Creating accessible food tourism experiences for people with sensory disabilities

KIM, Seon Young, GASSIOT-MELIAN, Ariadna and PRATS, Lluís

Creating accessible food tourism experiences for people with sensory disabilities

Seonyoung Kim; Ariadna Gassiot-Melian; Lluís Prats

Chapter highlights

- gives voice to people with sensory disabilities, namely vision and hearing disabilities, by utilising qualitative focus groups
- identifies the challenges people with sensory disabilities face in food tourism consumption
- presents recommendations to create more accessible food tourism experiences for people with sensory disabilities

1. Introduction

Both food tourism and accessible tourism have received increasing attention from the tourism industry and academia in recent decades. As food motivates people to travel, destinations promote food tourism as part of unique and authentic cultural experiences (Ellis et al., 2018). At the same time, many destinations have made efforts to enhance accessibility as it is perceived as not only the right thing to do but also as a way to attract a potential market (Domínguez Vila et al., 2015; Gillovic & McIntosh, 2015; Visit Britain, n.d.).

However, despite this increasing attention on both food tourism and accessible tourism, the accessibility of food tourism experiences has not been fully investigated. The current chapter aims to fill this gap and provide insights into the food tourism experiences of people with sensory disabilities, namely vision and hearing disabilities. It sets out to identify the challenges people with sensory disabilities face in food tourism consumption and to present recommendations to create more accessible food tourism products and experiences.

This discussion is based on the focus group findings of a European Commission funded project, AccentGastronomy, whose aim was to provide food tourism businesses with tools to create more accessible products and services for people with sensory disabilities. Within the project, people with vision and hearing disabilities were invited to participate in focus groups to share their experiences of a range of food tourism related activities. By providing a voice for people with sensory disabilities, this chapter contributes to advancing the knowledge and understanding of the access needs of people with more varied disabilities beyond mobility disabilities. The authors acknowledge that while this chapter focuses on vision and hearing disabilities, there are many different types of sensory disabilities that affect one or more senses.

The next section offers an overview of current literature on accessible tourism and food tourism relevant to our study. After detailing the focus group method, findings are presented focusing on the barriers people with sensory disabilities experience and recommendations for improvement. The conclusion highlights this chapter's contribution and its implications for future studies. The authors adopt the 'person-first' language, 'people with disabilities' throughout this chapter. This is to emphasise the need to define people by their humanity rather than by their attributes (Gillovic et al., 2018).

2. Literature review

2.1 Diversity in people with disabilities

Recently more studies in accessible tourism explore the diversity within the accessible tourism market focusing on different types and degrees of disabilities, shifting away from the heavy focus on mobility disabilities (Figueiredo et al., 2012) and the evaluation and improvement of physical infrastructure (Michopoulou & Buhalis, 2013). Researchers now consider 'invisible' disability, such as, dementia (Connell & Page, 2019; Tomej et al., 2023) and autism (Sedgley et al., 2017). Regarding sensory disabilities, some studies (Noghan et al., 2023; Qiao et al., 2023) have focused on vision disabilities and have explored issues related to aiding technologies, physiological and psychological limitations, etc. whereas other studies

(Ho & Peng, 2017; Jensen et al., 2023) have revolved around deaf or hearing-impaired tourists.

To understand this heterogeneity in people with disabilities, market segments and tourism products should also be considered. Different market segments, such as senior tourists (Huber et al., 2018) and students (Xie & Ritchie, 2019) have their own challenges. Food tourism experiences also have distinctive characteristics, for example, they are often considered to offer more authentic co-creation experiences for tourists (Carvalho et al., 2023). Some accessible tourism studies have started to pay attention to different market segments and products, such as, the experiences of families with children with disabilities (Nyman et al., 2018) and dementia-friendly nature-based experiences (Page et al., 2023). However, despite this increased attention to the diverse disabilities and tourism products, little attention has been given to food tourism experiences of people with sensory disabilities. This chapter aims to fill this gap in literature.

2.2 Barriers for people with disabilities

Tourism participation and experiences of people with disabilities may be challenged by different barriers or constraints. In the earlier studies, these barriers were dichotomously classified as internal or external (Jackson & Searle, 1985) or personal or social (Boothby et al., 1981). They were then further developed into three types of barriers or constraints: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Smith, 1986). Intrapersonal constraints are those related to individuals' knowledge and own physical, psychological, or cognitive functioning level. Interpersonal constraints are linked to communication and interaction processes with others, such as, travel companions, tourism professionals, other tourists, and the local people. Structural constraints arise when interacting with the external environment and may arise due to both social and physical conditions, and include financial issues, regulatory barriers and architectural and transport barriers (Daniels et al., 2005; Gassiot et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2012).

