as experiencing agent (Hughes and Paterson, 1997), she equally acknowledges profoundly that her bodily experiences are embedded in wider social structures, which is the main tenet of poststructural thought (Diedrich, 2005).

A number of interviewees drew attention to this dualism of transforming identity through discarding disability while equally being restrained by social structures that impose disability as central to one’s identity. Following a Foucauldian perspective, the body works as a foundation for the production of discourses (Mills, 2003), which subsequently regulate experiences (Hollinshead, 1999). The following quotes illustrate the influence of regulatory power:

“I'd never really thought of myself as disabled ... But it was a bit of a shock to be put in that bracket” (Joshua/ Mobility)

“disability doesn’t fundamentally change you. It might change the way you can interact with the world” (Chloe/ Mobility)
These experiences are not unique to the everyday life. Eva recalls her last holiday experiences and highlights:

“I don’t look at myself as being disabled ... but when I sat, um there ... I really felt disabled. I really, um, felt like I'm the person in a wheelchair ... It diminishes you as a person” (Eva/Mobility)

While the above example points towards negative effects that deny self-identity and most importantly agency, resistances are simultaneously in place to counter-act oppression:

“I look back and smile and I think 80% smile back ... to, um, overcome those barriers ... they see me as a human being ... and ... the wheelchair, um, looks, unimportant” (Alice/Mobility)

Here, the smile is an act of resistance similar to gazing back at the audience from a magazine cover (Dazed and Confused, 1998). While mobility-restricted individuals argue that disability is not a part of their self-concept, although acknowledging the influence of power forces, some visually-impaired people deny that blindness is a disability:

“I'm not disabled, I'm blind. I can run for a bus as long as there's not a wall in front of me ... Disabled is somebody who ... can't walk about, you know; he's got no arms, no legs” (Ben/Sight)

There was an overall consensus among participants that disability is equated with wheelchair users and not blindness. The emphasis placed on specific expressions and the wording to describe them connects the arguments to the next category of challenging terminology as a resistance strategy, assisting the transformation of identity positions.

8.3.4 Transformation through Challenging Terminology

Overall, interviewees used a number of different terms when talking about their restrictions. Only a few mobility mobility-restricted interviewees paid careful attention to the distinction between impairment, related to bodily functions, which is personal and disability, referring to the
interaction between body and society, which belongs to the collective realm. While this distinction follows the social model of disability, other mobility-restricted individuals used both terms interchangeably, while some stressed that the word ‘impairment’ contains negative connotation, possibly because experiences related to impairment should not become part of the public realm as it is highly personal (Thomas, 2004).

An examination of the terminology used helps to identify counter-discourses in which elements of individuality are formed (Mills, 2003). While participants used counter-discourses, integrating stigmatised identity representations similar to the example of ‘queers’, they equally underlined that they pay limited attention to the vocabulary used:

“cripple’s a really obnoxious term to use. But we could use it ourselves [laughs] ... It’s pussy-footing around it” (Joe/Mobility)

“I think it’s a load of nonsense, but I can call myself a cripple, but you can’t” (Sam/Mobility)

While it is argued that counter-discourses are taken on board to challenge the assumption that difference is based on biological differences (Mills, 2003), mobility-impaired individuals question the relevance of using different terms. Specifically by referring to their bodily parts, the body itself becomes a site for the production of knowledge, guiding the formation of identity concepts (Foucault, 1991). Harry illustrates this by stressing that different expressions do not change how he characterises his body:

“Whether I say I got, er, er, an impairment, because I’ve only got one leg, or I’m disabled, because I’ve only got one leg, it doesn’t change the fact; I’ve only got one leg [laughs] ... it’s not the person themselves that get the hang up of it, it’s, I think, people who maybe feel that we should be saying it in other ways” (Harry/Mobility)

Important in Harry’s statement is the reference made to other people and often interviewees established the link to political correctness. There was a general agreement that the policy surrounding the use of specific terms makes able-bodied people cautious, which was perceived
as counter-productive for disabled people. As a result, the majority of participants held strong opinions against political correctness:

“personally I don’t give a damned ... Political correctness does my head in” (Ben/Sight)

Specific to sight impairments, people argued that political correctness often prevents able-bodied people to utilise the verb ‘to see’. However, individuals accentuated that they would feel treated like normal humans being if they would be addressed with the same language everyone else is using. The absence of it causes anger and offense as stressed by Max, referring to a professional meeting where one person avoided any allusion to anything visual:

“of course the girls and boys were all winding her up and saying Max, did you see such and such on television ... and she realised that she was being wound up ... she said well, how do you regard your affliction then? I said simple, madam, I just can't fucking see [Laughs]” (Max/Sight)

Given the strong usage of words when referring to disability terminology, findings from this study highlight that disabled people do not necessarily adopt a stigmatised identity as counter-discourse, but instead deny the use of ‘appropriate’ terminology altogether. It is anticipated that political correct language forms part of the dominant discourse of disability. However, as individuals negotiate their own meanings related to dominant discourses (Uriely, 2005), the rejection of specific terms can be regarded as resistance. Further, and in line with Bowring (2000), it is the act of challenging dominant language models that creates the subject. In this context, participants also demonstrated agency through their transformative strategy.

8.3.5 Transformation through Altering Symbols

The conceptual category of altering symbols provided evidence of resistance by challenging signs and images that attempt to pigeonhole disabled people through the assignation of negative attributes. Mobility-impaired persons highlight the need for positive signs that move away from emphasising disability. By expressing his regrets that the disability sign represents a wheelchair, Alex says:
"I personally would love to see that changed because it's a negative image ... have a thumbs up in a particular colour would say to me, I can use that rather than use my wheelchair as a permanent reminder that I can't walk" (Alex/ Mobility)

This supports Ben-Moshe and Powell's (2007) argument in that the ISA contributes to reinforcing stigmatisations. However, by challenging this form of disciplinary control upheld by the notion of abnormality, people resist dominant discourses. Similar to the modifications by ADAPT (2008) and Not Dead Yet (2008), Alex's idea of a symbol changes the meaning and image of disability and also incorporates a bodily active stance.

Further providing evidence that the incorporation of the body is linked to the identity development process (Hughes and Paterson, 1997), individuals, relying on a walking aid, emphasised that they opted for a bright coloured stick not only as a symbol to make others aware of the restriction but also as a symbol to highlight aspects of their self-identity. While participants acknowledged that initially it was difficult to accept the mobility aid, later it represented part of their identity:

"when I first started ... going out with a stick ... I found it quite embarrassing ... I suppose it's the unknown ... it was like hide it here and there ... now I have coloured sticks. I've painted one myself ... that's just me, you know. I like colours" (Ella/ Mobility)

While Dowse (2001) highlights that a positive identification is problematic for disabled people, the example of the walking stick proves that participants embrace the colourful stick as part of who they are, indicating the embodied notion of pride. However, while mobility-impaired individuals use the stick as a positive symbol, people with visual restrictions often follow a different approach. Although they highlighted the importance of the cane as a symbol to make other people aware of the sight problem, others referred to situations on holiday, where the cane is either only used for the first few days or not at all:

"I never take a white cane on holiday ... so I don't have to carry this huge symbol - look at me, I can't see ... I think without either [cane and guide dog], people kind of take you more for who you are; you’re more of an individual" (Lucy/ Sight)
Lucy's narrative brings a number of interesting arguments to light. First, she expresses fear of not being able to project her personality when using the cane or being accompanied by the guide dog. A number of interviewees also highlighted this concern as it was believed that people automatically make assumptions about the blind person when seeing the cane. In this case, it is possible to speak about a threat to self-identity, while mobility-restricted persons embrace the walking stick as a part of their individuality. Second, the cane is perceived as a negative symbol as it highlights the visual impairment. Given the perceived negativity attached to it, people deter from using it. This also stands in contrast to the example provided by mobility-impaired individuals that use the stick as a symbol of pride.

It can hence be stipulated that mobility-restricted individuals show evidence of transformative strategies through challenging and altering symbols, while sight-impaired persons prefer to be regarded as normal by making their restriction invisible, mainly with the aim to protect their self-identity. These arguments already start to point towards inconsistencies with regard to themes belonging to either transformation or reproduction. Theoretical categories that occupy an ambiguous position are elaborated next.

8.4 Ambiguous Territory: Reproduction or Transformation?

Categorical themes that occupy an ambiguous position offer insights into reproductive or transformative elements simultaneously. Transformation potential is apparent due to the employment of counter-discourses and attempts to change negative representations of disability, while at the same time, evidence for following a reproductive approach exists due to the over-reliance on a collective identity following identity politics. Particularly the participation in disability organisations highlights this controversial area.

8.4.1 Ambiguity through Participating in Disability Organisations

The majority of interviewees are members of disability organisations in their everyday life, which was perceived as assistive to deal with exclusionary practices. Motivations for partaking in specialised organisations were related to the exchange of information and experiences, which provides a support and learning system to cope with disability. Further, Sam emphasised:
"the more I've met other disabled people the less I've felt excluded ... See what they can do, their morale, enthusiasm for life, shows you that you can have an acceptable life or do what you want to do" (Sam/ Mobility)

To be able to fully participate in social life, all social barriers needs to be dismantled (Darcy, 2002) and it is particularly the social-constructionist approach to disability that holds up the assumption that society is the creator of a negative social identity (Donoghue, 2003). Following this line of thought, the establishment of disability organisations is regarded as essential to change negative perceptions attached to disability. However, it can be argued that transforming the negative representation of disability as a whole can only be achieved by assuming a collective disability identity.

While authors have argued that it is difficult to build a strong collective disability identity due to the existence of various identity choices (Shakespeare, 2008, Dowse, 2001), findings from this study rather support the assumption that shared sets of interpretations exist, which are important to establish a sense of belonging and identification as a collective identity group. Harry explains this sense of belonging by making use of metaphors, such as “being part of the pride of lions” or “the pack of wolves”. By referring to the time when he lost his leg, he says:

“You feel excluded straight off ... if I join that group I’ll belong to something again; I’ll feel part of something ... because I’m different from people now; I’m different from society ... belonging to that group to feel that you do identify with somebody and it gives you some form of identity” (Harry/ Mobility)

While the quote stresses the benefits of a collective identity, such as belonging and identification, it also highlights the notion of difference, which might point towards reproductive aspects as marginalised identity positions ascribed to disabled people are reiterated. However, participants highlighted that organisations slowly move away from highlighting difference. This is stressed by Sophie, referring to the re-naming process of the Parkinson group:

“the Parkinson’s Disease Society it was before, and they thought disease was very off putting for people, because it’s infectious. And they thought the Society was a closed
shop ... nobody could join it. But they’ve changed it to Parkinson’s UK, they’ve changed the profile of it ... they’re trying to make it more human” (Sophie/ Mobility)

Accentuating that Parkinson can affect a large proportion of individuals and as such should be regarded as a normal, human element of society, is related to claims of getting a ‘bigger voice’ due to the fact that many disability organisations and charities compete against each other for financial support. Hence, an organisation that embraces a large number of individuals is potentially also generating greater income. This leads to questioning if disability organisations primarily move away from highlighting difference in order to create a more positive collective identity or mainly because of financial incentives.

Transformative potential based on a collective identity is related to the notion of identity politics, where individuals with common interests unite themselves to bring about social or political change (Taylor, 1998), often through campaigning for more rights. When interviewees were asked to elaborate on their responses to social exclusion, rights were frequently mentioned, using expressions, such as “fighting for rights” or “battle to achieve your supposed right”. Participants explained that they try to negotiate the situation by explaining the legislative context. However, in very few occasions does this help to solve the exclusionary situation and as a result, people move to different strategies. Among them are calling the police, threatening service providers with licensing authorities and fines, filling complaints and formally suing organisations.

Repeatedly, participants referred to the role of disability organisations to either challenge services providers and/or authorities or to press charges when organisations act against the law. James argued that a big legal case, handled by the Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB), is needed to make service providers more aware about the rights of disabled people as a whole. Hence, the participation in disability organisations can be seen as a strategy to pursue identity politics based on a collective disability identity with the aim to transform marginalised representations of disability. While at first sight, this approach can be regarded as politics of resistance, the narrative analysis also revealed opposing arguments, which rather point towards reproductive aspects, as the emphasis on rights does not change the negative perception attached to disability. For example, when considering the reliance on legal acts and the tendency to sue service providers, Jack, who is severely mobility impaired, categorises some fellow impaired
people as “disability terrorists”, which cause the following reaction by tourism services providers:

“it makes those that are sitting on the fence contemplating getting into the disability tourism market, for example, think, ooh, no. I don’t need that. Forget it. I’ll stay where I am and I’m not going to bother ... it very definitely is, um, destructive, you know. It can harm the well-being of other fellow disabled person” (Jack/ Mobility)

It is the emphasis placed on ‘destructive’ and ‘harming the well-being of others’ that can be used to support claims that the participation in disability organisations and the subsequent employment of identity politics is in fact counter-productive as it does not lead to overcoming negative representations of disability. With regard to his continuous complaints about inadequate services, Dylan acknowledges the downside as:

“you’re kind of making a pain in the neck of yourself ... It makes me feel like I’ve got a worse disability than I actually have, or it makes me feel certainly a lot more negative about the disability ... it does have knock-on effects” (Dylan/ Sight)

The narrative abstract above can be used to question the benefits of identity politics as it provides evidence of ignoring the complexity inherent in people life (Shakespeare, 2008). In Dylan’s case, this results in negative perceptions of his own disability, following a stigmatised position. Also casting doubt on the benefits of identity politics, Molly refers to the multitude of disability organisations, which all “have their own little empires”, resulting in no real actions for disabled people. While it is assumed that disability organisations aim to offer resistance, particularly by relying on a collective identity, the existence of a large number of different organisations spawns scepticism if a collective identity of disability actually exists. Also, the over-reliance on raising financial funds impedes the process of forming a positive collective identity. It could be argued that marginalised identity positions are reproduced as by continuously asking for money, disabled persons are possibly being perceived as people in the help for financial assistance. This confirms current stigmatisations and negative presentations and does not bring positive change.

In sum, the participation in disability organisations is regarded as controversial area when debating reproductive and transformative identity positions. While transformative potential is
apparent through efforts to change the representation of disability as a whole and to provide a sense of belonging and identification, arguments also highlighted reproductive processes. It is the emphasis placed on a collective identity category, important for identity politics, which was found to be counterproductive as it does not help to overcome negative perceptions and representations. As a result, disabled people remain in a marginalised, stigmatised position. In a tentative way, it can be argued that disability organisations produce knowledge of their members with regard to the characteristics of disabled people as a group. This knowledge might subsequently change disabled people's self-perceptions (Tremain, 2005). Hence, disability, as an identity concept, can be regarded as an effect of disability organisations, guided by political arrangements (Tremain, 2005). This possibly prevents the employment of transformative strategies as disabled people are not autonomous actors in their everyday life (Diedrich, 2005). Instead, they become the target for discourse producers, such as disability organisations, which have created the collective identity construct with the aim to pursue identity politics. In line with Watson (2002), findings from this study support the assumption that agency is denied as the personal ‘self’ is not acknowledged, which limits opportunities for individual resistance.

8.4.2 Ambiguity through Considering Disability as Advantage

The conceptual theme of ‘disability as advantage’ is partly related to the previous section as many disability groups campaign for discounts and deals to benefit disabled people. Benefits or advantages of disability where narrated by mobility and sight-restricted individuals alike, addressing their situation at home and while on holiday. Starting with the everyday life, individuals referred to benefits such as the blue badge for parking, lower tax rates, disability allowance or pensions from the government and special assistance. Given these benefits, people used positively connoted expressions:

“I feel privileged and lucky that I have all these things to help me ... I don't feel as if there isn't enough for me” (Ella/Mobility)

Particular looking at leisure activities, discounts on entrance fees was among the most frequently mentioned advantages. Stressing the benefits of disability could potentially be regarded as resistance strategy (Mills, 2003), where ‘disability as advantage’ becomes a counter-discourse. It
is a way of re-negotiating dominant meanings or perceptions (Uriely, 2005), hereby transforming negative representations of disability into positive and beneficial effects:

"if we can get people to flip from seeing the negative of disability ... it would actually shock people that ... there are benefits to being disabled" (Alex/Mobility)

In contrast to Alex, who aims at transforming negative representations by seeing benefits of disability, Jack deliberately uses negative perceptions to his advantage in a business context. By employing the metaphor of using his wheelchair as a ‘weapon’, he explains:

"the perception from many is that wheelchair users are the horrible stereotypical image ... who was unable to articulate well, maybe had a tilted head, possibly even dribbling ... It was an, it was an uncomfortable vision ... when I, for example, attend meetings ... they’re visibly shocked to start with. They’ve spoken to me on the phone ... ooh, you didn’t sound disabled on the phone. What the hell does a disabled person sound like then? ... They’re a bit uncomfortable now because ... they weren’t expecting a guy in a suit to turn up in a chair ... I feel very confident ... I am better than what people are expecting" (Jack/Mobility)

Also by referring to “turning a negative into a positive”, Jack stresses that stigmatised perceptions held by others work in his favour. Transformative approaches, where disability is turned into a positive, could also be identified in tourism. For example, Joshua highlighted that a physical disability does not necessarily present a barrier to tourism opportunities but can equally offer new perspectives:

“when I have my wheelchair ... you see a very different view on the world and a different image of ... visiting a, a place” (Joshua/Mobility)

The quote above includes an explicit emphasis on different experiences deriving from different embodied situations, highlighting positive elements. As places are regarded as sites to construct meanings and experiences by, in and for the body (Veijola and Jokinen, 1994), the body is used as a site for resistance. In a similar manner, other interviewees have stressed that a wheelchair or scooter provides opportunities for greater mobility and hence greater participation in tourism, which also underlines transformative potential. It is a way of resistance as individuals accentuate
that they are not 'confined' to mobility equipment, hereby possibly working towards dismantling existing stereotypes and marginalised identity positions (Darcy, 2003).

Other advantages of disability refer to the notion of coming ‘first’. Participants repeatedly narrated stories related to being on a tour and getting “the first seat in the bus”, “get taken through customs first” and “show you in first”. Similar to the everyday life, people used words like ‘privileged’ to express their appreciation for superior treatment while on holiday:

“I was privileged in this group, ah, the leader of this group made it possible that I could touch ... the golden wallpapers” (Jacob/ Sight)

Interviewees also welcomed being offered greater levels of help. This relates to a comment provided by Joe, captured through field notes, stating: “I want to be treated differently in order to enjoy the same”. He explained that due to the nature of his impairment, he feels that he deserves better services and care in order to gain the same holiday experiences when compared to the able-bodied population. Critically analysing the narrative abstracts covering the demand for superior treatment in a holiday context leads to the assumption that ‘disability as advantage’ could equally represent a reproductive aspect, as disabled people continue to rely on the assistance of able-bodied persons. It is particular the request for superior treatment as part of people’s perceived rights, that possibly prevents transformative potential in terms of individual opportunities for resistance and agency. However, not all interviewees stress additional help and care as part of the advantages of having a disability:

“I think the whole thing about disability discrimination is about equality, not superior treatment” (Jack/ Mobility)

Equally, other participants stated that additional services provided by, for example the government, have a reproductive instead of transformative effect. By referring to her specialised van financed by the state, Charlotte explains:

“although it is an attempt to make you feel ... like, um, well, normal, at the same time it still singles you out” (Charlotte/ Mobility)
Hence, ‘disability as advantage’ remains an ambiguous element in the debate on reproductive and transformative strategies. In Charlotte’s case, she still feels represented negatively although receiving support from the state with the aim to ‘normalise’ her situation. This coincides with other narrative abstracts, highlighting the controversial area of perceptions related to disabled people either taking advantage of the system or deserving greater levels of help and assistance. Starting with the former, taking advantage of the system, a number of participants emphasised that while they enjoy benefits, such as concessions, they do not necessarily need them. Hence, the rejection of the ‘disability as advantage’ argument suggests greater levels of transformation as people resist the negative representation of ‘using’ the social system to their advantage. Also with regard to the latter, deserving the merits of help, some disabled people refuse to being asked continuously if they need assistance, hence stressing the need to control the level of help required. While this links back to the debate on the paradox of (in)dependence, it also points towards resistance as individuals deny the argument that having a disability consequently leads to greater demand of help from society. Ella highlights this by stating:

“I wouldn’t ... think that you owe me because I’m disabled. You don't owe me... nobody owes anybody anything” (Ella/ Mobility)

Summarising the debate above, ‘disability as advantage’ could represent a transformative strategy, employed as counter-discourse to overcome negative representations of disability. Different embodied experiences are highlighted to act in response to existing stereotypes. However, the emphasis placed on advantages, specifically the demand for superior treatment, might follow reproductive characteristics as disabled people are still seen as heavily reliant on help and assistance, which subsequently singles them out and prevents changes to their representation. In contrast, denying the need for benefits, additional help and assistance was held to offer transformative potential.