Tourism barriers are not homogeneous and can vary according to the characteristics of each person, the characteristics of the products and services offered, the

destination or the context (Hung & Petrick, 2010). People with disabilities have different personal and socio-demographic factors, such as the type and degree of disability (Eusébio et al. 2023), economic and financial situation (Kim & Adu-Ampong, 2024), and personal determination and pervious travel experiences (Devile & Kastenholz, 2018). De Pascale et al. (2023) identify that there are also gender differences in participation and perception of barriers and women with disabilities are doubly disadvantaged as their propensity to travel is more affected by their personal skills, the lack of a travel partner, accommodation and transportation accessibility, etc. compared to men with disabilities.

People with disabilities face various intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural constraints when having food tourism experiences. Through a systematic literature review, Hemsley et al. (2023) identify common challenges for people with disabilities when eating out in restaurants, such as, lack of confidence and personal skills of people with disabilities, negative attitudes and lack of disability awareness among staff, physical inaccessibility of restaurants, etc. Dias de Faria et al. (2012) explore the preferences of people with vision disabilities in restaurants and they suggest accessible menus (in braille, in audio or read by staff), empathic and well-trained staff, low-intensity light and sound levels, round tables, and easy access to staff (buttons or staff's readiness). Poria et al. (2011) explain the challenges that people with vision disabilities face with self-service restaurants (e.g. buffet) and recommend personal service even for the buffet service.

Examination of barriers is crucial as they not only lead to lack of participation but can also influence the frequency or enjoyment of tourism experience (Lee et al., 2012). It is widely perceived that barriers have a negative effect on behaviour, not only depriving an individual of the opportunity to participate in a certain experience but also forcing them to modify their preferences and behaviour (Eusébio et al., 2023). Researchers have explored how barriers are related to other components of behaviour, such as, travel decision-making (Shin et al., 2022), destination image (Tan, 2017), future intentions (Lee et al., 2012), etc.

Despite efforts to understand barriers, there has been little research on the strategies used by people with disabilities in a tourism context to negotiate these

barriers and how the negative effects of these barriers can be mitigated through such strategies (Devile et al., 2023). The strategies that people with disabilities use are quite diverse, such as managing constraints through travel companions, rigorous and thorough travel planning, information searches, and more proactive personal attitudes (Devile et al., 2023). There is a need to analyse how barriers affect the food tourism experiences of people with sensory disabilities, their behaviour, and how they negotiate these barriers.

2.3 Food tourism and sensory experience

The sensory dimension of tourism experiences is crucial to understand how tourists interpret the world, how these perceptions influence their behaviour, and how destinations provide multi-sensory encounters (Agapito et al, 2013). The environment where tourism experiences take place plays an important role in shaping these experiences, so multiple sensory stimuli are often used to enhance these experiences and make them more accessible (Agapito & Guerreiro, 2023).

Food tourism experiences have received increasing interest because of their multisensory and engaging nature (Carvalho et al, 2023). Food authenticity and sensory appeal involving multi-sensory attributes are important antecedents of food memory and destination attachment. Food memory is ‘the travel food experiences that can be positively remembered and recalled by tourists’ and food memory and destination attachment play important roles in recommendations and revisit intention (Li et al., 2023, p. 112).

Muskat et al. (2023) demonstrate that sensory factors, such as cleanliness, noise levels and temperature, have importance in tourists’ food experience. Molina-Collado et al. (2024) show that the sensory environment of restaurants, including food appeal and the restaurant atmosphere, and service excellence provided by employees contribute to positive food tourism experience, with service excellence having the greatest impact.

Designing accessible experiences is crucial to ensure inclusive participation in food tourism experiences. As food tourism experiences heavily rely on the senses, this

however raises questions about the accessibility of food tourism experiences for people with sensory disabilities. Hence, it is important to understand how these stimuli may be managed to minimise barriers and improve food tourism experiences for people with sensory disabilities.

3. Methodology

3.1 Focus group

With little literature on food tourism experience of people with sensory disabilities, the authors took a qualitative exploratory approach, and focused on understanding the perspectives and experiences of people with vision and hearing disabilities. Focus groups were chosen as a research method. The key to the focus groups was interaction between participants, and the researcher played a peripheral role as a facilitator/moderator of group discussion between participants (Parker & Tritter, 2006). In the focus groups, the objective was “not primarily to elicit the group’s answers but rather to stimulate discussion and thereby understand … the meanings and norms which underlie those group answers” (Bloor et al., 2001, p.43)

3.2 Case study

The research was conducted in Girona, Spain, and Sheffield, UK. The two countries have significant differences in food tourism products.

The Girona region focuses on food transformation tourism, through wine making, olive oil production, small local biscuit or cheese factories, among others. But probably the most important food tourism experience in Girona is the gastronomic experience through restaurants using local products. Girona with close to 100,000 inhabitants has more than 400 restaurants (GOD, 2023) and generates an atomized and extended food tourism experience.

The city of Sheffield offers a variety of food and drink experiences from street food, food halls to fine dining as well as food festivals. It is also renowned for brewing with many real ale pubs and microbreweries (Marketing Sheffield, n.d.). Sheffield and the

region of South Yorkshire have several working farms that offer visitor experiences and events, restaurants and cafes, and farm-shops which sell homegrown and local produce.

3.3 Focus group participants

In each case study area, two separate focus groups were conducted – one with people with vision disabilities, and the other with people with hearing disabilities. The focus group participants were recruited through non-profit disability organisations for people with these sensory disabilities. They include ONCE (National Association for Blind People in Spain) and its Girona branch, and AGSORDGI (Girona Association of Deaf People) in Girona, and SRSB (Sheffield Royal Society for the Blind), and Deaf Advice Team, part of Sheffield Citizens Advice, in Sheffield.

Table 1. Participant details

Sensory disabilities	Vision disabilities	Hearing disabilities
Number	20	17
Gender	50% Male / 50% Female	65% Male / 35% Female
Age	30s-60s	20s-60s

Source: The authors' own.

In total, 20 people with vision disabilities and 17 people with hearing disabilities took part in the focus groups (see Table 1). The participants with vision disabilities had different types and levels of vision disabilities. For example, some participants were born blind whereas others acquired disabilities in different stages of their lives. The participants with hearing disabilities also had different levels of disabilities with some who were born deaf-mute and others who acquired hearing disabilities in different stages of their life. Some only signed, some only lip-read and others could partially hear and speak using various technologies.

3.4 Data collection and analysis

Each focus group lasted approximately 2 hours and had from 8 to 12 participants. For the focus groups with people with hearing disabilities, sign language interpreters were invited. The focus groups were facilitated by the authors using a set of topics (i.e., food tourism experiences in restaurants/cafes, museums, guides, farms, farm shops). Three of the focus groups were conducted in the premises of the relevant disability organisations, and the focus group with people with hearing disabilities in Sheffield was conducted in the premises of the Sheffield Hallam University. The locations were carefully selected to ensure accessibility for the participants. For example, the rooms for the focus groups with people with hearing disabilities were set up in a way that all participants, sign language interpreters, and the facilitator sat in a circle without a table or anything else that could block views.

All focus groups were audio-recorded to help the facilitators moderate and encourage the active participation of participants without taking notes and enable transcription of the complete conversation afterwards. The recordings were manually transcribed, and thematic analysis was carried out by the authors. The data was also independently analysed by academic colleagues and compared with the authors' analyses to ensure robust and unbiased analysis of the data. The following results section presents the voice of the participants through quotes.

4. Results

4.1 Challenges for people with sensory disabilities

The challenges the focus group participants faced in food tourism had much in common with the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural constraints (Gassiot et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2012) in accessible tourism literature, but arose from participants' unique contexts.

Both groups identified poor lighting and noise levels, inaccessible menus, lack of disability awareness and poor customer service as barriers. In addition, participants with vision disabilities identified lack of clear signage and pathways, and those with hearing impairment highlighted communication with staff as challenges.

Poor lighting and noise levels

Poorly lit and noisy environments create challenges for both participant groups. Lighting level is important for not only people with vision disabilities but also people with hearing disabilities as the latter often communicate via sign language and lip-reading. Equally, noisy environments create issues for people with vision disabilities as they rely on hearing for communications.

> We often find the lighting level is a problem and noise levels seem to be increasing in restaurants as well. … Even just putting your order in with waitresses and hearing what they are saying can be difficult. You want them to read the menu and you can't hear it. (Participant with vision disability)

Poor signage and pathway obstructions

Poor signage and pathway obstructions are key issues for participants with vision disabilities as they cannot easily access basic amenities, such as toilets, and navigate venues safely. They very often rely on their sighted companions or guides to help them with navigation.