8.4.3 Ambiguity through Employing Humour

Most interviewees underscored that a good sense of humour assists in dealing with counter-acting experiences of exclusion. Often participants refer to expressions, such as “because you don’t want to be excluded, you laugh”. Further, it was stressed that they employ greater levels of
humour as their restrictions deteriorate. Central to this approach of employing humour is the aim of highlighting self-identity:

"you can cut off my leg but you can’t cut out my sense of humour ... that will put people at ease ... look at me and not see the disability" (Alex/ Mobility)

Alex also establishes the link between self-identity and the wider social environment as laughing things off or making jokes was held as essential to dismantle barriers that other people have built up. In a holiday context, narratives point out that the employment of humour changes negative perceptions held by other people and assists in building stronger relationships. By referring to falling into the pool, due to misleading directions given by her grandmother, Caitlin says:

"it was funny ... everybody was killing themselves laughing, and that makes you more friends than before. I’ve apologised to, walked into bushes and Christmas trees and I’ve apologised to them all, and it’s the quickest way to make friends, to do something really stupid like that” (Caitlin/ Sight)

The employment of humour can be regarded as a counter-discourse to resist marginalised identity positions, similar to challenging symbols or rejecting appropriate disability terminology. Emphasising that she employs humour at home and while being away, Lydia refers to irony:

“I use irony ... People can’t be angry with me when I answer ironically. Often I can make the situation better ... my irony is with a laugh ... it’s better than to cry” (Lydia/ Mobility)

It is particularly the last element of this narrative that causes doubt on whether humour can only be regarded as transformative strategy. Although numerous interviewees reported that laughing can counter-act feelings of exclusion, the underlying triggering factor for the implementation of this strategy is the attempt to suppress sadness. Referring to herself as a functional and contributing member of society, Caitlin recalled the following emotional encounter:

“my mum should have been sterilised, I should have been drowned and my granny should have been punished for letting my mum reproduce. All this whilst in a bank
queue ... some of it flabbergasts me, but at the time, I can do nothing but laugh ... If you didn’t laugh, you’d spend about 90% of your day crying” (Caitlin/ Sight)

Caitlin’s story highlights succinctly that perceptions, negative attitudes and norms can potentially be internalised into a disabled person’s self-identity (Holt, 2008, Imrie, 2001). Hence, it can be anticipated that employing humour is seen as a shield in an attempt to protect one’s self-identity. While this assists to resist negative perceptions held by other individuals, the internal effects that it has on someone with a disability are still regarded as harmful:

“you might pass something off as being a joke but underneath you just feel so stupid ... you call a taxi ... I’ve done that myself a couple of times where ... a neighbour’s friend’s turned up and I’ve waltzed over and got in the car and said, right I’m going to Newcastle, and you just feel so stupid” (Scarlett/ Sight)

Thus, the employment of humour is regarded as a transformative strategy in an interactional context, however, not at an individual level. This argument can be illustrated by Molly’s experience, where humour works as resistance in a group, highlighting the reliance on a collective identity, which was found to follow principles of reproduction as it does not lead to contesting negative representations at an individual level:

“he said, are you a group? So she said, well, yes ... we’ve all got, um, Parkinson’s or related diseases. Oh, he said, I thought there was something wrong with all of you. [laughs] ... you would think, my God, how rude. We actually, we all fell apart laughing, because there was something wrong with us ... But ... if I hadn’t been with that group ... I would probably have taken offense’ (Molly/ Mobility)

This section explored those themes deriving from the narratives analysis that occupy an ambiguous position between transformation and reproduction. In line with the performativity framework adopted, it has been shown that transformation and reproduction do not exist as dualistic positions, where individuals either follow an approach that leads to transforming identity positions or reproducing marginalised identity locations. Instead, approaches are highly bound to contextual underpinnings as well as temporal dimensions:
"You have good days when you feel you can fight the cause ... Other days you feel terrible, so you don’t bother to do it” (Sophie/ Mobility)

Rejecting the dichotomy of two fixed poles leads to acknowledging multiple identities and the possibility to incorporate many ‘selves’ according to different situations, as highlighted by poststructuralist thinkers (Wearing and Wearing, 2001). Central among contextual aspects is the differentiation between home and away, which is further explored next to identity if tourism offers greater potential to employ transformative acts when compared to the everyday life.

8.5 Tourism – A Site for Reproduction or Transformation?

In general, when comparing experiences of exclusion between home and away, a large number of interviewees indicated they experience greater feelings of exclusion while being on holiday. These augmented emotions derive from levels of frustration as the desired relaxation and enjoyment remains partly absent or barriers seem to increase:

“you go on holiday to escape from your everyday life, and if on holiday you come across even more boundaries ... then it’s not something you enjoy” (Eva/ Mobility)

“it’s more frustrating when I’m on holiday because ... I’m supposed to be away to relax and enjoy myself and you think ... you’ve left all that behind, but then it follows you away” (Sara/ Sight)

Noticeable is the employment of words, such as ‘comfort’ or ‘safety zone’, to express that the everyday life is easier and less anxiety provoking. This is mainly because the surroundings at home are well-known, particular when it comes to physical access elements, which reduces uncertainty and perceptions of risk. When being away, this knowledge has to be acquired in a short time, which further augments the pressure put on an individual, consequently reducing the actual time to enjoy the new holiday. Ben describes his comfort zone compared to being away:

“your own area, that’s your comfort zone. You know the problems you’re going to have in your own comfort zone ... It has got to be a little more stressful when you are
abroad ... I'm more comfortable with a problem in my own area than I am with a problem in a strange area” (Ben/ Sight)

Confiding to the idea of being able to better cope with problems in the everyday life is linked to being in control over the surroundings. In contrast, while home is characterised as comfort zone, being on holiday is often portrayed as the ‘unknown’ or the ‘unfamiliar’. Any unknown territory was held to provoke a higher probability of feeling excluded. Linking the debate to the notion of familiarity, Tilly states:

“when you’re in your, your own town ... you’ve got more elements of familiarity.
And perhaps, ah, a lesser extent of, of exclusion” (Tilly/ Sight)

It can be seen that participants distinguish between home as comfort zone, which is associated with greater levels of inclusion, and away as unknown territory, which often leads to feelings of exclusion. This leads to a noteworthy assumption. While the tourism literature highlights the unknown, unfamiliar or strangeness as central to the set of existing travel motivations, outlining why people engage in tourism (Cohen, 1972), the situation appears to be the opposite case for disabled people. While Cohen (1972) argues that the degree of familiarity and strangeness influences the nature of tourism experiences, indicating how individuals perform their tourist role, the strangeness element can entirely deter disabled people from travelling. Even if the desire for escape, relaxation and enjoyment is stated as common motivator, coinciding with a number of motivational studies (Iso-Ahola, 1982, Dann, 1977, Pearce and Lee, 2005), the unfamiliarity of tourism spaces creates the potential for greater feelings of exclusion.

This contradicts current studies, emphasising the benefits of a holidays for socially excluded people in terms of escaping from the challenges faced in the everyday life (McCabe, 2009) or the drive for freedom (Caruana and Crane, 2011). However, if home is closer associated with inclusion, tourism might not represent an attractive option for people with a disability as escape would signify a departure to confront challenging circumstances. This supports other research highlighting that tourism does not free individuals from barriers of their daily life (Rosh White and White, 2007). Central here is the importance of perceived risk as a motivational factor (Mayo and Jarvis, 1981), which prevents reaching the first step of the travel career ladder. Thus, a greater emphasis has to be placed on understanding needs, in line with the critique of the travel
career ladder (Ryan, 1998). Further, greater emphasis should be placed on combining internal psychological dispositions and external social environmental factors (Harrill and Potts, 2002).

Relating psychological elements to the discussion of identity positions, it is found that individuals move alongside a spectrum of transformation and reproduction. There is no single strategy employed in a tourism context, accentuating that within the two spheres of home and away numerous approaches and hence multiple identity positions can be found, supporting claims of a performative framework. A number of interviewees emphasised that their reactions to experiences of social exclusion are identical when comparing home and away. Interviewees also highlighted that responses differ even when only considering a tourism context:

"it depends ... if my expectation to get in is great, then I will make every effort to try ... get somebody ... or whatever it might be ... on the other hand, if it's something that you can sense that people aren't really going to do anything to help you, then it's just to say well, thank you very much, cheerio and go away from it" (Harry/ Mobility)

While Harry emphasises transformative and reproductive strategies, Molly outlines greater level of resistance strategies at home and away by referring to her self-identity:

"I'm still independent, awkward, difficult, old Molly ... I do my own thing in my own way, really. I don't think there's a vast amount of difference ... apart from the fact that in one setting I might be with strangers and in the other setting I might be with people I know" (Molly/ Mobility)

It is precisely the link to dependence/ independence and strangers/ non-strangers made by numerous interviewees that led to the identification of one vital difference in the contextual analysis that relates back to the distinction between home as comfort zone and away as the unfamiliar and unknown. While home was held to be typified by greater levels of independence leading to potentially greater feelings of inclusion, away was found to initiate higher perceptions of exclusion due to the dependency on other people. While some interviewees highlighted that not seeing other tourists again makes it easier to show greater levels of resistance as representational issues become irrelevant, others held the opinion that the familiarity at home spawns more potential for transformation:
“I’m less conscious of people around me, because we’re quite a close community ... but on holiday it’s a bit different because you’re in a different environment ... you don’t know the people ... I’m probably more likely to have words in this country rather than abroad ... perhaps you feel a little bit more intimidated than you do if you’re at home” (Jessica/ Sight)

Bringing in the strategies as discussed earlier in this chapter, individuals rely more on the participation in disability organisations and making use of identity politics in the everyday life when compared to tourism. Often this was related to people’s affirmation that they are familiar with the legal context in their home country, hence having the confidence to assert their rights:

“you would actually do more about it ... because obviously it’s going to be something that comes up more often ... and obviously ... with the DDA you’ve got something to back yourself up with” (Scarlett/ Sight)

Thus, it can be assumed that individuals at home are pursuing a strategy that was identified as ambiguous territory as while trying to resist, the approach is based on a collective identity, ignoring self-identity and agency. While the identity politics perspective remains uncertain with regard to either transforming or reproducing identity positions, participants also highlighted that they are more inclined to “fight the cause” at home, which entails transformative potential (Holt, 2007). However, apart from not knowing the legal situation while away, interviewees highlighted that they refrain from engaging in a battle while being on holiday:

“when you’re on holiday, you want to make the most of, of being away ... so it is ... a bit frustrating if you fought ... because of some kind of design or, um, staffing type issue” (Tilly/ Sight)

“to be honest you get to the stage where you get sick to death of always having to fight and always having to make a big issue of something ... I want to go on holiday to relax and not have to ... make an issue at every single point” (Scarlett/ Sight)
Some participants highlighted that a holiday environment brings more relaxation, which prevents feelings of angeriness or bitterness even if they are treated in a stereotypical manner, indicating that they show greater levels of tolerance with regard to exclusionary situations. However, taking a critical view, James points towards a critical aspect in this debate:

“it’s a different... the frame of mind that you’re in at the time ... because you are more relaxed on holiday ... and will actually put up with ... if we are being excluded from something, oh well, right ... we’ll do the other thing ... I think the, the other question is, should you be more relaxed about it” (James/ Sight)

This narrative quote illustrates that while a holiday context brings more relaxation, it is this context that prevents individuals from adopting a transformative strategy in terms of ‘fighting back’. The crucial question at this point is if relaxation deriving from a holiday context balances out the need to adopt transformative strategies. While this argumentation would leave individuals to follow reproductive positions, pointing towards tourism as a negative force in encourage societal change, Adam highlights transformative potential:

“I just change my mindset ... I just think ... if I was a famous pop-star ... people would look and stare ... I feel pretty special” (Adam/ Sight)

Adam’s account can be used as example to illustrate transformation through rejecting norms and valuing difference. However, the majority of interviewees reject the notion of difference in a tourism context. This finding derives from narrative abstracts made by nearly all participants, accentuating the strong denial to use a specialist tour operator. Whereas the participation in disability organisations appeared as dominant theme penetrating the everyday life, the analysis of narratives referring to a tourism context, presented a different set of findings. While some interviewees argued that they would be inclined to consider using a specialist disability operator in case of friends and family members being absent, reiterating the paradox of (in)dependence, overwhelmingly, participants expressed their opposition to using specialist disability organisations or travelling with other disabled people in general (Table 10). This contrasts findings from other studies that highlight the significant role that disability organisations play for acting as specialist travel agency and enabling holiday experiences (Stilling Blichfeldt and Nicolaisen, 2011).
Table 10: Narrative Abstracts: Rejection of Travelling with other Disabled Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>'I don’t particularly want to travel around with a whole bunch of visually impaired people as a rule'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>'do not prefer to separate myself with other blind people'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>'I definitely don’t want to go on holiday with a lot of people who are quadriplegic. That would limit and cut down what we could do enormously. I just want to go with a mix of people I get on with and whether I get on with them is more important than their physical abilities'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>'I like to just go on normal holidays ... most of it is down to personality'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>'in terms of sort of belonging to a group ... it’s something again I don’t really feel I want to do ... don’t sort of want to be necessarily reminded of my sight problems ... just get on and do whatever [laughing] ... I’d want to do'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>'I’m disabled, why should I just like disabled people? So I’m not keen on this kind of group travel. I don’t see why I should have to travel in some group in order to achieve the same as anybody else would achieve'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>'I wouldn’t choose to go ... with the same people all the time. I’ll just like choose my holiday'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>'I don’t think you really have to join a group with similar needs ... it was a bit like a ghetto ... you’d just rather have a holiday with a general mix of people'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the denial of difference is a key feature in the transformation debate in tourism as evident by rejecting to make use of a specialist tour operator with the desire to be ‘normal’:

“I still think of myself as normal ... That’s probably why it is that I want to go with normal people, whatever normal is” (Sophie/ Mobility)

In addition to highlighting their normality, examples can be found that also draw attention to the over-performance approach in the pursuit of not having to rely on specialised tourism operators, which has been identified as transformation (Lester, 2008):

“If I want a holiday, I damn well will go and sit sometimes for hours on the computer trying to find somewhere” (Charlotte/ Mobility)

Often, the desire to holiday with non-disabled people is triggered by the everyday life, where disabled people are involved in disability organisations: “I want to go with normal people
because I work with disabled people here in [M]" (Lydia/ Mobility). Apart from the wish to mix with other people, interviewees highlighted that perceptions of others lead to the assumption that disabled people need specialised holidays:

"these people are saying I am different from everybody else so keep me along with the people that are the same difference as me. Me, I'm the same as everybody else ...
I don't want to be ... institutionalised" (Ben/ Sight)

Stressing the 'same' was also found to be strongly related to the identity debate. For example, some participants argued that people who travel in groups of disabled individuals are caught in the belief that they have gained autonomy and greater power:

"The difference is that you feel differently, i.e. you have anonymity because you're in a big group of people who have the same problem" (Caitlin/ Sight)

"there's safety in numbers ... they feel that there's more power to the elbow if there's a group, rather than trying to fight the good cause on your own ... which needs... takes courage and strength ... you have to really push yourself" (Julia/ Mobility)

While this leads back to the debate of pursuing a collective approach to identity, which was found to be counter-productive, it also stresses aforementioned arguments that transformation derives from the inner self, highlighting agency. Expanding the debate further, it was felt by participants that the existence of specialist operators generates exclusion:

"I would never do that ... I would be afraid they would tend to fulfil needs I haven't even expressed ... They sort of, fulfil it or based on their idea of what's nice, comfortable ... but then at the end ... they go against the idea of inclusion ... they ... exclude, they make you a separate member of a different group again" (Eva/ Mobility)

In this context, having specialist operators reinforces the establishment of categories of individuals, similar to claims made by Horsell (2006) referring to institutions aiming at addressing the needs of 'identified groups'. This argument can also be seen as related to
Goodin's (1996) argument, stressing that exclusion exists because society creates an inclusive community. Related to the example above, the inclusive community is the population that travels without the assistance of specialist operators, hence representing the norm in society. Thus, it could be argued that the idea of assistance in the travel process denies normality to disabled people:

“if you put yourself altogether in a group, you’re excluding yourselves from ... degree of normality ... you’re also making the situation worse, because you’re excluding other people from being able to see that you are in other aspects, a normal human being” (Harry/Mobility)

This coincides with Joshua’s argument who adds that positive attitudes are central to offer resistance to exclusionary situations, which ultimately changes the behaviour of other people. This supports Chen’s (2002) argument that people use self-images not only for intrapersonal reasons but also for interpersonal motives, both with the effect of making oneself:

“I have quite a positive approach ... people do react back to that ... then people just get on with things as well. I think that reflects back ... I’ve never really missed out on anything ... as a way of life I kind of believe in ... where there’s a will there’s a way ... bring that back to travel, I approach that in the same way ... an attitude that, ah, you don’t look for obstacles; you look for ways around them” (Joshua/Mobility)

The desire to fit into the dominant perception of normality appears as central to approaching tourism. Hence, the tourism industry will need to tackle the following paradox. On the one hand, the everyday life is considered as comfort zone with greater independence and less exclusion. However, certain strategies employed in the everyday life mainly focus on emphasising a collective approach to identity, denying the self. In contrast, on the other hand, by referring to a tourism environment, individuals indicate an intrinsic yearning to highlight self-identity, denying the membership to any collective category. Yet, this desire, underscored by rejecting specialist operators, appears to be hampered by connecting tourism to the unknown and unfamiliar that leads to increased feelings of exclusion due to the greater levels of dependency. While the concept of interdependence is equally relevant to both home and away (Figure 10), it is again the dependency construct that impedes the development of full agency in tourism.
It is in this context, that tourism has to identify possibilities to act as an agent for positive change. Higgins-Desbiolles (2006) emphasises that tourism has to be regarded as a social force, enabling disadvantaged people to fulfil their right of travel, with associated positive effects such as improving individuals’ well-being, contributing to cultural protection and stimulating global consciousness to the formation of a global society (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006). However, it is anticipated that a more critical engagement is needed to reveal how this can be achieved in practice. In this context, the present study highlights the need to increase the agentic potential of people with a disability by particularly allowing for greater independence. While the practicalities of potential approaches are discussed in the final chapter, it is hoped that by increasing the independence of disabled people, tourism could be perceived as a different zone, which is highlighted by Julia:

“this is the alternative me ... there’s an element of just get up and go. Just do it. Just have a go ... because you’re in a totally different context. You’re out of your normal life zone ... You want to have the best time that you can have, so you want to take advantage of the chances and the opportunities that present themselves. And you do stuff that you would not do at home, because there’s this element of what people think about you ... things change completely when you’re on your holiday. So many inhibitions and, and hang-ups that you’ve got when you’re at home, suddenly go out of the window” (Julia/ Mobility)
In line with a performative framework, the above narrative abstract highlights the possibility of 're-making' one's identity (Burkitt, 2008). In this context, the opportunity is chiefly facilitated by tourism encounters. In this context, the 'I' acts and modifies (Wearing and Wearing, 2001), which could also have an impact on life at home. Hence, it could be argued that trying different things while on holiday could possibly lead to continue exploring new options in the everyday life with the aim to overcome exclusion in the daily life.

8.6 Summary

This chapter focused on analysing the effects of social exclusion with regard to identity positions. Particular emphasis was placed on identifying progressive and regressive parts of the narratives indicating transformative and reproductive strategies respectively. Reproductive strategies were discussed in terms of 'resignation' and 'restraints by the intimate circle and wider society', while transformative approaches included resisting or over-performing norms, discarding disability, challenging terminology and altering symbols. The findings also revealed that a clear-cut dichotomy of reproduction and transformation does not exist. This was exemplified by debating strategies that appeared to occupy an ambiguous role between the aforementioned two poles. Among the aspects representing an ambiguous territory was the participation in disability organisations in the everyday life, employing humour and considering disability as an advantage. Throughout all themes, the paradox of (in)dependence appeared to represent a key theme, which does not only influence identity positions related to collective identity and self-identity but has also important implications for increasing the potential for agency of people with a disability.

While the analysis highlighted that individuals employ a wide range of strategies regardless of the context, underlining that tourism opportunities do not necessarily result in transformative potential per se, it was anticipated that the tourism industry needs to pay greater attention to improving possibilities for independence, which could subsequently lead to greater agency and greater reflections and expressions of self-identity in tourism. With these insights in mind, the final chapter focuses on reviewing the entire research, with particular emphasis being placed on the practical implications of this study, its contribution to knowledge and limitations, resulting in propositions for future research.
Chapter 9: Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

Having discussed the findings deriving from the empirical research, the purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the entire research process, starting with re-visiting the overall research aim and related questions. This not only reiterates the concepts forming the theoretical heart of this thesis, but also assists in highlighting the contribution to knowledge and the implications for practice and management. After acknowledging the limitations of this study alongside different categories, future research avenues are discussed. The chapter concludes by providing an additional reflexive account covering the entire research journey.

9.2 Revisiting the Research Aim and its Objectives

The research was structured alongside five research questions aiming at critically investigating the meaning of social exclusion in tourism and its influence on identity positions of individuals with a disability. The concepts of social exclusion, disability and identity represent the theoretical heart of this research, with the development of a performative framework guiding the research throughout the empirical part. Deriving from the following review are five key findings, which assist in substantiating contribution to knowledge claims.

The first question aimed at examining the current understanding of disability and the inherent limitations. While the social model of disability informs society's current understanding of disability, its relevance within a tourism context was questioned as it focuses only on macro-environmental barriers, thereby neglecting individual, personal factors. Central in this debate are questions about how to account for the heterogeneity and multiplicity of existing identities as well as subjective knowledge deriving from embodied experiences. Another overlooked aspect relates to the power of discursive formations that exclude some individuals by either privileging one set of experiences and/or de-privileging other. Hence, it is anticipated that tourism researchers need to be more critical in terms of a wholesale adoption of the social model. This does not mean that tourism research should fall back to the medical model but instead,
researchers should carefully examine the benefits and potential disadvantages for following the social model perspective in all its complexity.

In an attempt to overcome the apparent limitations of the social model, the second question investigated different conceptual frameworks, which could potentially be utilised to overcome shortcomings. After exploring the gaze, embodiment and performativity with its advantages and weaknesses, it was found that the application of a performative approach represents the most suitable framework for understanding disability and the power processes by which individuals become tied to a certain identity. Performativity moves beyond the visual dominance in tourism encounters and embraces the embodied nature of experiences, while placing a strong emphasis on the identity development process within different contexts. By critically examining the failure of the social model to consider the heterogeneity of identity positions, it was questioned whether disability can be equated with social exclusion without taking into account different subjective experiences of exclusion. These insights provided an answer to the third question, outlining how a performative framework can assist the disability debate for investigating social exclusion.

The use of a performative framework for analysing disability and social exclusion is considered as the main finding deriving from the conceptual work of this research. At its core, performativity requires tourism scholars to investigate all kinds of phenomena and the effect that these have on individuals. Specific to disability, such an approach questions binary approaches such as impairment/disability and inclusion/exclusion as well as the collective approach to identity, which is upheld by the discourse of social exclusion and the social model of disability. As both discourses disallow for subjectivities and obscure the complexity of lived realities, indicating their intrinsic performative social power, a performative framework recognises multiple identities, emphasising the importance of context and space for different identity performances (Holt, 2007). This assists in offering a critical perspective of the social model of disability, ultimately with the aim to improve the model. This can be achieved by incorporating the lived experiences of people with a disability instead of privileging a few selected voices, which would lead to greater levels of advocacy and empowerment.

While critics of the social model have outlined deficiencies in terms of failing to incorporate the heterogeneity and multiplicity of identities as well as subjective knowledge deriving from
embodied experiences, only a few studies have applied a performative perspective to disability as part of the empirical research. This negligence is rectified by this study, incorporating the voices of disabled people and their experiences of social exclusion, drawing attention to the fourth question related to re-conceptualising social exclusion in tourism. The narrative analysis revealed that social exclusion is mainly rooted in interactive aspects. Central here is the recognition that social exclusion acts as a discursive force, establishing a normative, space-related framework. These norms have an effect on the enactment of roles in multifunctional spaces. Performing the role as a tourist is severely hampered, with the gaze contributing to normative judgements. While it was previously highlighted that social exclusion affects individuals, this study has further shown that social exclusion has also to be considered at a collective level, moving away from the unavailability of services in a geographical area towards the denial of access affecting disabled people, their friends, family members and unfamiliar persons. Highlighting the need to embrace a multi-personal perspective also led to the identification of the paradox of (in)dependence, which was regarded as an inherent feature of social exclusion linked to norms.

With this in mind, the last question aimed at investigating the potential for agency. As perceptions of a ‘common’ norm do not necessarily translate into a shared common identity (Pratt, 2002), responses to experiences of social exclusion were discussed related to reproducing identity positions or alternatively transforming and challenging norms and dominant identity representations. Findings revealed that a clear-cut dichotomy of transformation and reproduction does not exist. Apart from strategies that were classified as ambiguous territory, the paradox of (in)dependence continued to be a central theme. This is due to the fact that while individuals highlighted ‘home’ as the comfort zone with higher levels of independence leading to fewer experiences of exclusion, tourism, as the unfamiliar or unknown was deemed to lead to a higher propensity to feel excluded due to the dependency on other people. This dependency restricts the employment of transformative strategies while the desire to demonstrate the ‘self’ or self-identity is clearly in existence by rejecting to make use of specialist disability tour operators. Also classifying people with a disability as ‘vulnerable’ prevents the adoption of transformative strategies. As an analogy to Shakespeare’s (2008) line of reasoning, it can be argued that the classification of ‘vulnerable’ consequently leads to social exclusion and limited opportunity of agency. This represents a challenge to the tourism industry as ways have to be found that
encourage positive change and greater agency for disabled individuals by enhancing independence.

In sum, the five key findings deriving from this research can be summarised as follows. First, performativity offers a valuable framework to analyse disability and social exclusion. Second, using the performative framework as part of the empirical research, social exclusion in tourism can be re-conceptualised on the basis of interactive aspects, norms and social relations of power. Third, these elements do not only affect the individual with a disability but also other persons belonging to the wider collective realm, classified as collective exclusion. Fourth, a clear-cut dichotomy of either transforming or reproducing dominant identity positions does not exist. Fifth, the paradox of (in)dependence is an intrinsic feature of social exclusion which affects the employment of transformative or reproductive strategies.

9.3 Contribution to Knowledge

This study makes a contribution with regard to applying a performative framework, developing theory in terms of re-conceptualising social exclusion in tourism and offering a critique on transformation/reproduction assumptions.

First, while performativity has been highlighted as a valuable concept with numerous potential opportunities, much of the research conducted so far remained at the theoretical level, drawing on dramaturgical performances and the enactment of roles (Turner, 1974, Goffman, 1959), different performances according to different markers of social identity or self-identity (Hyde and Olesen, 2011, Gregson and Rose, 2000, Gray, 2003, Coleman and Crang, 2002) and the role of power, discourse, conflict and control determining different performances (Hochschild, 1983, Butler, 2007, Burkitt, 2008, Lester, 2008, Hammack, 2008). Specific to tourism, studies focus on conceptualising places as stages for tourism encounters (Crouch, 2004, Crouch and Desforges, 2003, Edensor, 2000, Edensor, 2001, Edensor, 1998). These stages determine which practices are allowed and which are forbidden (Coles and Church, 2007, Edensor, 2000, Edensor, 2001).

In line with the existing literature, it is acknowledged that performance and performativity are crucial concepts to explain social phenomena and what they do to individuals (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998, Crouch and Desforges, 2003, Gregson and Rose, 2000). However, hardly any
research has made use of performativity, guiding the entire research including the empirical fieldwork and/or outlining how it can be applied holistically to the research process.

By bringing together different perspectives and insights of performativity from a wide range of disciplines, this study addressed the aforementioned negligence. It has brought the performative angle to the empirical stage by focusing on what social exclusion, as a particular phenomenon, 'is' and also what it 'does' to the identity process of people with a disability by following a narrative approach of collecting data. It is anticipated that this framework can also be applied to different phenomena and different sectors or contexts outside tourism.

The narrative approach facilitated participatory voices of individuals that are regarded as socially excluded, which represents a performative action in itself. These performances are forms of daily discourses that reflect on specific roles, rules and structures in the process of defining experiences (Pollock, 1990). In this context, the 'voice' that is heard serves as a starting point to reveal complex social and political processes. Due to the fact that experiences expose the everyday life of an individual, they entail a 'theoretical' site of producing emergent knowledge. As such, the approach to methods based on narrated performances allowed for enhancing the narrator's agency in terms of producing emergent knowledge while at the same time paying attention to structural constraints. In addition, as only few studies have dealt with performative notions under the critical theory paradigm (Denzin, 2003), there could be a shift in the paradigmatic base of critical theory incorporating performative dimensions.

Second, with regard to theory development and taking into consideration that the concept of 'social exclusion' originated in the field of social policy, this research adds to the epistemological and theoretical base by establishing an improved understanding of social exclusion in tourism. Epistemologically speaking, it is acknowledged that findings are mediated by the researcher's values and context-specific by employing a subjectivist and interactive epistemological base. This stands in contrast to the sphere of social policy where the voices of those addressing social exclusion remain invisible (Koller and Davidson, 2008). With regard to the theoretical base, the re-conceptualisation is based on combining multiple perspectives with a strong focus on the role of power/knowledge bound to the notion of identity. The study provides evidence that social relations of power and norms need to be taken into consideration to achieve
an improved understanding of social exclusion. It was demonstrated how the incorporation of these aspects significantly alter the understanding of social exclusion moving away from purely distributional, institutional and environmental elements, which have been the focus of previous studies. For example, Collin and Kay (2003) highlight distributional aspects as key when investigating the social exclusion of disabled people, Imrie (2001) and Imrie and Kumar (1998) focus on environmental constraints and Braddock and Parish (2001) concentrate on institutional elements in form of advancing citizenship rights. However, in contrast, this study emphasises the central role of interactive components which influence other dimensions of exclusion.

Through this re-conceptualisation of social exclusion in tourism, theoretical critiques, differences and boundary conditions could be identified when comparing the use of the concept to social policy. As this type of theory development often challenges the underlying rationale of accepted theories (Whetten, 1989), the conceptual understanding of social exclusion in tourism following a performative approach to accommodate processes of power and knowledge bound to identity, could potentially alter the understanding in social policy. It could also lead to a re-conceptualisation of affected theories, such as ‘social inclusion’, with the aim to overcome alleged deficiencies in terms of possibilities for agency (Colley and Hodkinson, 2001).

Third, by utilising performative theorisations of identity, a critique is offered on assumptions related to either transforming or reproducing identity positions (Holt, 2007). Instead of focusing on a dichotomy, identity positions are performed in a fluid manner depending on different contexts. Tourism, considered as context-specific, is often regarded as a social force (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006), however, this research has critically explored that a holiday environment does not automatically lead to the employment of transformative strategies. This substantiated claims that tourism might act as a reproducer of inequality (Carlson, 1996). Furthermore, this study offered insights into ambiguous territory, which is currently neglected in tourism research.

Overall, these insights are deemed beneficial for tourism scholars in terms of facilitating an improved understanding of social exclusion. Academics outside tourism could potentially benefit from applying a performative approach and findings from this research to other disciplines to examine whether opportunities for replication exist. Outside academia, this research has important implications for numerous players in the industry, which is discussed next.
9.4 Implications for Practice/Management

For the tourism industry, the key question deriving from this research relates to how to achieve greater independence for people living with a disability in tourism. Hence, what is needed is exploiting the situations that enhance agency leading to transformative potential. It is anticipated that a wide range of individuals and organisations are involved in this undertaking.

Starting with tourism policy makers, current approaches rarely consider the voices and experiences of disabled people. However, listening to this ‘client knowledge’, would lead to the identification of practical benefits. This is evident by, for example, investigating current conflicts regarding ‘Design for All’ principles, as disabled people feel marginalised by this initiative, which was initially devised to improve access for all individuals. Hence, making tourism sites and facilities accessible to a wide range of user groups, as currently proposed by the European Commission as part of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (European Commission, 2010b) is not enough and will not completely eliminate social exclusion. It can also be argued that even spatial exclusion can only partly be minimised as the conflict over shared spaces requires attention being paid to relational factors.

Furthermore, as social exclusion is currently regarded as a theory of need (Bowring, 2000) which marks out differences (Peace, 2001), policy makers as well as society at large need to consider how to move from a theory of need to a theory of desire, or at least, how to address needs and desire simultaneously (Peace, 2001). Important here is to recognise heterogeneity among people with disabilities, which could improve the social model of disability. Central here is to direct social policy action to situations where negative representations of disability still prevail and/or are reproduced, such as in the area of interpersonal relations, instead or alongside indicator-centred approaches to social exclusion.

As independence has been singled out as central to enabling inclusive experiences, tourism suppliers and intermediaries have to set up approaches that allow for greater agency. With regard to intermediaries, while established with the best intentions, specialist tour operators catering for the disability market were deemed counter-productive as these create exclusion by establishing a different category which ultimately works against expressions of self-identity. Due to the overall
consensus among participants, highlighting the desire to be 'normal', specialist tour operators seem to work against inclusion, which necessitates mainstream players to optimise their strategies to incorporate all individuals.

For tourism suppliers, in order to benefit from an increase in visitors with disabilities, strategies should embrace the provision of adequate information, which supports an independent decision-making process. However, more difficult is ensuring independence while getting to and being at a destination. While assistant services at airports specifically tailored towards the needs of individuals as well as accessible pathways at the destination can help in this process, it is still the reliance on accompanying people that creates dependency. While recalling that social exclusion in tourism is mainly rooted in interactive components related to norms, it is anticipated that the problem of negative attitudes, stereotypes and prejudices needs to be tackled at the stage where norms are formed, placing a focal emphasis on education and training providers to increase the level of disability awareness among all people. This was emphasised by a number of participants of this study:

“I am a strong believer that, as early as possible in the school curriculum ... leading all the way through school years, that people are given disability awareness sessions ... It normalises disability in the far sort of, um, wider aspects of society” (Tilly/Sight)

It is anticipated that training and education is the main way forward to overcome social exclusion in tourism and in the everyday life. While staff employed in the tourism industry needs to be trained, it is equally important to provide education to all individuals as often conflicts between disabled individuals and able-bodied people leads to strong sentiments of exclusion. Addressing disability-related aspects as part of school or university curricula as well as in employee training programmes is currently neglected at the policy level as an emphasis is placed on raising awareness through the accessible cities award (European Commission, 2010a). Hence, the emphasis placed by participants on the need to improve education and training related to disability should receive further attention.
9.5 Limitations

Discussing the features that were left out of the research is part of the process of reflexivity, indicating the underlying reasons why these decisions were made and the resulting implications for the findings of the study (Gibbs, 2009). Chapter six has already highlighted some of the limitations of this research. While some of the perceived shortcomings have been acknowledged and justified as part of the dual-paradigmatic approach adopted, it was shown how other limitations have been overcome by paying attention to carefully designing the research as well as appropriate data collection and analysis techniques. However, some limitations remain, which fall under contextual, temporal, geographical and conceptual categories. Further, it is argued that mixed method approaches, combining qualitative and quantitative methods, provide value in terms of generalizability and transferability (Flick, 2009). However, by following a purely qualitative approach, reaching generalizability and transferability was not the aim of this research, hence foregoing a mixed method approach. It is also anticipated that a mixed-method approach would have been difficult to combine with a paradigmatic approach consisting of interpretivism and critical theory.

It is argued that sensitivity needs to be paid to the context, especially when research and its associated theories deal with experiences of individuals (Whetten, 1989). Contextual limitations stress the difficulties in the analytical transfer of theoretical findings deriving from this research to other people and settings. This study focused on analysing social exclusion in tourism. However, while tourism has started to use the concept of social exclusion, the same tendency can also be witnessed in other sectors such as in the employment and labour market, the educational context, housing as well as health care, which have been neglected as part of this research.

It is also acknowledged that apart from disabled people, a wide range of other groups, individuals and communities are considered as socially excluded. Among them are children in poverty (Watt, 2001), homosexual individuals (Pritchard et al., 1998, Clift and Forrest, 1999), disadvantaged adults, older people, individuals/communities affected by frequently moving home (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004a). This research, however, focused only on individuals with a disability. Other markers of social identity, such as race, gender, sexual identity, age and class, were omitted as their inclusion would have increased the complexity of this research beyond a manageable scale. However, references are made to these categories of social identities as
research in these areas help to support the arguments put forward in this research. Further, as highlighted in the chapter on social exclusion, the discourse of social exclusion currently neglects individual perceptions of exclusion. Therefore, there might be other individuals and groups that feel excluded but have not been recognised at all.

By concentrating on individuals with a disability, only people with mobility and visual restrictions as research participants were interviewed as part of the empirical analysis. Their experiences of social exclusion in tourism cannot be equated with other impairment groups such as deaf, speech or intellectually impaired individuals. The reason for omitting these impairment groups relates to communication difficulties, which would have added an additional layer of meaning by for example having to rely on sign translators.

Findings derive from the experiences of mobility and sight-restricted individuals that could be captured during the interviews. Although attention was paid to terminate the interviews when the point of saturation was reached, it cannot be assumed that the entirety of experiences and strategies are identified. In addition, it is acknowledged that something might have been always hidden from the narrative (Doucet and Mauthner, 2008). As such, what can be known is what the research participants have narrated and the interpretation of it (Doucet and Mauthner, 2008). It is also recognised that individuals who are not a member of a disability organisation have been excluded by the participant gathering process.

Related to temporal limitations, interviews were conducted in a rather artificial research setting and not while or just after the interviewee experienced exclusion. This might have an impact on the findings as participants had to rely on their memory for recalling these experiences, possibly triggering different answers as they had time to reflect on their experiences. However, given the limited knowledge when and where experiences of exclusion occur, the study has to deal with the time difference between the interview and incidences of exclusion. Claims to be timely objective is an ethical problem and temporality is widely accepted as a key feature of the narrative form (Elliott, 2005), which emphasises the ontological assumption of critical theory that reality can only be partially understood and will always be open to contestation.
Apart from temporal factors, the study is constrained by geographical shortcomings as the data collection process of narratives was geographical limited to the UK, Germany and the Netherlands. While qualitative research is ideally suited to examine cultural frameworks and differences, it is not an intrinsic element that needs to be incorporated for all qualitative research (Morrow, 2005). The same argument is applicable to this study, where the primary lens of investigation was not the investigation of cultural differences. Despite the coverage of participants from three different countries, it is impossible to identify differences deriving from different cultural backgrounds due to the unequal distribution of participants.

Lastly, conceptual limitations exist as the research aimed at reaching a better understanding of the meaning of social exclusion and its influence on identity positions of disabled individuals by paying particular attention to the role of discourse and power. Other concepts that could have been used to investigate social exclusion, such as the notion of mobility or network theory were omitted as it would have moved the scope of this research beyond a manageable scale. This is in line with Flick’s (2009) argument in that quality can be achieved by limiting the focus of the study, hence breaking down a complex field of research into pieces that can be managed within a given time frame and available resources. Further, as outlined in chapter five, it is acknowledged that the conceptualisation of social exclusion will always remain contested and different and new concepts, constructs and paradigms might challenge the claims put forward in this research.

9.6 Future Research Avenues

It is anticipated that ample opportunities for future research avenues exist, which partly derive from the limitations of this study and partly from additional questions that emerged during the data interpretation process. The latter is supported by Lieblich et al., (1998) in that narrative research leaves opportunities for future directions to emerge.

Starting with the former, investigations are needed that aim at achieving a better understanding of the processes of social exclusion experienced by individuals with different types of impairments, such as hearing, speech or intellectually impaired individuals. This is regarded as important as these groups were excluded from this research due to apparent communication difficulties. Furthermore, social exclusion faced by individuals and groups with different markers of social identity and their experiences of exclusion requires further examination to identify if
their perception of exclusion also focuses on interactive elements, norms and the paradoxical nature of (in)dependence.

Specific to collective exclusion, experiences made by travel companions of disabled people might add an additional layer for better understanding social exclusion moving beyond the individual level. Apart from applying a performative framework in relation to different individuals or groups, it can also be used for different sectors, such as education, or for other taken-for-granted phenomena to identify where findings from this research deviate or align.

Apart from changing the contextual parameters, a cross-cultural study is regarded as important to identify cultural differences in the understanding of social exclusion. Further, embracing a longitudinal perspective, transformative approaches could be analysed, investigating if these strategies and influences on identity positions change over time.

Looking at future research avenues that emerged from the narrative material, it is anticipated that the meaning of disability symbols needs to be explored in an in-depth manner as it was found that specialised providers catering for the needs of people with a disability create exclusionary structures through the use of ‘dedicated’ or ‘specialist’ disability symbols.

Further investigations are also needed that investigate the paradox of (in)dependence and ways to overcome existing hindrances to achieve greater transformation and independence. Here, findings from this study could be used in focus groups with tourism policy makers, DMOs, tourism suppliers and intermediaries with the aim to establish a design framework for enhancing agency in tourism. Focus group discussions with disabled people are also regarded as essential to examine ways to increase independence and its effect on potentially more meaningful holiday experiences.

Also with regard to the construct of (in)dependence, the perceived risk of people with a disability requires further attention as this currently prevents individuals from reaching the first step of the travel career ladder. This would add to the under-researched area of constraints to tourism motivation (Harrill and Potts, 2002) and would provide further justifications for the need to account for intrapersonal barriers (Yau et al., 2004, Nisbett and Hinton, 2005).
As findings highlight the importance to overcome obstacles in terms of interactive aspects that lead to exclusionary feelings, education and training appears to be a crucial dimension that needs to be addressed. While the tourism industry can provide assistance in terms of developing appropriate training courses, education instances in higher education are also regarded as crucial for achieving a more inclusive industry. In practice, there appears to be limited investment in disability training in the industry (Darcy and Pegg, 2011) and so far, only very few studies deal explicitly with education and training related to disability (Bizjak et al., 2011), which still provides plenty of scope for further research, particularly with regard to overcoming exclusion.

9.7 A Reflection of my Research Journey

In line with claims made in chapter five to engage in a process of continuous reflexivity, this section provides an additional reflection on the entire research journey, highlighting key experiences and challenges divided into five different stages: choice of topic, upgrade meeting, fieldwork, data interpretation and writing-up stage.

Starting with the choice of the research topic, my initial PhD proposal was entitled 'The exclusion of disabled people in nature-based tourism', with core concepts focusing on social exclusion, disability, nature tourism and tourism planning. Soon after starting to review the literature at a deeper level, nature tourism and tourism planning were discarded because it was felt that the topic requires a more critical approach. As a response, identity, power and knowledge constructs were added to account for the complexity of the phenomena studied. By investigating these concepts, performativity emerged as crucial element guiding the entire research. While the use of performativity helped to build a conceptual framework, it added to the complexity of this research, which remained a challenge for the entire research journey. Also posing a challenge was dedicating sufficient time for the PhD after being appointed as lecturer in tourism after one year into the research process on a part-time basis.

Of major assistance was the upgrade meeting, where examiners suggested reducing the complexity by focusing on interviews and leaving out the focus groups as originally planned. With this recommendation, it was anticipated that claims for empowerment can be accommodated as part of the individual narratives. After the upgrade, applying for favourable
ethical approval was time-consuming and took longer than originally anticipated, highlighting the difficulty for research on disability.

At the start of the fieldwork, getting interview participants represented a major challenge and the use of disability organisation seemed the best option to reach out to their members. Once this hurdle was overcome, conducting the actual interviews was a fantastic learning opportunity and all thoughts about whether or not I should have chosen a different group of individuals that are deemed to be excluded were forgotten. Also, while it is often stressed that predicaments exist in obtaining rich data, this was not applicable to my research as interviewees elaborated on their experiences of social exclusion unreservedly and extensively, possibly because I felt trusted and a very good relationship existed between me and my interviewees. As part of this process, I also co-experienced what I have categorised as collective exclusion. One of my interviewees got stuck with his electric wheelchair in a pathway of gravel on the way out of the building. While this was an experience related to dependency resulting in exclusion, I was also able to come into contact with the opposite in terms of independence, confirming levels of inclusion. This occurred by volunteering for a charity which focuses on rambling for wheelchair users, where all participants could freely roam the countryside with specialised scooters.

I came to re-visit the challenge of complexity during the data interpretation stage. Central here was an ongoing concern to fairly and equally represent the voices of my research participants. For the first time, I experienced the power of the researcher at a practical level. The interpretation was further perceived as complex by incorporating three levels of data analysis in addition to accounting for contextual differences between home and away, theory as well as data-driven codes and examining variations in the experiences between male and female participants as well as sight and mobility restricted individuals. After having completed the first two chapters related to the findings of this research, a supervisory meeting led to dismissing the final research question aiming at investigating ways to overcome social exclusion in tourism. However, as data related this objective has been gathered already, the material will be used as part of a subsequent research.
Coming to the final writing-up stage, my last obstacle related to cutting down the PhD from 160,000 words. The realisation that I have to cut half of the material felt unachievable at the beginning as all concepts seemed to be related with hardly any irrelevant information.

Looking back at particular stages of this PhD, I realise that complexity was a challenge throughout. Acknowledging that this might be a natural process that has to be dealt with as part of a PhD, it might have helped to reduce the number of disciplines informing this research while still assuring an interdisciplinary approach. However, despite the challenges associated with a complex subject, it allowed me to gain an in-depth insight into a number of different concepts, which I consider as a great experience, particularly at the current stage of finalising the research.

9.8 Concluding Words

This research, opening with the question “On the Edge Looking in?” in the title, is written as a critique to expose sites of power that have previously been hidden or taken-for-granted by using the term social exclusion in tourism without critically questioning its precise meaning. Following Tribe (2006) referring to Said (1994), it is attempt to reveal power forces by facilitating the speech of the voices that have been suppressed. At its core, this research questions dichotomies upheld by numerous discourses in contemporary society. These dichotomies support approaches which place individuals into separate categories based on pre-defined rules and norms. However, what is neglected are ways to facilitate greater expressions of self-identity and agency.

Even by acknowledging power forces influencing identity constructs, self-identity is crucial for all individuals. We constantly ask ourselves questions related to who we are, what we are doing and what we are going to do in the future. It is a process that helps us to create meaning for ourselves and the social world we live in. Central to the ‘I’ is the notion of agency as challenging and creating new meaning in life is important as it creates the opportunity to have a more meaningful life which justifies our existence (Chen, 2001).

The same can be argued for tourism, where transformative possibilities need to be identified in line with the idea of hopeful tourism (Pritchard et al., 2011) as self-identities can develop as part of touristic performances (Hyde and Olesen, 2011). This is also linked to the notion of freedom in tourism, which supports the development process of self-identity while relations of power
restrict full individual agency (Caruana and Crane, 2011). For example, people’s reactions can influence the self-concept of a person which can lead to withdrawing from “life enhancing engagements” (Richards et al., 2010, p.1107). Hence, important in the quest for greater self-identity and agency is the development of counter-discourses to challenge dominant meanings and identity representations with the aim to reduce exclusionary practices in tourism leading to a more meaningful life. While Hooks (1990) elaborates on “Homeplace: A Site of Resistance” (pp.41-49) as a source for self-recovery and renewal (Hooks, 1990), tourism should follow with similar aspirations by embracing “Tourism: A Site of Resistance”. By returning to self-identity and the importance to continuously resist dominant identity representations, social exclusion in tourism might not represent being on the edge looking in “because I’m still me inside” (Sophie/Mobility).
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## Appendix A: Interview Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme:</th>
<th>Sub-Themes:</th>
<th>Potential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>• Participant Information Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure participant is aged 18-70 and confirm mobility or sight restriction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Obtain completed consent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Warm-up’</strong></td>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td>• Participant’s latest holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• When? Where to? How long? With whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What do you look forward to most when going on holiday?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link to social exclusion based on example</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Exclusion</strong></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>• Have you felt socially excluded in tourism? Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences of</td>
<td>• If Yes: How? / Why? / Could you give me (an) example(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social exclusion</td>
<td>• One-off occasion or does this happen repeatedly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>• Do you experience this in everyday life as well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences of</td>
<td>• Why? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social exclusion</td>
<td>• Could you tell me a bit more about these situations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in everyday life</td>
<td>• What might other people tell me? Similar experiences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differences:</td>
<td>• Do you think there are differences when you compare your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘home’ vs. ‘away’</td>
<td>experiences of social exclusion between being on holiday and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>being home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What is different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reaction to social exclusion</strong></td>
<td>reproduction vs.</td>
<td>• How do you react in situations of feeling excluded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transformation</td>
<td>• At home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• While being on holiday?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are your reactions different when comparing being on holiday or at home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depending on context/ experiences/ stories, potential questions to gain further insights into reproduction and transformation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link Social Exclusion &amp; Disability</strong></td>
<td>Relationship:</td>
<td>• Do you think that there is a relationship between experiences of social exclusion and having an impairment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social exclusion &amp; disability?</td>
<td>• Why/ How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective Identity</strong></td>
<td>Disability – social</td>
<td>• Do you make a distinction between having an impairment or a disability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>model - collective</td>
<td>• It is claimed that ‘disability’ and ‘social exclusion’ are terms that express the same – what do you think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identity politics</td>
<td>• Are you a member in any type of disability organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Why / Why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Theme:</td>
<td>Sub-Themes:</td>
<td>Potential Questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Self-identity | Self-identity | • Does your impairment play a role for identifying who you are?  
                  • To what extent do you think you can to change your environment/ your situation? |
| External influences on self-identity | | • What role do norms and expectations play in your life? |
| Overcoming Social Exclusion | Initiatives – structural constraints of existing programmes? | • What you think are good initiatives to overcome social exclusion?  
                                • Why these? / Why do you think there aren’t any?  
                                • Can tourism help to overcome exclusion?  
                                • Why? / How? / Why not? |
| ‘Warm-down’ | Holidays | • What are your future holiday plans?  
                      • Thank you |
Appendix B: Example of Editorial for Newsletter

Over the last ten years, a number of documents and reports have been published to highlight the need to overcome exclusion. In 2010, we have the ‘European Year for combating poverty and social exclusion’, but do we really know what social exclusion means for all individuals? What does it mean to you? What do you think are good initiatives to overcome exclusion? What is the role of tourism for supporting social inclusion?

If you are interested in these questions, then please contact me to participate in my study. My name is Victoria Eichhorn and I work as Lecturer in Tourism at the University of Surrey. I have been working on improving the availability of information about accessible destinations and I am continuing to be involved in various projects related to accessible tourism.

In order to take part in this study, you have to be between 18 and 70 years old and consider yourself as either having a mobility or sight restriction.

I am looking forward to hear from you!

My contact details are:

Victoria Eichhorn:
Tel.: 0787 56 03 765
E-Mail: v.eichhorn@surrey.ac.uk

All data collected will be treated absolutely confidential and anonymously and will not be attributable to individual participants. Participation in this research is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw from this study any time. I will use a tape-recorder but this is only to remind myself of the themes raised during the interview. No personal incentives or rewards will be offered.

The study has been reviewed and has been given a favourable ethical opinion by the University of Surrey Ethics Committee.
### Appendix C: Interview Participation List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Restricted Mobility</th>
<th>Restricted Sight</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Interview Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>14/06/10</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1:34:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>21/06/10</td>
<td>Farncombe</td>
<td>1:15:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22/06/10</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>47:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22/06/10</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>48:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>24/06/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1:45:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>24/06/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>58:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29/06/10</td>
<td>Northallerton</td>
<td>1:20:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30/06/10</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>59:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/07/10</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>1:26:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/07/10</td>
<td>SE London</td>
<td>1:20:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19/07/10</td>
<td>Münster (GER)</td>
<td>46:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19/07/10</td>
<td>Münster (GER)</td>
<td>53:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20/07/10</td>
<td>Best (NL)</td>
<td>1:17:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22/07/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>50:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23/07/10</td>
<td>Shamley Green</td>
<td>1:09:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26/07/10</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>1:08:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30/07/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>54:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Searlett</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30/07/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1:28:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02/08/10</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>1:15:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03/08/10</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>1:05:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04/08/10</td>
<td>Horley</td>
<td>1:18:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1:17:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>58:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09/08/10</td>
<td>Frimley</td>
<td>1:17:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/08/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>46:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/08/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>44:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/08/10</td>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>1:29:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tilly</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/08/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1:23:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/08/10</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>1:01:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13/08/10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>39:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16/08/10</td>
<td>Dewsbury</td>
<td>1:08:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17/08/10</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>58:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19/08/10</td>
<td>Wimbledon</td>
<td>1:08:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24/08/10</td>
<td>Farnham</td>
<td>50:13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Transcript: Joshua – Mobility-Restricted

Speaker key:

VE  Victoria Eichhorn
IE  Joshua

VE  Okay, ready?
IE  Okay.

VE  [Laughs]. Just put the papers here. Well again, like, thank you very, very much for your time. Very much appreciated.
IE  You’re welcome.

VE  And, ah, I should say, well as I told you in the email, this is very much about you; so your experiences, your perspectives. For the next, well hour... 50 minutes to an hour will be just about you.
IE  Okay.

VE  Um, as I was mentioning earlier, I teach tourism, so therefore I always would like to start by talking about tourism in general a little bit. So could I ask you when was your last holiday and where have you been? And I think...
IE  Yeah, I think...

VE  [Laughs] [unclear].
IE  Yeah, I think it was... The last holiday was about a month ago. Yeah, I got back about a month ago I think, um, to France, um, with some friends and we stayed in a little [unclear] in Bosley in Burgundy. Um, well I had a few days in the north of France, um, with one friend and then we met the rest of them and had a week in this house.

VE  All right. Very nice.
IE  Beautiful. On a vineyard, um, and we stayed at the same place two years ago, the same group of us.

VE  Ah, okay, all right.
IE  So we knew exactly what to expect this time and we just all wanted a really nice relaxing week, good food and some nice wine and good company, and it was lovely [laughs].

VE  And could you relax over the week?
IE  Yes, yes.
And did you enjoy the wine?

Yes, we brought some back.

All right.

It was nice actually having, um, a few days beforehand as well. Just... I drove, so I went over with one friend and so we had just, just two or three days before the week begun. So in that time it was nice just to sort of unwind and by the time the week in the house started we'd been on holiday for a few days, so it was quite nice to do it like that.

I can imagine.

Sometimes it takes you a few days to relax and unwind and then if you're only away for a week, then you just relax and then you start thinking about coming home, so...

It's not enough time, so, no, no, it's a very good idea to do it this way. And before France, um, where did you go to before France? Was there any other holiday happening during...?

Before France, last holiday I had... Um, I hadn't been away this year. I've been busy this year. Um, I went away, ah, last December... beginning of December to Morocco, to Marrakesh. I had five days I think, or was it; no it was a week. I think we had a week with my sister in Marrakesh.

Okay.

And that was lovely as well.

And when you look at your, your last holidays, for example like France and, well, Morocco, what do you look forward to most when, when going on holiday?

Um, it [sighs], it depends where I'm going I guess. Um, on those... Probably different things for those two holidays in fact. Morocco we were... both my sister and I had been quite busy and we were quite stressed at work. Sort of five or ten years ago, I just didn't have that side of it. I never really felt like I needed a holiday. I always wanted to go on holiday and the last two or three years, I've felt like I needed a holiday. So I used to be really active on holidays and if we went somewhere, even if it was, ah, just a beach holiday then I couldn't sit still and I wanted to visit places and going to see things all the time, but now I'm much happier just to relax. So Morocco was really good for my sister, Anna, and I in the same way, because we had a really good balance of being able to relax a bit and then it was still warm. Um, but Marrakesh is a... is a fairly small city, so in a week we could see a fair bit, but by not doing very much every day. So we, we got a really good blend then, of a bit of, sort of sun in the winter-winter sun, a bit of a cultural experience too, because obviously it's Arabic and North African. Um, some great food, definitely part of the holiday - food. Um, well I guess having said it was different; it was the same I suppose, the same sort of thing. Um, so we went to the same place a couple of years ago. So we knew the area, we knew the house. Um, it's the first time I've ever been back anywhere and I used to say I'd never go back however good somewhere was.

Oh really, uh-huh.

But now it is actually just quite nice because it's more relaxing. Not, not that it's stressful to go somewhere new, but when you know somewhere you don't feel under pressure to go out and see things if you've seen a bit before.

Yeah, well I guess it's like the notion of coming back and you're familiar with...
IE Yeah, it was, yeah. And that house; the owners live there and they’re a really nice French guy and English wife and their children who were there before, weren’t there this time. But it’s a very sort of... very welcoming. It was a bit like coming home. It was quite, quite nice, but it was sunny.

VE Ah, [laughs], especially by mentioning the sun at the moment.

IE Yeah, sorry, again.

VE But we’ll get better, we’ll get better. Like I… I’m an optimist [laughs].

IE So then... So that kind of holiday, I guess more... I want to relax more. Not necessary sunbathe, but just read and sit and not do very much. And as I say, where I, I didn’t used to be able to do that for more than two minutes and now I can do it for a week...

VE Oh wow [laughs], it changed.

IE And not really, not... Yeah, I’m tired and it’s fine, that’s lovely. Um, but if I go somewhere else, maybe further afield, then I want to see more of the scenery I guess and...

VE So when you go for example, on a long haul.

IE Yeah.

VE Um, flight, a long haul destination, then there’s more to be seen.

IE Yeah, I guess you probably want to pack more in and be more active, because you’re... Generally you’re less likely to be going back somewhere like that. So you go there because obviously you’re interested in the place, so you want to see as much of it as possible. So it’s more rushing around and trying to do everything. That’s, that’s good too, but it’s nice to have both types of holiday [laughs].

VE Yeah, like a balance in a way [laughs].

IE So Morocco was a good balance, because, um, we could do a bit of each. So in the mornings we’d relax and get up late and have a nice breakfast sitting outside and then it was warm enough to sort of sit outside in the morning and sunbathe, even swim, but the pool was really cold. And in the afternoon we’d just go into the town centre and walk around the [unclear] and have something to eat, maybe, maybe visit a palace or something. So it’s quite a manageable city. So there’s things to do. If we went into town at three o’clock and spent a couple of hours looking around somewhere and then just soaked in the atmosphere with a drink and then had some dinner and it was lovely.

VE Right, it sounds really, really lovely.

IE Yeah, it’s good, I can recommend it if you’ve never been, it’s really good.

VE [Laughs], no I have not been. Well over the last, well months, I can say now, like I, I’ve been talking to a number of people and I think like now I have a huge list of kind of travel motivations and I’ve heard a number of different reasons why, where people travel. But what I found interesting, um, when I talk to some people at the beginning of these interviews, they said, well although they have, well let’s say their set of travel motivations, um, to go to a particular place, they told me that it happened to them that once they arrived at the destination, um, that they didn’t feel welcomed in a way or that they felt marginalized in one way or the other. And whenever I’ve heard comments, um, such as these, like I come to think about, well the concept of social exclusion. And over the time I kept asking more and more
people, like whether they had any experiences of social exclusion, while they have been on holiday. So could I ask you [Joshua], like did you have...? Did you ever have any feelings of being socially excluded while being on holiday?

IE  Not, not in a particularly negative way, not really, no. I think... I don’t know if I’ve been lucky or not, but not... I’ve not really felt excluded in anywhere really. Um, I think you notice different cultural attitudes and different approaches and different places, but I’ve never really felt... I’ve never felt excluded anywhere I don’t think. Um, no.

VE  So when you said, never felt excluded, did you look at your previous travel destinations, or did you also look at the everyday life?

IE  Um, well I guess, I guess I’m talking just in terms of travel really, I suppose in everyday life is... Visiting a place is always different to living in a place. I guess it would be very different. You could look at somewhere differently if you had to live there. So I suppose in that sense, then there are... Yeah, well I’m going to contradict myself now completely, because I suppose in that sense I have felt excluded, purely, um, because of my physical limitations. So I suppose, if... Because I can’t walk that far and in some places that’s not a problem, public transport’s fine or on a holiday you’re maybe... you’re taken around somewhere. If I was looking to live somewhere and I suppose it’s something I’ve thought of in a... in a different way. As I’ve mentioned to you before, I spent some time in Spain and thought about whether I would want to live abroad again and it would be... that would be an issue for me. Um, just feeling, um, comfortable in a place, physically. I’m very, you know, I use my car a lot here. Um, I don’t... I haven’t... I guess I haven’t thought that through in specific cases, but it has always been something that has been in the back of my mind when I’ve thought about; would I want to live abroad temporarily or permanently? Um, in a country like Spain it’s pretty much fine.

Um, but in some less developed parts of the world, obviously that would be very difficult. Places I’ve been where I have a wheelchair that sometimes I take with me. But sometimes it’s just not practical to take it. There’s no point if the pavements are non-existent. Um, sometimes the infrastructure just isn’t cut out for it. So I suppose in that sense there’s an element of exclusion, but it’s not very marked and from a holiday point of view you can normally get around it, because you research a trip, you work out what you want to do, what you want to see, you talk to the company that you’re going with, if you’re going with a company. Um, if I do book with a company, I almost always would talk to them and I ideally want to talk to people that have been to the countries, to the places. You can read a description in a brochure and you don’t obviously know how far you have to walk to get there or to see this or to do that. So I need some sort of reassurance on that. Um, but again I’m lucky because I don’t think there are very many things I’ve come across that I’ve wanted to do that I haven’t been able to do. So either, either in terms of just preparing properly or coming across a barrier when I’m there that I hadn’t foreseen.

VE  Right.

IE  Um, so I guess I have been lucky because that’s good people as well and good local guides, or whatever - that helps out. But one or two places have been a bit harder. Um, I’m just trying to think of an example, but, um, Moscow I remember was a bit difficult [laughs].

VE  Why was that?

IE  Well I went to Moscow a few years ago, um, with a friend who... Well I did night classes in Russian; just because I wanted to.

VE  Right, interesting [laughs], but it’s what you do.
IE Yes, slightly [laughs] strange, but, um, so I wanted to visit Russia. So I went, um, with another lady who was on the course and I guess... Normally when I go on holiday I go either with... I go a lot with my sister or with friends or my family. So they all kind of know me and know my limitations. And more to the point, they just get on with it. So if I take my chair, nobody ever bothers if they just push me. Again, I’m very lucky with that; so I don’t have to miss out on things. Um, but when I went to Russia with this lady, I, I knew here quite well because we’d done, I think three years or two years of classes, so I knew her quite well, but I... When we talked about the trip and before we actually booked I remember actually talking to her and just explaining that if we did it, I was going to be reliant on her a bit, because I took my chair. Because I can’t push it myself, I would need some help from her. And she was fine with that, it was good. But actually, when we were there, she wasn’t very good at all.

VE Can you tell me what happened, like...?

IE Um, well she just... she just wasn’t very considerate. She would... Some of the time was organised; it was a trip, so we were looked after or whatever, but if we had some free time and the free time she would just go and do something and I needed to go with her really, because I couldn’t get around the city myself. Um, so actually there were... it was a small group, but there were some other people on there and they were really good to me - strangers. Australians; they were were all Australian I think, apart from us. And so we had a free day or afternoon in Moscow and they pushed me around Moscow in my wheelchair. Because Moscow’s a... I don’t know if you’ve been to Moscow... Moscow’s a very big city, but it’s on a big scale. So, um, well our hotel was sort of in the suburbs, but it was quite near a metro stop... a bus stop. But quite near in Moscow, there’s actually still quite a long way to walk, to walk across the road system in a precinct actually was quite a long way to get to the bus stop.

So I, I was a bit isolated there and so that particular day they were... the other guys were really nice. Because we were supposed to meet up somewhere as a group, at a museum I think, mid-afternoon or whatever, I can’t remember. But I was really stuck because I needed my wheelchair to do that, to go around the museum. But to be on my own in a city with the wheelchair all day when I can’t push it myself, I have to walk and push it empty and then it’s not very easy to walk around [laughs] the city and then push. So they were really nice and they took me with them. Um, otherwise I don’t know what I’d have done really, but that was probably the worst I’ve had with that. But that’s the kind of thing I have to... So I thought I’d covered that, by speaking to that lady beforehand and explaining to her that I would need help. And it’s difficult, because I don’t like asking for help. But I thought I had to have that conversation with her. I had to be honest. It wasn’t fair to either of us to not explain that. So I was a bit let down, a bit disappointed when we got there, but, but managed to make the most of the trip anyway.

VE Right. So is...? Is...? When you said like, well this was an example where you felt like a bit, um, isolated, I think is the word you were using...

IE Yeah.

VE Um, so is social exclusion then down to people as well as physical infrastructure?

IE It’s not... I suppose, you know, it’s really... I suppose the other thing about that is, that wasn’t really related to the location or the fact it was Russia or... It... That could have happened here. Um, it just happened to be on holiday. I guess the exclusion was caused by people or a person because I didn’t get the sort of help I thought I was going to get. But it’s heightened because you’re in a big city and alone and you want to... go out and see things and you realise you can’t. And that... I guess that wouldn’t happen here, because I know this country well enough to know my way around or have my car or whatever. So I suppose there’s... It, it wasn’t Russia’s fault if you like. It wasn’t the Russian people that made me feel excluded on that occasion. It was that... Just that one individual really.

VE Right.
Um, and, and almost to the contrary the other people had the opposite effect. They restore your nature in human nature again [laughs], ah, your faith in human nature, because they were so kind. It was nothing to do with them; they didn’t have to. It was their holiday; they didn’t have to push me around. So it was nice that they did that.

So peoples, peoples behaviour or peoples attitude make a difference?

Yeah, definitely. And I think, um, I think that’s absolutely true, I think that’s critical. I think... I’m sure I’m not untypical, but I don’t... I’m very stubborn and I don’t like asking for help; I hate asking for help, to a fault really. But you sometimes do need help and then other peoples attitudes are crucial because if you need peoples help, then you know, if they’re forthcoming and they’re friendly and they’re welcoming, then that’s great. And if they’re not, then you’re going to have a problem. But as I say, I suppose I, I try and avoid that situation just by preparing the trip and making sure that I feel like I can cope with it beforehand. Or by... I, I prefer to go away with some... with people anyway, with friends or family, because I prefer to share travel experience. But if, if I had the opportunity where none of my friends were available or whatever and I had a holiday and I wanted to go somewhere, I’d find that difficult, I suppose, because I can’t get around too easily. Um, but I... I’m lucky because I don’t generally run into that situation, um, and then you really are reliant on other people’s attitude and being helpful.

But again, wherever I’ve been I’ve found generally that people have been very helpful. Um, with friends it’s different because they’re fine. But if you go on a, a tour party somewhere, generally you have a tour manager or somebody that looks after you anyway, it’s their job to. But the local guides are pretty helpful normally, ah, and they’re the ones that know more in a way, so... I think in places I’ve been where they’ve been a bit rough or their walks in the jungle, you know, the Amazon or rainforests or somewhere, you... There’s only so much preparation you can do and I have to, I suppose accept that sometimes maybe I’m not going to be able to do something. But I don’t really think like that and I have quite a positive approach. But I think people respond to that too. If you have a can-do attitude, people do react back to that. And I think people don’t... If you don’t make a fuss, then people just get on with things as well. I think that reflects back. Um, ah, I think... I keep saying it, but I have been lucky with the people that I’ve found on these trips, the guides or whatever. I’m not really cut out for walking in rainforest, but, um, [laughs]... But I’ve never really missed out on anything. And I... We had a guide in the Amazon who carried me some of the time. He didn’t have to do that. Um, but he had the same attitude as me basically; he saw no reason why I should miss out. But I was lucky because he was like that. He didn’t have to and... But I didn’t miss out on anything, because if I was struggling a bit, then he carried me for a bit.

Which is great [laughs] - fantastic. And what...? When you said like sometimes we all come to a point where we need help and over the weeks like, ah, like I talked to a number of people and from, from what I can see now, there are basically two groups... roughly two groups. A bit... a bit of generalisation.

Yeah [laughs].

Forgive me for this one. So one group is the group that says like, okay, I’ve come to a point where I need help, so I ask for it. Um, the other group is the group that would like to be asked, ah, and would not ask themselves.

Yeah.

Um...

Well, ah, when you said that, I sort of... my instinct was very much that if I need help, if I really need help, I’ll ask for it. Um, but having said that, I don’t like asking for help either. So I suppose in a way, you want it to be offered, but that’s asking an awful lot because for somebody to know and
understand. So my family can do that. My sister, I’m very close to my sister and so we go on holiday quite a lot. So she knows me as well as anybody. She... But she also knows how stubborn I am by nature.

VE [Laughs].

IE So she won’t necessarily ask me. It’s just... Sometimes she’ll perhaps just do something. But you have to know me very well to get that right, because it would really annoy me if it was wrong [laughs]. Because I’ll do it myself thank you.

VE [Laughs].

IE So that’s really... But that’s, um... I know that’s unfair on other people, to expect them to understand that. So I kind of feel that if I need help I should ask for it. I shouldn’t... I wouldn’t expect people to know when to offer it. But when people do offer help, I don’t... I kind of don’t like it, because it’s overbearing. Generally I can manage. But I understand that people don’t mean any... people are being nice. People are being kind and helpful when they offer help. So you can’t... you, you can’t be annoyed.

VE Right, right, I see.

IE Does that make sense?

VE Yeah, definitely.

IE I kind of don’t like it, but I appreciate the sentiment.

VE Okay, no, no, no, a very, very good point. And, I’d like to come back... Like I have a number of points that you mentioned. So forgive me if I, I...

IE Yeah, no of course.

VE Jump a little bit forwards and backwards.

IE Um, I just... I suppose just sort of generally tell you that, you know, regards to travel and everything else, but obviously... I mean obviously I am disabled and I can’t get away from it. But I’ve never really thought of myself like that. I was... I went to a normal school... primary and secondary school. Um, I had, um, I’m more mobile now than I was then and I had operations my last couple of years of school, on my legs and all sorts. But even then, I’d never really sort of thought of myself as disabled either. I, I don’t know whether... I guess it was just I sort of blocked it out. Um, but I guess... I think the older I get the more I’m sort of prepared to accept it in a way. Um, and talk about it and be more about it - I am. I never would have said it ten, ten years ago or 20 years, 15 years ago or whatever, I would never have sort of sat there and said; I am disabled. But I am and I guess I accept that a bit more now.

VE You said like you... I, I found this extremely interesting like... You said you probably blocked it out. Is it...? Is it blocking it out or seeing different things that define you?

IE Yeah maybe, yeah, I just... I, I suppose I’ve just always been in that able bodied environment so I’ve sort of been able to pretend that I am able bodied. Um, I guess it’s because I want to be I suppose. But I’m okay with it. I know I can’t pretend and I can’t do anything about it, but... But I don’t... I think when I was younger, I tried... I subconsciously... I probably deliberately didn’t think about it, because I didn’t like it, I guess. So I’m not... all of a sudden I do like it. I’d change it if I could, but I don’t... It’s
really hard to explain, because I don't often sort of talk about it, but I, I... I think I probably did block it out because I wished it wasn't true. Um...

VE So is it in a way, [clears throat] ignoring... like ignoring?

IE Yeah, I guess, yeah. Um, and, and I've found very few situations where it actually matters, as it turned out. Because, because you can get around it, you don't need... There was... there's not that much I can't do. And so it was never really a problem, I guess.

VE And you've been so many destinations.

IE Well yeah, but I, I suppose... I suppose there's lots of things that happen in your life that make you realise that you can do what you want. But again, it's not really conscious. But I suppose as I get older I just sort of realise that, like it or not, I am disabled, I... That's a fact, but I can still get on and do what I want. But I guess there are things that I can't do, I'm more accepting of that. Um, but generally, as a way of life I kind of believe in the expression; where there's a will there's a way and there really is, almost always. If you want to do something, you do it, you can do it. Um, I suppose bring that back to travel, I approach that in the same way. I've always been in this able bodied environment, but never sort of thought of myself... So it's quite new to think about it. Until Caroline mentioned this study, I'd never... I mean I knew that there were companies that obviously offered holidays for disabled people or whatever, but I'd never really thought about it particularly, let alone the social exclusion. Kind of a few conversations here and there with my sister, I'd been away with or something and we'd talked about how their attitude was towards us generally or to me in particular in different places. But, um... but I just wanted to say that as a general thing, that I never sort of thought of myself as excluded, I suppose. So it was an interesting... It's very interesting to think about it and talk about it now.

VE No it is like, um, it's actually interesting for me to listen to your point of view, because I can tell you it's very, very different to what I've heard, um, so far, um, in the last few weeks. So it's, it's really interesting and I just want to come back to some things that you said. Like, um, you said like, you went to a normal school and you just, very much in an able bodied environment, when you said a normal school, like whenever I hear the word normal I... it makes me to think about norms and, um, and in a way how our life is affected by, by norms. And to be perfectly honest with you, I think like everyone's life is, to some extent, affected by norms. Um, just to give you an example, um, for example I teach the first year students, the fresher's and, um, when I give my first lecture, um, I go into the room, there are 70 of them usually and I look at them and they look at me and I can tell you, in this moment I see like, I just don't fulfil their norms with requirements. I, I know it exactly. Well, they look at me and, I guess it has to do with, with expectations as well, because they expect someone to come in to teach who is, who is probably male, above a certain age, um, wearing a suit and a tie and probably having a beard to be honest [laughs].

IE [Laughs], yeah, sounds like a geography teacher, but yeah.

VE [Laughs]. So I know, when I come in I don't match this picture; I don't fulfil the normative requirements. I, I could do the suit and the tie [laughs]. I cannot change and I know I probably do look younger than I actually am, but again, like I can't change or I don't want to change it. I am who I am and this is how I teach and... But I know that for the first weeks, like I have to work this little bit harder to tell them; well look, I can teach as well. Maybe I teach very differently to what you have expected, but I teach... You learn something. Well hopefully [laughs].

IE Yeah, yeah.
So this is just an example how I feel my, my life is in a way affected by, by norms and since you were using the word normal, um, so can I ask you to what extent, well what role do norms play in your life?

Um, I guess pretty much the same as everybody's life. Um, you have a... I suppose when you analyse it, it's a horrible word; norm, because there really is no such thing I suppose, but um, but I, I guess, you know, I go to work everyday, I have a normal job, um, I come home and I'm tired in the evening I don't want to do anything [laughs].

[Laughs].

Visit my friends at the weekend. So I guess my life is very normal, ah, in that sense. And you know, I've got a house and a garden, so I guess everything's very normal in that regard; my routine is normal. Um, but I, I, kind of live the same as everybody else in my peer group, I suppose. My, my friends have similar lives and basically the same sorts of things I guess, so I guess it's normal in that social group, my social group. Um, I guess, I guess in a way that's important to me. Um, I mentioned to you with my garden, I'm lucky that I have my family nearby and I rely on them heavily. Um, but I'm lucky to have them, they're, they're very good to me, but I, I think... I'm just remembering, when I went to university, I had, had my... I had summer surgery. Two years running I had operations on my legs, so when I went to university I was not very mobile, I was on crutches. Um, and I went to Southampton University and when I went to... Sort of applied and went to an interview at Southampton, they, they were fine, but they had a special hall of residents for disabled students and they, when I went down there they arranged for me to see it and showed me around it. And it... I suppose there are lots of moments, but there was a moment where... that was a moment where even though I'd been through those operations and everything, I'd never really thought of myself as disabled, and that was a moment when they sort of said, they offered me a place conditionally on going into this hall of residence.

So this was the condition?

Sorry?

So this was the condition that like...?

Yeah and I was quite shocked by that. You know, it was fine, you know, I'd looked around it, it was a really nice... it was a brilliant place. It... I think there were 20 students in it. It was like a, a house really - a big house and everything was set up very well and it was right on the main campus. Um, so it was very well set up, they had some of the systems... they came in if you needed help I think for some of the more, um, I guess the more wheelchair bound or those that needed more help had some care assistance. But it was a bit of a shock to be put in that bracket, because I've never been in those circles. Not ever being treated differently. Um, I suppose it was similar to what I was saying earlier. They weren't doing it, um, to exclude me, but I did feel... I felt excluded then.

And is it...?

They were doing it to be helpful, because they thought I needed it and it would help, but I was damned sure I didn't need it and I didn't want it.

So is it that they treated you differently that made you feel excluded?

Yeah, I think so, they, they were trying to... I felt like they were trying to exclude me from normal life, to come back to that. I had expected... You know I went to primary school and I expected to go to the secondary school I went to, because it was kind of linked to my primary school. It was the norm, if you passed the exam that's where you went and then I just expected... never really thought about
it, I just expected that I'd go on to university after that, and, and I did. And I just thought I'd do that the same as everybody else and then suddenly they were telling me, ah, no, you're not going to do that the same, because we're going to... we want you to go into this sort of... well, a ghetto is a bit extreme, but we want you to be in this separate area because you're disabled. And that was a bit of a... But I don't need it; why? And I persuaded... I, I talked it through and I persuaded them again that I didn't need it and, and that was fine.

YE Oh right.

IE I went to a normal hall of residence... normal.

YE [Laughs].

IE And still go on holiday with the friends I made there now. You know, but again it was all part of it for me, I've always moved in... Norm; I'm going to keep using the word now, normal circles. So I was on a floor in a block with other people. The only difference was actually, it seemed to be a hall... or a block in the hall where everybody had had a year out, apart from me, because they were all a year older, but I don't know whether they did that on purpose. But in my little corridor I'm still in touch with... Well there were seven of us shared a house in the second year and I'm still in very good contact with all, apart from one of those guys, so...

YE Oh wow.

IE So they put us all together. Somehow they got it really right. They put us all together. Um, so maybe I feel vindicated that I was right, that they were trying to exclude me from that. Maybe if I'd gone down a different path, I'd have had lots of other good friends and lifelong friends and lots of other experiences, but I'm so glad that I pushed back on that and went into that normal hall of residence and had able bodied friends. And I got off my crutches a lot quicker I'm sure, because I was trying to keep up with everybody else. Um, so I think, you know, that's why... I guess that's why normality means something... It means a lot to me I suppose, even in its mundaness [sic] and the boring side of it, it's important for me to just do the same things as everybody else. It sounds a bit lame because you don't want to just follow everybody and be the same as everybody, but in a way that is important, to do the same things.

VE No, that is very, very interesting. Um...

IE It's funny, because I suppose society builds up what is normal and what's expected of us and you're supposed to get a job and have a house and get married and have children and these are all normal things. But that's... I suppose it's kind of what I want to do as well. Um, so it is important and I don't know if that's more important to me, because potentially I could be excluded or not. Because... So it's very rare that I have felt... It's so rare that I can mention those isolated incidents like that, where I've felt any kind of exclusion really.

VE So is it that if someone tries... Well as it was the case, to put you into a certain group...

IE Yeah.

VE To move you to a certain group or to...

IE Yeah, I guess it is exactly that and it's probably the same switch that triggers in my head as when somebody asks me to help and I don't need it. You know, ask me if I want help and I don't need it. I, I guess I react against that because, because I'm [laughs] trying to prove it to myself probably, more than anything else. Because I'm normal.
IE I don’t know if that makes sense. It sort of does to me, but [laughs]...

LE No, no, it definitely makes sense and I, I think I completely understand what you mean. It’s about... I guess it’s about taking a person or individuals and putting them in a group and giving them a particular label and by doing this...

IE Yeah.

LE Like excluding them in a way.

IE Yeah exactly. And not, not maliciously, not in any way... Well, not necessarily maliciously, but it, it does happen like that and I think... I don’t think... In some cases I’m sure that is necessary or helpful, but I don’t think it ever would have been necessary or helpful for me, generally speaking. I didn’t need it [laughs].

LE Right. So then a question comes to my mind, and again, sorry for like, um, changing topics. Um, when you say like, okay, this is how, in a way how social exclusion is created. What do you then think...? Like what do we need to do towards... for moving towards an inclusive tourism industry?

IE Um, I think... oh gosh, in terms of tourism, it’s huge, isn’t it? Because the culture differences are immense across the world. But I think that the important thing is what I mentioned earlier. I mean I, I’m disabled, but I’m not as... anything like as disabled as some people. I’m, I’m not as mobile as, as you or somebody else, but I’m a lot more mobile than a lot of people. So it’s a question of degrees, isn’t it? But, um, I think, generally people can do what they want to do. Um, physical disability doesn’t necessarily have to be a barrier, but that’s not... So you have to be a little realistic and of course sometimes it is. Sometimes there’s no way around it. Um, I’m not wheelchair bound, but when I have my wheelchair and when I’m in it, you see a very different view on the world and a different image of... you know, from visiting a, a place, a stately home or something here, I can get out of my chair and walk up a set of stairs. Um, I can carry my own chair up a set of stairs if! have to or, or generally there’s somebody kind enough to do it for me, but...

Um, you know, if you can’t get out of a chair and there’s an old building, then you’re not going to be able to necessarily have the freedom of that building. You’re not going to... So there are barriers. It’s not realistic to say you can do anything you want. But I think if you have an attitude that, ah, you don’t look for obstacles; you look for ways around them. Most of the time you can find that, ah, and I think... I suppose that applies to the travel industry too, but most of that comes from the individuals. The, the traveller. You... Whether that’s disability or whether it’s anything. You don’t go to a country and another part of the world where the culture is different and expect to have the same view on society as you do here. So you have to expect things to be different. Um, I suppose the attitudes to disability are different too, so you have to appreciate that that might be different too. But I mean, I’ve never run into problems with that. Ah...

LE And again, this I find very, very interesting, because if I understand you correctly you say that, I’ll always have inclusion, um, but the initiative has to come from the traveller.

IE Yeah, I think so, yeah. I, I think it does, yeah. I think obviously people that work in the industry have to react to that. But I think that goes back to what I mentioned earlier about... I think a lot of the reason why I’ve not had too many problems is partly that I’ve been fortunate and partly because, as I said earlier, I think if you have the right attitude, it kind of reflects back off people. People... If you approach something in the right way, then they tend to react similarly. I think if you don’t see an obstacle, then
they won't necessarily see it either, they'll just help you to achieve what you want to do. So I think in that sense, it does come from the traveller. But obviously in an industry like tourism you're heavily reliant on people that are organising trips and facilitating that trip to wherever for you. So that, that's where it gets much harder because understanding peoples needs is so difficult and everybody's needs are different and everybody reacts differently. As I explained to you, how I would perhaps react to being offered help, um, other people might now. I think, as you said, other people want to be offered help. So for the people working in the industry I, I mean it's extremely difficult to gauge. But what they can do is help put an infrastructure in place whereby people can maximise whatever... you know, get the most out of something. They can achieve the most possible in their circumstance. So... So I think you have to have a touch of realism. I, I'm never going... I will never go trekking to the South Pole, you know. I'm not... That's not going to happen. I might like to...

VE [Laughs].

IE But it's not going to happen and [laughs] how ever wonderful the people I met along the way, it was... It's not going to happen, is it? So it's a silly example, but you know, you have to... you have to understand that sometimes not... Nothings going to... Something isn't going to work out. But I will say I've been on trips before where I've been pretty satisfied before I've gone, that I'm going to be able to manage things and some trips I've gone on, I've really not been sure if I'm going to be able to do some things. Um, but in that circumstance, I would much rather take the attitude; if there's a particular place I want to visit, I would rather go there and see some of it than none of it. So... And as I say, I've been fortunate because I haven't had to miss out on very much, but I would... I think that's just a question of attitude.

VE Right.

IE If I want to visit somewhere I will and if I can't do something, then I'll cross that bridge when I come to it. If I really can't, then so be it. I will get to see something that I wouldn't have done otherwise.

VE Yeah, and yeah, well try to see most, most of it.

IE Yeah exactly and generally I do and that's great so.

VE And like what do you...? What is your view with regards to going to enforcement of laws or legal Acts in order to change infrastructure, change attitudes?

IE Um, I don't know... I don't know if you can change attitudes logistically. Um, well I guess you can, but it's probably a very, very slow process over generations, but, um, in, in terms of sort of, purely of infrastructure, I think that can be important. I think... You know I'm not well versed on the laws, but I know that, ah... But I used the example earlier of visiting a house or a stately home; in this country, generally access is very good. And I don't know... I don't know if it was a result of a law or what, but I know that places have to be accessible wherever possible. Um, so I think that's important, I think where that's possible, then that's a good thing. Um, I can't see any... I can't see any bad side to legislation on that sort of level.

VE Right.

IE Um, not [laughs] explaining that very well, but you know if you put ramps in and lifts in wherever possible, accepting that it simply can't be done in some locations, then I think that's reasonable. I think you can do that in a country like this, but I don't think you can do that in some less developed countries.

VE Right.
IE Or it’s a lot harder to do.

VE Yeah, no I see your point, I see your point. So you think like... if I understood you correctly like, okay legal Acts are, are good, but maybe they are just one part of the story?

IE Yeah, absolutely yeah.

VE There’s nothing negative that we can say about legal Acts, but like there’s... that’s just one element of a whole...

IE Yeah, I think so, I mean I guess... I suppose you can go into all sorts of levels. There was, um... I’m not very well up on the law here, but I do remember, years and years ago, um, I, tried to... I can’t remember if I tried or if I was. I was registered disabled in this country. Um, or maybe I never was and I thought I probably ought to be for some reason or whatever. And I found out then that although that had been the case in the past, the anti-discrimination laws that were passed whenever, ten years ago or whatever, meant that you were no longer registered disabled. Ah, and when I sort of thought about it, I didn’t really know what benefit of going on a register was anyway. [Laughs], but I could not really understand why that had happened and then I found out more about it and a realised that the anti-discrimination laws had come in and that meant that whilst it was good in that it was outlawing discrimination, trying to change attitudes in a sense, um, but it also meant that you weren’t able to benefit in a sense, from, from that... Well, not benefit, but maybe in some circumstances it was useful to be pigeonholed or bracketed in a certain way.

Um, and then if that’s broken down, although the intention was good, then you, you maybe lose some benefit in a sense too. Ah, again I haven’t explained that very well, but it’s similar to, um, in France they... [Unclear] there, they have very strong antidiscrimination laws in that they basically didn’t differentiate between anybody. Um, consequently there was no protection for the immigrant population. So you still see it. Now there’s a lot of, ah... I’m not picking on France, because the same happens everywhere, but you have a lot of issues with North African immigrants and suburbs in Paris where their wages are very low and because there’s no protection, because there is no law, because there is perceived to be no discrimination, they have no level of protection from it either. So, I suppose [laughs] there is a benefit in legislation. You know, I suppose you can argue everything both ways, can’t you; but...

VE Yeah, but you think like... Well, if I got you correctly, like it’s still important to have it, but it’s not...

IE It’s not the be all and end all, certainly no. I think it’s a step that in some circumstances can be very helpful. Um, but it’s, it’s peoples attitudes I suppose, but it’s education, it’s not, it’s not about... it’s not just about attitudes either. I think generally speaking, with, again it’s such a broad generalisation, but with disability, I guess the discrimination you would get it largely sympathetic. Race discrimination can be more aggressive or potentially more aggressive. I’m sure it can be in the case of disability too, but as a very broad generalisation I’m kind of guessing that the discrimination would be manifested in... When you’re talking discrimination, so racially you can get all sorts of nasty problems and people being attacked or whatever and disability, probably people sympathise with that situation. They don’t... it probably does happen, but generally you wouldn’t hate somebody for being disabled. Whereas you might because of the colour of their skin.

VE Yeah, I see, that’s an interesting point that you raise.

IE Um, but, ah, I don’t know what I was going to say [laughs].

VE [Laughs] I think you came from education and then you were...
IE Yeah, yeah, so that's with disability it's more... Well education is key to it all, but it's more people don't understand the world as seen through the eyes of somebody disabled. I kind of, often sort of think that it would really help if every able bodied person... another bad term, but if every able bodied person had to spend a week wheelchair bound, then the world would change overnight. And that's not a criticism of any able bodied person, because there is no reason why somebody should. Think about it. And why would you? You take it for granted if you can walk to the shops. You just... you know I... I'm fortunate because I can walk, but I can't walk that far, so I do appreciate the mobility I've got. But I can totally understand why somebody wouldn't give it a thought, because 98% of the population or whatever, can walk fine, so why would you actually think about it? Why would you then think about the fact that when you're permanently at that level you can't reach for something from the shelves? You can't see anything around you, that you can't go somewhere if there's a curb. You just... Why would you think about that?

So education is massively important. To bring up... That's your question about the travel industry. That's where... that's where the industry needs to try and help and understand that side of, what's needed for disabled travellers and on an, you know, an infrastructure level if you like and understanding their view point and... But again, it's such a broad generalisation, because every individual, every disabled person is different and sees the world differently, their disability affects them differently. Um, my disability is actually quite easy for people to understand, if I explain it. People don't understand it because they don't generally see it. Um, I think if at work for example, if they just suddenly they would see me in my wheelchair, they're a bit surprised because they don't think of me like that, because I'm not wheelchair bound, so... Um, ah, I've forgotten, forgotten what I'm saying with that again too. I was trying to make a point there. Um...

VE So you were... Well you were coming from awareness and, um, basically teaching, um, people in industry like about, different needs and understanding.

IE Yeah, yeah so I guess, yeah I was going to say, my situation is easy to understand because it's... you can liken it to an elderly person. So somebody who's getting older or a bit infirm, they can't walk so far. So, so when I'm trying to talk to somebody about a holiday, it, it's quite easy for me to explain to somebody over the phone or whatever about... I'm interested in doing this trip, but, um, I can't walk that far or whatever. So it's kind of a bit like an elderly person and my, my, I'm not that dexterous, so again it's a bit like I'm getting older, I've got a bit of arthritis, I can't open jars so easily or whatever, so, so that, for my disability is easy enough to understand if I explain it to people. But everybody's disability is different. Um, just because I'm disabled doesn't mean I understand the needs of the next disabled person or somebody that's in a wheelchair or somebody that's... Ah, I mean in some ways it's, it's not easy... that's certainly the wrong word, but having said that, in some ways it's easy to explain my disability, in some ways it's very hard. Because I'm a big football fan, so I go to football a lot, but I've had... I'm a Chelsea fan. I've had endless discussions... gave up years ago, but with the club, um, because I find it difficult to get to the games. Um, but they, they are very black and white in that they see, if you're disabled you're in a wheelchair and if you're not in a wheelchair, you're not disabled, so they can't seem to understand the fact that I can't walk very far. Even though I think it's an easy concept. It's just like somebody that's getting old.

VE Yeah, yeah, no.

IE Um, but a lot of infrastructure is put in place for disabled people, assuming that they are wheelchair users, so actually, if, if... when I'm in my chair, in some senses I'm more mobile, because I can travel a lot further if I've got somebody pushing me. Um, I can park two miles away from where I need to go if there's somebody to push me. But if I have to walk I can't, I can't do that. So, everything I say is contradicting myself just because you, you can't generalise I suppose.
VE Yeah, well yeah, this I completely agree, I completely agree. And it’s interesting what you said, because like I, I talked to, I think last week I talked to someone who’s blind and the person told me, well you need to understand, I’m blind, but I’m not disabled. I, I... You get to hear all these different views and everyone perceives their needs as very different and in a way every... Needs are unique to an individual, to a person.

IE Yeah it is and every individual I’m sure is as hypocritical as I am, because just think of another example; when I’m on a tube train, um, nobody will give me a seat and it can sometimes be quite evident I’m struggling a bit. Um, but in this country, it... Because I go... I’ve have a season ticket to Chelsea, so I go probably 25, 30 times a year and probably once a season somebody will offer me a seat on a train which is pretty awful I think. But that’s coming from somebody who just said earlier that I don’t like admitting that I’m disabled and I need help. And yet, I won’t ask for a seat. I guess, maybe if I was really desperate, I guess maybe if I was really desperate. But I can be in quite a lot... Because I’m so stubborn, I’ll be in a lot of pain or something before I’ll get to that.

VE [Laughs].

IE But I feel it should be obvious to somebody at that point, that I’m struggling and I don’t know if it isn’t obvious or if people just don’t care or don’t think. But I, I find that a bit annoying.

VE Right. No, it’s interesting, it’s very, very interesting...

IE But then, yeah, yeah, there’s a... In our team at work there’s a blind guy who’s, um, he’s actually based in London, so I don’t know him very well, but I’ve spoken to him a little bit, because I’ve got... I’ve got no idea what it means to be blind. Um, and it’s a totally different type of disability and again, having just said people think that disabled people in wheelchairs, but I tend to think... I suppose if you ask me, off the top of my head, I would say disability was mobility, because that’s my issue, I suppose. Um, but he’s perfectly mobile, he’s just... But he’s... he’s disabled too you know, in a completely different way. But there’s such a different range of disabilities so it’s, it’s a vast area.

VE And I think like, when we look at all the different types of disabilities or restrictions, um, people have, I mean, like including like visual restrictions, like if you take my glasses [laughs], I’m absolutely lost here. So please, I need to keep my glasses [laughs].

MA But that, I mean that... That is a form of disability. It’s not... it’s not inhibiting you hopefully most of the time, but you’ll find there are times when it does.

VE Yeah, no definitely. So when we look at all the different types of disabilities, um, I think we also see that we have the same amount of organisations, of these 30 organisations. Now we have, apart from charities, access groups, access forums, um, we now have like dedicated tour operators, dedicated travel agencies.

IE Yeah.

VE And I was just wondering what your view is on this, because I talked to someone and it was... I think it was a lady and she said; well she often felt excluded on holiday due to different reasons and then she decided, well like I’m not doing this anymore. So therefore she now decided, well just to book with a specialist tour operator. Um, because she says, well there are people with the same or not the same, but with similar needs. So she feels far more included and I... So I was just wondering what...?

IE I think... I think that’s invaluable. I think that’s, that’s another example of how everybody is different, because it... For her obviously that’s fantastic and that means that she can get to do things that she might not otherwise have done. Um, which is brilliant. Um, I wouldn’t want to if I could avoid it. But in the same way as I said earlier, I’d rather do something than nothing if, if I was in that situation
where I felt I needed that and if I wanted to visit a particular place and that was the best... I was going to get the best out of it by doing that, then, then that, that would be brilliant. I think it’s hugely important that there are companies or organisations that do that. Um, I’ve kind of looked at them, but it, it, I... And I’m not just being stubborn now, but I don’t think... I don’t think I do need that sort of thing, because... Well, I never have yet. Um, but I’ve kind of had... The other day I just briefly had a look at... I can’t remember where I got it from, but it was only a two minute glance, but just out of interest, a couple of websites and I didn’t really look properly at all, because I didn’t have long, but I, I think it was in a magazine I get, a Lifestyle magazine. Um, and just out of curiosity I wanted to go and see what sort of things they were offering, but I didn’t really look. But I think it’s a really good thing that there are... I think, companies that provide that kind of help are fantastic, because as I say, everybody’s different. In some ways, I would feel excluded by being bracketed in that, practically. But, you... by the same token you can be excluded if you’re not included in that category, so... I didn’t feel it was right to be included in that disabled hall of residence. But, if somebody isn’t happy or comfortable holidaying and needs that extra help and feels that they are included by doing that, then I think that’s fantastic.

VE So again we’re coming back to different people with different needs.

IE Yeah, but I think that... I think that is very important. That sort of company I think is great. I think disabled people should not be excluded from holidays abroad or more adventurous holidays or whether it’s sort of young disabled children being taken on outward bound trips in Wales or whether it’s just that you’ve always had an ambition to go on safari. But just because you’re disabled, why shouldn’t you be able to do that? Um, there’s no reason why you shouldn’t, but it’s that much harder, the more disabled you are and the more help you do need. You know if you... if you’re wheelchair bound, there’s no use to just booking a trip and turning up, because they’re going to look at you and say; well, we can’t accommodate you.

VE Yeah, yeah, yeah.

IE Then you’re going to need specialist companies where they provide jeeps that are accessible and all the rest of it. And fantastic, I think that’s absolutely fantastic. Um, you know, I think that’s very important.

VE No, I was just wondering what do you say, because again like you hear so many different, um, things, um, or perspectives. So for example, there’s, there’s this change, um, which is called Vision Hotels, which is...

IE Called?

VE Vision Hotels, um, which is a chain, um, well dedicated to people who are blind. But like I talked to the Director and he told me, well they have difficulties in terms of full occupancy. So they’ve opened it up to everyone, like everyone would like to come are like welcome to stay at the Vision Hotels. And by talking to, to blind people, I realise that some do welcome this idea, because they say like, well it’s great, we want to mix and mingle in a way. And it’s great, it’s great for a... I’ll say this word now, able bodied to, to see how we are, but we are not kind of in a ghetto by just being among blind people. So it’s great, but then you have the other ones who say, like I don’t know, like don’t open it to the mainstream, don’t, don’t let able bodied in here [laughs], um, because we’re afraid that this will decrease the service offering for us. So like it’s just you get to know so many things and perspectives.

IE Yeah, yeah, being consistent and understanding both sides. Yeah and they’re both valid so I don’t think you can say one point of view is right or wrong, but I guess it’s important that both situations happen, so that whatever suits you best is available to you. If, if you want one thing, hopefully you can get it and if you want the other, then hopefully you can get that too, somewhere else. And what... you know, what’s right for one person isn’t right for another necessarily. So, that’s... Again it all comes down
to education, but it's not just a question of education, because education implies that it's something that can be taught. But it's not... it's perhaps, it's perhaps just more, more a concept of understanding and tolerance, as opposed to... Not so much tolerance, but just trying to understand and making, making an effort, but you're never going to get it right for everybody, are you; all of the time. But that doesn't mean you don't try, but...

VE No, I see what you mean.

IE I mean the travel industry... As I enjoy travel and have travelled a lot, so in fact we were talking in the car about why... I said that you sort of work in a travel related industry and I took a look at myself and I don't know why I'm doing what I'm doing when I don't enjoy it and I... whenever I'm having my moments of; I need to change career, I can't do this anymore, I've never known what I want to do, but whenever I have those times when I'm thinking about it, I look at travel. And I, I don't know what I want to do, but I've thought about... I've thought about whether there would be job opportunities in travel whereby I could use my experience as a disabled traveller, um, in some kind of environment. I don't know how, I've never got that far with it, but, um, but even then, when you think about it, you know, I, I have my own experiences which may be similar to lots of other people, but they're going to be so different to so many other people. So, it's, it's such a... I mean it must daunt you doing this study, because it's such a wild field.

VE [Laughs]. Like yeah, it is, as you said, it's absolute wide, um, but absolutely fascinating and you're obviously right, there are... like everyone... like each individual has, has so different needs and it's just very...

IE And it's not... it's not about being right or wrong, it's different needs, but different needs and different attitudes. People want different things.

VE See I think the attitudes you mentioned at the beginning when we talked, um, about social exclusion, you said was... is very much related to attitudes, um, as well as the physical infrastructure for some obviously. Um, when we now think about, well how to, to overcome exclusion and to keep thinking about tourism as well, and often we highlight tourism as, you know, the great thing in the world, like.

IE Yeah, yeah, yeah, well [laughs].

VE Um, what it can give us, um, the experience it delivers, the employment opportunities and income generated and so many arrivals and, so to continue on this positive note, so do you think [Joshua], that tourism as such can in a way help to reduce exclusion? Can tourism be a sort of pioneer towards an inclusive society?

IE Um, I think...

VE I know it's a tricky, but this is my last tricky question I have [laughs]...

IE Yeah, it's a difficult question. I think it... I think it can, yeah, because I think it can open up opportunity to people that may not otherwise have that opportunity. So again there are lots of levels to it, but purely in terms of enabling a disabled person to do something or go somewhere that they may not have been able to do, I think is, is healthy if they want to go there. But, um, but that's because I'm, I'm a fan of travel. I enjoy travel, I love experiencing different cultures and seeing different places and different... I mean aesthetically and socially, I think it's fascinating and I think it's important. I think it... The old cliché that travel broadens the mind, but I do, I really do think it does. I think the more you see of the world, the more... the wider your understanding. You just learn and it doesn't necessarily make you a better or a cleverer person, but you, you never stop learning and the more you see, the more
different things you see and I think that is a good thing. I think that’s a positive thing. And so therefore I think it’s important that disabled people are able to do that too, to exclude them from that aspect of life is, is... well it’s wrong if it’s not... if it doesn’t have to be that way and it doesn’t have to be that way. You know, these days, you know there are ways around most things, infrastructure is there, there is so much that can be done. Um, that can give people the opportunity to do things that they couldn’t before and when those things are positive experiences, and I think travel is generally a positive experience, maybe not always enjoyable, but hopefully it is and the bad things that happen as well as the good things when you’re abroad, I think, I think it is all positive.

VE So how...? Like when we think about travelling, and as you said like it broadens your horizon and it’s a, it’s a constant learning process, do you think if people with let’s say mobility restriction, once they travel are then also more adventurous in their everyday life?

IE Um...

VE Or does it go the other way around?

IE Yeah, you can probably cut it both ways, couldn’t you [laughs]?

VE [Laughs] so we’re coming back to...

IE Yeah, I don’t think necessarily that, that happens. It might do because it might reflect a certain personality type, the fact that if you’re a certain type of person that is more likely to go off and travel to far-flung places then maybe you are the sort of person that is more likely to be adventurous in your everyday life too. Or it might be that you satisfy that need for adventure or excitement and can quite happily live a very mundane life the rest of the time. I, I don’t think there’s a... I don’t think there’s a yes or no answer to that either [laugh]. I haven’t given you a straight answer all night [laughs].

VE [Laughs], no, no, no you... I think there have been some, there have been some [laughs].

IE Um, but I think it is important in that respect, because I think in, in terms of changing attitudes or breaking down barriers or changing attitudes to social exclusion as a whole, I... I mean I think that’s a massive topic, I don’t think tourism can do that on its own, however huge tourism is. But it’s certainly an important part and I think... I think it must affect somebody’s attitude if you see somebody that you may have subconsciously or not given a lot of thought to, but you see as restricted and limited and then suddenly you see that they’ve travelled all over the world or they’ve done whatever they wanted to do, then... And surely even if you don’t give it a great amount of thought, you’re going to realise that that person is capable of doing things that you probably didn’t think that they could do. Um, and that’s important, but again it’s important in changing people’s attitudes in the way they see people and the way they perceive people. Um...

VE It’s absolutely fascinating, because like what you just said, like links into what someone else has said and, um, this person said, ah, well it’s education by being around.

IE Yeah, yeah it is.

VE Ah...

IE But ah, I mean that’s important on different levels too. I... When I graduated, I applied for a flying scholarship for disabled people. There was a scheme that still exists today, um, it was a charity... I think it was a charity... Well it is a charity, but it was in association with the RAF Benevolent Fund. And at the time when I did it, I think there were nine scholarships a year they gave out and King Hussein of Jordan, before he died unfortunately, funded nine... funded seven or eight of those scholarships, and, and
they had funding for the others. And what those scholarships did was send those people... At that time they sent you to America and gave you flying training. Um, so you did ground school and, um, flying... 40 hours of flying with them. Um, and I, I got one of those... I was lucky enough to get one of those scholarships. So I went to the states, um, for two months and did that. Um, I actually stayed on a couple of weeks extra myself and got my pilots licence out there.

VE Oh wow, uh-huh.

IE But, but that’s... It’s the same... The reason I mentioned that is because it was the same principle, it’s the same thing in that the idea behind those scholarships were essentially to... ah, I think the motivation that they sort of said at the time was that it was to give people a kick-start. So a lot of the people that got them... there, there were three of us that went off together on mine. One of the guys had been an engineer in the air force and, um, was working on tornados and an air break came down on his back and broke his back, um, and he was paralysed. So he, he was a very typical example of somebody whose life had been changed massively. Um, the aviation theme happened to be there, because he’s worked in the air force anyway. But the point was that through the scholarship, it showed what you could do and gave you a kick-start again to, to your life to appreciate that that catastrophic event in your life hadn’t ended your life. And I, I think in a very general context, that was the idea of the scholarships, and I never... I kind of never felt that I really should have had one. I never [laughs]... I just sort of took it without ever feeling I deserved it. But maybe looking back, they knew what they were doing because I mean, I had that privileged upbringing and education and all the rest of it, but I think that’s the one thing I’ve done in life that I think back to now and makes me realise what you can do. Um, it was hard work. I’ve never worked as hard and never will again.

VE [Laughs].

IE And it was [laughs]... It was all the stuff that academically I was bad at. And so I had to learn, you know, the maths, the physical geography, you have to understand the weather patterns, you have to understand the mechanics, you have to know how your plane works, you have to understand how it flies. You have to understand how the engine works, in case it fails when you’re in the air. All of this sort of stuff that... You know, I’ve never known how my car works, I’ve no idea - I’m not that way inclined and I had to work so hard to understand that, but I did it. And I got a pilots licence and I flew a plane of my own. But it’s the single thing that is a sense of achievement, but I suppose... I mean it’s a hell of an achievement, whoever you are, but maybe it’s more important if you’re disabled, maybe it’s not. But it’s a thing that I think back now and whenever I’m not sure about something, I can do whatever I want within reason, it made me realise what you can do. And I think where I’m just coming from on that is, the point is the same. If, if people see what you’re capable of, then it changes people’s attitudes, doesn’t it? And that’s for the individual themselves as well as the people looking on the outside.

It... The disabled person; it’s important for them to understand what they can and can’t do. Ah, and to understand that they needn’t be limited or not perhaps as limited as they think they might be and tourism is a relatively easy way of doing that. Because there are such huge opportunities to visit so many wonderful places. And as [unclear], I said earlier, is a brilliant example because... Okay, don’t let me generalise, because there’s all sorts of disabilities, different... but it’s relatively easy if you can adapted vehicles, you don’t need to be mobile, because you’re not on foot anyway, you do Jeep safaris. You can visit the Amazon because there are ways around. You can’t go trekking through the jungle, but you can go up and down the river on canoes or maybe even adapted boats if need be. But there’s so much that can be done, that people can do that they probably don’t realise they can. Um, but that’s themselves as well as other people seeing what people are capable of doing. You’ll see it on television where you see a documentary or a programme about somebody disabled doing something and people saying how remarkable that is and fantastic. And maybe it is, but it’s, it takes something like that for people to realise what people can do. But again everybody’s different because some able bodied people are more adventurous than others.
VE Yeah definitely.

IE Lot’s of people could do something adventurous, but don’t. And so... But it’s important to realise what you could do if you wanted to. Don’t have to do it, but to know that you’re not necessarily restricted or limited or excluded I suppose, to come back to the point of study, isn’t it?

VE Right, but I think you’ve summarised it very, very nicely, um, like, um, and I’m glad I have it on, on the tape recorder, because I can’t write that quickly...

IE I’m sorry.

VE But, um... No I found it was very, very interesting, especially like, um, we talked about the achievements and then people see what you do and then this changes people’s attitude. So it’s a kind of a loop that, that we have and...

IE Yeah, but you have, I don’t want to say different levels, but you have different... We’ve talked about attitudes a lot, but attitudes is different across different cultures too. So the attitude of us here in Britain or Western Europe is so different to the attitude of people in India or Africa or... I’ve glimpsed that when I travel, but again never in a really negative way, but social perceptions are different. Um, in India, I think people are surprised when they see a disabled person travelling because they assume if you’re white, you’re wealthy and all the rest of it, but that doesn’t sit with their perception of somebody disabled, so I think they find me a curiosity, somewhere like that. Um, because they don’t... I don’t fit with their understanding of the way the world works. They don’t understand how I clearly am disabled, yet I must be successful and wealthy because that’s how they perceive white people visiting their country. So there’s... You know, sometimes we’ll go somewhere like that and... India’s a good example because people stare a lot in India. People don’t stare here and sometimes, in a way, I wish they would because you know that people see you as different, but there’s that veneer of being polite that means you can’t really tell what people are thinking.

VE [Laughs].

IE But in India people stare; adults, not just children. And that’s almost refreshing, because there’s nothing malicious to it, they’re just seeing something different and they’re looking at it. But it’s much more open, the way they manifest that.

VE But it’s interesting what you’re saying because like I’m... You say like, well you’re finding it almost refreshing.

IE Yeah, kind of.

VE When...? While being in India?

IE Yeah.

VE Um, and I had some people, um, that I interviewed here in the UK and they said, for them social exclusion is when people stare at them, like, well, like kind of the notion of the onlookers. Like we’re being a kind of subject for the gaze of others and they said, well this is exclusion for us.

IE I... Well I guess in a... It is exclusion in a way, but that’s not exclusion in the way I kind of think of exclusion. I see exclusion as in being prohibited from doing something or sectors of society or something with people that look or stare or... I sometimes find that uncomfortable, but I don’t... not particularly excluding for me. I don’t like it, although I don’t, ah, say... I don’t mind as much in India.
I've been... You, you get it all over the place, don't you. In, in India they find me fascinating, for the reasons I explained and I've literally been sitting down... I've felt something on my head and turned around and there's somebody trying to take hair out of your head.

VE [Laughs].

IE [Laughs], well why are you doing that? But I kind of don't mind that. Yet in... Well I went to Korea with a friend of mine who taught out there for a little while and he's 6 Ft 6, so we make a slightly odd pair when we're out together. But they found him much more interesting than me there. Um, they would just say... The people would stare at him and they would... It's just genuine. They would be open mouthed; you're so tall. They couldn't understand how tall this man was. They didn't notice me. You know, that's weird because elsewhere people perhaps will look at me because they can see my hands or my legs or whatever. But we don't think of somebody 6 Ft 6... I mean it's very tall, but it's not ridiculous in this country. You'd never stare at somebody being 6 Ft 6 in this country. But that's in a... When that's... It's sort of a mine field, isn't it? When that's... When that attitude is skin colour, it's somehow very awkward and there's that whole connotation of racism, but in other contexts I find it quite amusing or quite refreshing or... I don't mind it at all. In France; um, this time in France I remember going... I was going to the loo somewhere I visited, um, in the North of France and there were school trips there and I don't know, ten, 11 year old French schoolboys. Ten, 11 year old schoolboys anywhere are not good, but...

VE [laughs].

IE But I know when I was in the loo washing my hands, a couple of these boys were just staring and pointing and giggling and they were being very... they weren't being subtle or whatever and I found that very rude. And I speak French. Um, so I let them carry on for a while and then I turned around and I said something to him in French and they were a bit surprised, because they knew I was English and didn't realise I understood what they'd been saying. But, I didn't... I really didn't like that. Um, so strangely I was made... I didn't really feel excluded by it, but it's almost... It's just not very pleasant. Your being pointed at and being giggled about and... They don't really understand. Kids will pick on another kid at school and it can be quite cruel without really realising it. And I don't think they probably really meant offence or harm. But I found that much more offensive and impolite than people in India, when you're looking at something and you could turn around and you realise that there's a guy next to you who's having his photo taken with you in the photo or... I, I can't... It's no different. But it's... That's about perception too.

VE Yeah, yeah.

IE My perception is that I don't mind it in some context and in other contexts it makes me feel very uncomfortable and, and if that were to happen in this country, I would feel very uncomfortable with it. Sorry, you were trying to wind up, but there are so many different things...

VE So, so many interesting points [Joshua]. I just realised I took far more time...

IE I'm sorry [laughs].

VE Off you than I, I originally said. So I, I...
Appendix E: Example of Reflective Journal Entry

01/07/2010

This is my ninth interview. So far, I have interviewed seven individuals with a mobility restriction and two people that are blind. I always thought that the interviews would represent a learning process but what I do learn/ get to know goes far beyond my initial expectations. Sometime I struggle to find the balance (I realise that 'balance' is not the right word, but cannot find a better word at the moment) between asking more questions because it fascinates me, questions about how individuals manage their lives and moving back to the actual topics as set by my research questions, while at the same time understanding that the research focus can always change in qualitative investigations.

I always get new insights although some topics such as 'physical access' are recurring themes. But the surrounding stories/ experiences/ perspectives are not. Today my interview participant was talking about viewing norms in a positive light to be used as weapons. An interesting perspective! ‘Interesting’ – I am not sure how many times, I have used this word during my interviews and this keeps reminding me that I should have a look at some synonyms.

Coming back to the positive notion related to norms. I feel, it is about showing the world that he is a good businessman, a man understanding what he is doing with visions and constantly new ideas – and he certainly is all this.

The experience today reminded me of my participant yesterday, where she said that she does not feel excluded because she has a PhD. Oh – how I can understand this in a reverse way of expressing it... While today, I heard about personal experiences of social exclusion when compared to the interview yesterday, I feel that these two individuals can be compared due to their determination and strength. When I listened to their stories, I saw so much of the transformation elements I read so much about in the literature. While differences between these two individuals clearly exist, they are both an example of disconfirmation. I can’t remember right now who wrote about disconfirmation as quality criteria for qualitative research, but I guess
it is not important at the moment. Disconfirmation occurred as I initially believed that people with low to moderate impairments will show transformation aspects to a much greater extent than people with more severe limitations. And here I am, sitting on the train to go home and had two interviews in a row with people who are severely restricted in their mobility and representing transformative identity positioning as a naturally given element of their lives. This, despite all the obstacles that I see and have encountered with them.

Taking today as an example: I arrive and [J] proposes to go to the pub close to his office and sit outside. I am thinking about the windy condition that we had today and how it affects the recording but quickly, I push these thoughts away and we are about to leave the office. I go in front, hearing the motorised wheelchair behind me. We are moving through the corridors of the building until we reach the exit door that is accessible. We turn left – there is a path with pebbles on the right and left edge of the path. Now [J] is at the front. His wheelchair just fits onto the path. Then, very suddenly, I don’t know how it happened, the left front and back wheels are on the stones. Stuck! [J] is able to move forwards again and we both hope that in 2 meters he is able to get the wheelchair back to the asphalt area. But no chance, wheels turn and turn and he ends up with one wheel pointing opposite to the driving direction. I offer to push but he says that this is not possible. His employee comes out. The electric wheelchair does not move at all anymore. Power cut! We all don’t know. The employee gets some guys who are able to lift the wheelchair back to the path. Change to manual mode and one of the guys is pushing [J] back in. Back in the office the wheelchair is not responding anymore – despite an attempt to recharging it. [J] seems relaxed. He just said ‘than we have to stay here’ and it is not a problem because at 6pm his carer comes who has some idea about the wheelchair. And if not, the ‘wheelchair guys’ will fix it another time. I look at my watch: it is just passed 1pm.

Our trip to the pub was ‘short-cut’, not even having left the office premises. While I felt slightly distressed, particularly since [J] said before leaving ‘this is a bit of adventure’ as he has never left the building with this wheelchair, the atmosphere was great. Maybe it was just a ‘normal’ experience for [J]?
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Please see separate document containing the risk assessment for conducting the interviews with participants. The risk assessment contains information with regards to potential hazards and risks, outlines who can be harmed and how and provides an evaluation with measures on how to minimise or control risks.

14) What are the potential adverse effects, risks or hazards for (a) research participants? (b) researchers?

There should be no adverse effects on either the research participants or the researcher. However, it is recognised that questions about participants’ impairments could be deemed to be of a sensitive nature. Therefore, these questions will be kept to a minimum. Participants will be asked to identify their age bracket and whether they consider themselves to either have restricted mobility or restricted sight. Most questions refer to perceptions and experiences of social exclusion as well as reactions to potential situations where
participants felt socially excluded. Further, questions seek to identify possible ways how to overcome exclusionary practices.

Given that most studies conducted until now neglect to listen to and incorporate the voice of those individuals, who are deemed to be excluded, the approach taken by this study could have potential emancipatory effects, as individuals with impairments are given the opportunity to inform the researcher about their individual opinions and views.

In order to ensure that questions are not of an offensive nature, a pilot study will be conducted after having received ethical approval. The pilot study will be conducted with participants following the criteria mentioned above, e.g. age bracket (18-70) and mobility or visual impairment. This allows for reframing the questions asked and ensures that questions are non-intimidating.

Please see separate document containing the risk assessment for conducting the interviews with the participants. After having conducted the risk assessment and outlining measures to minimise them, there should not be any type of intimidation or power differentials between either party.

15) What are the potential benefits for research participants?

There are no material benefits to participants.

16) Please provide details of arrangements for the collection, retention, use and disposal of research data:

Collection:
All interviews will be collected via one-to-one interviews. These will either take place in a public area or at the participant's home. A friend or family member of the participant may be present if the participant wishes this presence. However, this companion will not be interviewed. Each interview will start by explaining the purpose of the questions, including who is doing the research as well as outlining the study's main aim and rationale. The participant will be informed that he/she can withdraw at any stage during the interview and that all information remains confidential. Together with the consent form, permission will be sought at the start of each interview to audio record the proceedings using a digital tape recorder. As participants have been already informed about the use of a tape recorder in the recruitment information (see 9), this allows for obtaining a re-confirmation. If permission is refused, the interview will be terminated. A transcript of the interview will be sent to the participant. Each participant will be advised that by not responding it, it will be assumed that they agree to the transcript.

Retention:
The digital file for each interview will be stored on a password-protected PC with a back-up stored on a second password-protected PC, both owned by the researcher.

Use:
Each interview will be numbered and interview numbers rather than participants' names will be used to identify each interview and digital file. Hence, participants' names will remain confidential and anonymity is preserved.

The collected data will be analysed, employing a combination of three types of analysis:
(1) First, analysing the content, using content analysis techniques, leads to an understanding of the meaning and perceptions that individuals with mobility and visual impairments attach to social exclusion.

(2) Second, investigating the structure involves building structural models, which reveal the form of narratives or the 'development of plot over time'.
(3) Third, the interactional context is examined, providing insights into contextual perspectives in which narratives are produced, consumed and recounted. This analysis technique takes into account that words attain meaning from the specific context in which they originate.

Disposal:
All research data will be retained until completion of the PhD degree in line with the University of Surrey’s requirements and then all digital files will be deleted. This procedure is in line with the Data Protection Act of 1998.

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.

No. Whilst interviews are conducted with individuals with mobility impairments or visual impairments, we do not consider them to be, in any way, vulnerable adults. We acknowledge that questions related to impairment can be of sensitive nature, we keep those to a minimum. In addition, an overall risk assessment with regards to the interview process is provided.

Individuals taking part in this study are independent adults. Further, informed consent will be taken and interviews are audio recorded. If participants do not appear able to understand what is being asked of them, the interview will be terminated. No interviews will be carried out with individuals with cognitive impairments.

18) For Drugs Trials
   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:

N/A

19) Checklist of Accompanying Documents (Please tick the appropriate boxes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please ensure that, where appropriate, the following documents are submitted along with your application:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i  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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii The detailed protocol for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii Evidence of agreement of other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv Copy of the Information Sheet for participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Copy of the Consent Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

315 of 340
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Copy of questionnaire/Interview Schedule</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Copies of standard letters related to the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Copy of risk assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</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:

21) Date of Application:
Appendix G: Project Summary

‘Self-Identity’ and Agency in Tourism: 
A Performative Analysis of Disability and Social Exclusion

Background to Study:

Over the last ten years, a number of documents, reports and articles have been published by national and international institutions, such as the Social Exclusion Taskforce in the UK, the European Commission, the United Nations World Tourism Organization and the United Nations Development Programme, indicating the need to overcome exclusion. The high involvement by these organisations indicates that social exclusion is a topic at the heart of contemporary society. With the ‘2010 - European Year for combating poverty and social exclusion’ approaching, the European Parliament highlights the role that tourism can play in supporting the social inclusion of disadvantaged groups.

Among these ‘disadvantaged groups’, references can be found to individuals with a disability. However, the concept of ‘social exclusion’ itself, which derives from social policy, remains highly debated and different interpretations are apparent. Hence, a full understanding of social exclusion has not been reached yet. A similar argument is applicable to tourism, where the concept remains highly unexplored (Botterill and Klemm, 2005), which precludes practical action. Particularly looking at individuals with a disability, research in tourism predominantly highlights physical access barriers, leading to neglecting multiple perspectives of social exclusion.

Theoretical Framework:

Key theoretical concepts for this study comprise (1) social exclusion, (2) disability as well as (3) identity. The concepts are related to each other as:

- The social model of disability equates disability (2) with social exclusion (1)
- Disability (2) is a social identity category (3)
- Certain social identity categories (3), such as disability (2) are said to contribute to the experience of social exclusion (1)

Aim of Research:

Given the lack of research in this area, particularly as current studies pay only limited attention to the role of ‘self-identity’ within the discourses of disability and social exclusion, which leads to omitting different, subjective experiences by people with disabilities, the main aim of this PhD is: “To investigate possibilities of allowing for greater agency and the recognition of ‘self-identity’ for individuals living with a disability within the social exclusion debate in tourism”.
Research Questions and Objectives:

In order to provide an answer to the overall research aim, three questions are formulated. The following table lists the three research questions and their purpose alongside some of the key lay questions asked during the interviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions:</th>
<th>Purpose of Research Questions:</th>
<th>Interview Questions (Lay Questions) related to each Research Question:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: In relation to disability, how can social exclusion in tourism be re-conceptualised?</td>
<td>Theory-building: Understanding =&gt; Re-conceptualisation</td>
<td>Participants views are used to endorse conceptual results from theory building stage:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions centre around:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What does ‘social exclusion’ mean to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2: Do individuals living with a disability reproduce or transform characteristics of identity processes in tourism?</td>
<td>Empirical Research: Application</td>
<td>Participants are asked question to reach an understanding of strategies of transformation and/ or reproduction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions centre around:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have you ever felt socially excluded? =&gt; Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes: Could you tell me a bit more about these situations or your personal experiences of social exclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How do you react in situations of feeling excluded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3: How can tourism enhance possibilities for self-identity and agency for individuals living with a disability within the social exclusion debate?</td>
<td>Empirical Research: Practical Implications =&gt; Action</td>
<td>Participants are asked questions to understand how to reduce exclusionary practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions centre around:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What you think are good initiatives to overcome social exclusion?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why is this Research important?

As this research aims at critique and transformation in tourism, forces are exposed that prevent individuals living with a disability to shape the decisions that affect their life. It is anticipated that findings indicate what denies and what enables agency. Agency refers to the ability to change or alter social surroundings. Pre-requisite for this is ‘self-identity’, or expressed in other words: a subjective ‘I’, moving away from social identity categories.

⇒ Hence, central is listening to the voices and experiences of people with a disability, as particularly this ‘client knowledge’ could help to facilitate alternatives to current approaches to tourism policy.
Beneficiaries of this Research?:

Apart from people with a disability, major beneficiaries of this research further include academics, tourism suppliers, Destination Marketing Organisations (DMOs) as well as policy makers.

Who is conducting the Research?:

It is the researcher, Victoria Eichhorn, who will carry out all face-to-face interviews. The researcher has over 2 years of expertise in dealing with disability and accessibility issues as well as experience in interviewing people with impairments. Qualitative research is carried out, using one-to-one semi-structured interviews in order to ascertain detailed views, perceptions and experiences of social exclusion. Victoria will not only conduct the interviews but will also analyse the data collected and discuss findings. Each interview will be transcribed verbatim and the data deriving from the interviews will be analysed in terms of content, structure and interactional context, following a narrative approach to data analysis.

With Whom?:

Participants in this study will be individuals with mobility and visual impairments. People with hearing, speech and cognitive impairments will not form part of the study's participants.

In order to recruit participants, the researcher will make use of established contacts to disability organisations in the UK as well as the ENAT network (European Network for Accessible Tourism), of which the researcher is a member. The contacts with disability organisations have been made during a 2.5 year's period of working as researcher officer for accessible tourism, being in direct constant contact with these organisations, often led by individuals with a disability. Potential participants are obtained through the client's database of these organisations, prior to checking if clients have granted permission to be contacted via such a database. Disability organisations are asked to distribute a short editorial in their newsletter about the research project, asking potential volunteers to contact the researcher directly in case they would like to participate. They can contact the researcher either by phone or by e-mail. The initial information provided in the short editorial will also outline that potential interviewees need to be over 18 years and under 70. Further, an additional criterion for participation includes having either a mobility or visual impairment. The participant recruitment information will also highlight key issues with regards to confidentiality and anonymity as well as informing potential participants that interviews will be tape-recorded in order to allow the researcher to be reminded of the themes deriving from the interview.

In addition, the researcher will attend dedicated workshops, roadshows and trade fairs tailored towards the accessibility-requiring market to distribute leaflets, informing potential participants about the study. Similar to the first source mentioned above, the leaflet will contain information about the research project as well as the researcher's contact details. Again, the criteria for participation are outlined.

For both cases of participant recruitment, the criteria outlined in the initial information allow potential volunteers to do a 'self-screening' in order to participate. In sum, potential participants will need to identify themselves within an age bracket to ensure that all participants are over the age of 18 and under the age of 70. Further, potential participants need to identify whether they consider themselves to either have restricted mobility or restricted sight. The sampling technique employed is therefore purposive with
the characteristics or criteria for selection outlined above. Given these criteria, this study is restricted to mobility and visually impaired individuals. Individuals with speech and hearing impairments as well as people with cognitive impairments are not considered as participants for this research.

In addition, snowball sampling is employed after having conducted the first interviews, asking participants if they know other individuals who would have an interest in participating.

The majority of questions will look into individuals’ views, perceptions and experiences of social exclusion as well as perceived, beneficial approaches to overcome exclusion. In order to ensure that questions are not of an offensive nature, a pilot study will be conducted after having received ethical approval. The pilot study will be conducted with participants following the criteria mentioned above, e.g. age bracket (18-70) and mobility or visual impairment. This allows for reframing the questions asked and ensures that questions are non-intimidating.

Given that most studies conducted until now neglect to listen to and incorporate the voice of those individuals, who are deemed to be excluded, the approach taken by this study could have potential emancipatory effects, as individuals with impairments are given the opportunity to inform the researcher about their opinions and views.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary. No personal incentives or rewards will be offered. Informed consent will be obtained before each interview in the form of a completed consent form (see example enclosed). Permission will be sought before starting each interview to audio record the proceedings using a digital recorder. As participants have been already informed about the use of a tape recorder in the recruitment information, this allows for obtaining a re-confirmation. If permission and/ or consent is/ are refused, the interview will be terminated.

All interviews will remain confidential and anonymity preserved through the use of interview numbers rather than participants’ names.

How Many?:

Although, it is difficult to specify a number of interviews to be conducted as the process will terminate at the point of theoretical saturation, it is anticipated that around 30 to 40 interviews will be carried out.

Where?:

These interviews will take place either in a public area or the participants’ homes (please see accompanying document on risk assessment).

When?:

The interview process will start as soon as ethical approval has been granted and it is hoped to finish interviews in the first half of 2010.
Appendix H: Information on Semi-Structured Interviews

Method:
Primary Research: Oral histories – Individual Interviews
- **Why?**: Focus on a particular event in life – Way to understand social processes/ meaning attached to events - Enhances agency of narrator

Research Design:
- In-depth and semi-structured
- Use of checklist/ interview grid based on 4 themes (see table below)
- Simple questions/ Lay questions

Data Collection:
- Potential participants obtained via contacts to: Disability organizations, European Network for Accessible Tourism and accessibility tradeshows/ workshops
- **Who?**: Individuals with mobility and visual impairments
- **When?**: After having obtained favourable ethical opinion
- **Where?**: Public areas or participants’ homes (see risk assessment)
- **How long?**: 60 to 90 minutes for each interview
- **How many?**: Until point of ‘theoretical saturation’ is reached/ approximate: 30-40 interviews
- **Data obtained?**:
  - Verbal narratives: tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim
  - Non-verbal behaviour: body language, intonations, silence

Data Analysis: Three types of analysis:
- Content = meaning of experiences
- Structure = form of narratives
- Interactional context = contextual perspectives

While the Table below summarises the four main themes, together with its sub-themes and potential questions, it has to be taken into consideration that the interview still needs to be piloted after having obtained ethical approval. It is anticipated that interview questions will be modified and streamlined in order to ensure feasibility after the pilot test.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme:</th>
<th>Sub-Themes:</th>
<th>Potential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social Exclusion | Individual understanding | - What does social exclusion mean to you?  
- Dimensions (not asked) |
| Personal experiences of social exclusion | - Have you ever felt socially excluded? Yes/ No  
- If Yes: Could you tell me a bit more about these situations or your personal experiences of social exclusion?  
- Could you tell me some examples? |
| Personal experiences of social exclusion in tourism | - Depending on examples given:  
- Have you felt socially excluded in tourism?  
- How? / Why? / Could you give me (an) example(s)?  
- Do you think there are differences when you compare your experiences of social exclusion between being on holiday and being home? |
| Reaction to social exclusion | - How do you react in situations of feeling excluded?  
- Are your reactions different when comparing being on holiday or at home? |

1. Strategy: Reproduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme:</th>
<th>Sub-Themes:</th>
<th>Potential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Link Social Exclusion and Disability | Relationship between social exclusion and disability? | - Do you think that there is a relationship between experiences of social exclusion and having an impairment?  
- Why/ How? |
| Collective Identity - Social Model of Disability | Disability - Social Model - Collective Identity | - Do you make a distinction between having an impairment or a disability?  
- It is claimed that ‘disability’ and ‘social exclusion’ are terms that can be used synonymously – what do you think? |
| Identity Politics | - Are you a member in any type of disability organisation?  
- Why / Why not? |

2. Strategy: Transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme:</th>
<th>Sub-Themes:</th>
<th>Potential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Link Social Exclusion and Disability | Relationship between social exclusion and disability? | - Do you think that there is a relationship between experiences of social exclusion and having an impairment?  
- Why/ How? |
| Self-identity | Self-identity | - Does your impairment play a role for identifying who you are?  
- To what extent do you think you can to change your environment/ your situation? |
| External influences on self-identity | - What role do norms and expectations play in telling others about yourself? |

All:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme:</th>
<th>Sub-Themes:</th>
<th>Potential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overcoming Social Exclusion | Initiatives – structural constraints of existing programmes? | - What you think are good initiatives to overcome social exclusion?  
- Why these?  
- Why do you think there aren’t any? |
Appendix I: Risk Assessment

This risk assessment relates to conducting interviews at the home of interview participants. It identifies potential hazards and risks, outlines who might be harmed and why and based on an evaluation puts forward measures how to control and minimise risks.

General Statement with regards to the risk assessment:
- Both, the participants as well as the researcher should feel safe
- In relation to the participants, respect for the person is essential and a person's dignity needs to be preserved at all times
- Confidentiality should be guaranteed and maintained
- A mutual contract in form of a consent form will be signed by both parties at the beginning of each interview

Potential Risks for Participants:

1) It is acknowledged that conducting interviews at the homes of participants might:
   a. interfere with the participant's privacy
   b. be intimidating for the interviewees.

Measures to minimise risks:
- The researcher will leave it to the participant to decide where to conduct the interview, which reduces the perceived risk by participants ⇒ hence not interfering with the participant's privacy
- Further, it can be argued that conducting interviews at the home of the participant might be beneficial for the following reasons:
  ▶ The perspective of health and safety: risks can be avoided by conducting the interview in an environment that is known by participants as fully accessible and corresponding to their needs
  ▶ This follows principles of beneficence, considering the well-being of the participant
- The researcher will create an unintimidating, friendly and pleasant environment. It is understood that an interview is a dialogue and although it is difficult to formulate a general rule, a feeling for the limits of the participants is crucial to understand when they do not want to talk about certain aspects. Privacy and intimacy have to be respected.
- A friend or family member of the participant may be present at the interview but will not be interviewed.

2) It is acknowledged that conducting interviews in public places might contain risks for the participants

Measures to minimise risks:
- It is difficult to control this risk, as it follows the perspective of everyday living, where risk is viewed as part of everyday life and in that sense, everyone takes risks for much of the time (crossing a road, etc.). However, the researcher tries to ensure that the public area itself is accessible for the participants.
3) It is recognised that questions about participants' impairment could be deemed of a sensitive nature.

Measures to minimise risks:
- The purpose of the questions will be clearly explained to the participant, including who is doing the research and why, the study's aim and rationale
- Hence, participants will know before starting the interview the type of questions that will be asked. They will know what they are letting themselves in for and what will happen to the data they provide after the research is completed.
- At any stage, the participant can decide to withdraw
- Information remains confidential
- A pilot study will ensure that all questions are non-intimidating
- In addition, from the perspective of the participant, the participant might perceive the questions as an opportunity to take part in the decision-making process, based on their personal knowledge and understanding of their disability
  = Greater principles of emancipation

Potential Risks for Researcher:

1) It is acknowledged that conducting interviews at the homes of participants might entail safety risks to the researcher

Measures to minimise risks:
- Interviewer safety procedure:
  ➢ A detailed list of scheduled interviews will provided to the supervisor on a regular basis
  ➢ Before each interview, the researcher will call the supervisor, stating when the interview will start and also indicate the anticipated finishing time
  ➢ After each interview, the researcher will call the supervisor to inform him that the interview has finished, providing evidence that the researcher is safe
Appendix J: Participant Information Sheet I

Thank you very much for your interest in participating in my research!

My name is Victoria Eichhorn and I work as Lecturer in Tourism at the University of Surrey. I have been working on improving the availability of information about accessible destinations and I am continuing to be involved in various projects related to accessible tourism. Currently, I am investigating perceptions of social exclusion in relation to disability.

The aim of my research is to find ways on how to overcome exclusion in tourism. In order to achieve this aim, I am interested in getting to know:

1) what 'social exclusion' means to you
2) understand your response to potential experiences of feeling excluded
3) what you think are good initiatives to overcome social exclusion

This research forms part of my doctoral degree. I receive no funding or financial return for this study, neither from the University nor from any other source.

The interview will involve me asking you to identify yourself within an age bracket and whether you consider yourself to either have restricted mobility or restricted sight. You will not be asked details of your medical history. The majority of questions will be concerned with your perceptions of social exclusion, in everyday life as well as in tourism. Further, I am interested to hear what you do in case you experience social exclusion and ways to overcome social exclusion.

All data collected will be treated absolutely confidential and anonymously and will not be attributable to individual participants. I will use a tape-recorder but this is only to remind myself of the themes raised during the interview and I will send you a transcript of the interview.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw from this study any time. No personal incentives or rewards will be offered. In case, I receive information about a serious offence in the recent past during the interview, I am required to report this to the relevant authorities.

In the event of a concern about any aspect of this research, you can contact my supervisor: Dr. Graham Miller, Faculty of Management and Law, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH, Tel. 01483-68 3095, E-Mail: g.miller@surrey.ac.uk.

Should you require any further information about the research, please feel free to contact me on 0787 - 56 03 765 or at v.eichhorn@surrey.ac.uk.

Thank you very much for your time
Victoria Eichhorn

The study has been reviewed and has been given a favourable ethical opinion by the University of Surrey Ethics Committee.
Thank you very much for your interest in participating in my research!

My name is Victoria Eichhorn and I work as Lecturer in Tourism at the University of Surrey. I have been working on improving the availability of information about accessible destinations and I am continuing to be involved in various projects related to accessible tourism. Currently, I am investigating perceptions of social exclusion in relation to disability.

The aim of my research is to find ways on how to overcome exclusion in tourism. In order to achieve this aim, I am interested in getting to know:

1) what 'social exclusion' means to you
2) understand your response to potential experiences of feeling excluded
3) what you think are good initiatives to overcome social exclusion
This research forms part of my doctoral degree. I receive no funding or financial return for this study, neither from the University nor from any other source.

The interview will involve me asking you to identify yourself within an age bracket and whether you consider yourself to either have restricted mobility or restricted sight. You will not be asked details of your medical history. The majority of questions will be concerned with your perceptions of social exclusion, in everyday life as well as in tourism. Further, I am interested to hear what you do in case you experience social exclusion and ways to overcome social exclusion.

All data collected will be treated absolutely confidential and anonymously and will not be attributable to individual participants. I will use a tape-recorder but this is only to remind myself of the themes raised during the interview and I will send you a transcript of the interview.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw from this study any time. No personal incentives or rewards will be offered. In case, I receive information about a serious offence in the recent past
during the interview, I am required to report this to the relevant authorities.

In the event of a concern about any aspect of this research, you can contact my supervisor: Dr. Graham Miller, Faculty of Management and Law, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH, Tel. 01483-68 3095, E-Mail: g.miller@surrey.ac.uk.

Should you require any further information about the research, please feel free to contact me on 0787 – 56 03 765 or at v.eichhorn@surrey.ac.uk.

Thank you very much for your time

Victoria Eichhorn

The study has been reviewed and has been given a favourable ethical opinion by the University of Surrey Ethics Committee.
Appendix L: Consent Form

- I, the undersigned volunteer, voluntarily agree to take part in the study on perceptions of social exclusion in relation to disability.

- I have read and understood the Information Sheet provided. I have been given a full explanation by the investigator 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 investigator.

- 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 data collected may be shared with other researchers or interested parties. I agree that I will not seek to restrict the use of the results of the study on the understanding that my anonymity is preserved. 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 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)

..............................................................

Signed: ......................................................

Date: .......................................................