> I need to go to the toilet and go to the bar and ask. The guy says ‘yes, they are at the end, on the right.’ I walked to the end of the bar and turned right and there are two doors facing you. I am staring at these two doors thinking 'Which is which? Which is the skirt, or which is the trousers?' I can’t really see what it says because they have done fancy writing on a brass flask. (Participant with vision disability)

> Every time I needed a toilet, I had to have someone to take me because you had to walk in and out, in and out, … walk past at least 7 or 8 tables and they were not even straight, they were here and there, everywhere. It was like a crazy maze. (Participant with vision disability)

> To visit the wine and oil cellars was a challenge. There were lots of tubes and pipes on the floor, liquid that leaked, and a huge noise due to the pressing of the olives so we could not even hear the warnings. (Participant with vision disability)

> We talk about the food market [festival] in Sheffield. There is no real access from one side of Fargate [a street] to the other without walking all the way up and then all the way back down. There is a gap and then somebody has decided to pile all their boxes next to the three so you can't get through. I complained to the Council countless times. (Participant with vision disability)

<u>Inaccessible information and communication barriers</u>

Both groups identified inaccessible menus in restaurants and cafes as key barriers. participants with vision disabilities expressed that they could not always access the full menus because menus are often hung up on the wall or in inaccessible formats.

> If you go to any sort of cafe or restaurant, they have stuff written up behind the counter. I personally haven't got a clue what it says. I can't read anything up there. (Participant with vision disability)

> Some restaurants do their menus in italic and there is not enough contrast on the menu. Even if you have got a little bit of sight and even if it's not dark, if it's pale blue writing on off white paper, that's a struggle to read. (Participant with vision disability)

To overcome this barrier, some people with vision disabilities search online menus before their visit to a restaurant. However, they experience further challenges because online menus are not in an accessible format, or not kept up to date.

> If it is a photograph of a menu, no screen reader can read it. It is like trying to read a picture. (Participant with vision disability)

> I booked [a restaurant] for my 40th birthday party. I've got the menu off their website, they told me it was there, so I printed it off, I have everybody to put what they want. [When we got there, they said] 'Oh, that is not the right one, we have got a new one now!' (Participant with vision disability)

For many participants with hearing disabilities, sign language is their first language and they do not fully understand written language. This means that they do not understand each dish or food allergy/intolerance information. When ordering food, they often point at a dish on the menu so if the menu is not printed (i.e., on the wall), ordering food becomes difficult.

> I sometimes don't know what each thing is. Sometimes deaf people want to be able to know what they are describing. If there was a picture and I can say this is what I want and show it to the waiter and that is what you get. (Participant with hearing disability)

> All you do is point at something on a menu and you don't know what's in it and you might swell up hugely and have a real reaction to it and everything. It's really dangerous. (Participant with hearing disability)

Participants with hearing disabilities agreed that it is easier for them to understand menus if photographs of dishes are available. Some people also like self-service or buffet style restaurants for the same reason.

> We love to go to restaurants that have menus with pictures. Usually, they are of less quality, but we have less surprises with our orders. (Participant with hearing disability)

> One restaurant I really like is … it's a buffet style and all the food is laid down so you just go and help yourself. …You can see everything there. … you don't have to ask for what they've got or anything. (Participant with hearing disability)

Some participants used apps to translate the written language to sign language so that they can understand the menu.

> So, for me, trying to read in English, I have an app on my phone where I can type in some words, and it then translates it to signs so I can say ‘oh that word means that sign’. (Participant with hearing disability)

However, there was a disparity between generations in the use of technology. Younger generations have grown up with technological tools, so it is easier for them to integrate them in their daily lives whereas older generations may not be willing to learn how to use technology unless they see clear added value.

> The young ones use all these technologies, we prefer to use our colleagues, partners, and friends. That’s one of the reasons we travel together. (Participant with vision disability)

For both groups, the lack of accessible information was a constraint when engaging in food tourism experiences. Participants with vision disabilities stated that they are a minority group which businesses do not accommodate for.

> What they [businesses] need to do is to look at what they have produced for people with normal sight. And then think ok, … how can I help somebody else? Do I have to enlarge it? Do I need to do it in an audio format? (Participant with vision disability)

> In fancy restaurants they explain to you the dish they are serving you, but they don’t know if we can read lips. We all have to look at them properly and we all need to be aware that they are talking to us. (Participant with hearing disability)

> At the beginning the guides don’t know how to talk to us. It doesn’t matter. We teach them how to do it. If they are open minded, they can give a clear added value to our visit. In the vineyards, helping us to walk properly on the field,

> giving us raisins to taste or leaves to touch, raised our interest. (Participant with vision disability)

Many sign language users cannot read and write but staff often assume that they can. Amongst sign language users, there are no communication problems at all. However, when they interact with staff and others who do not sign, this becomes a key issue. The information and communication barrier is in fact a language barrier.

Participants who use sign languages said that sign language tours are not well promoted, and some are still unsuitable due to the big size of the group, or different sign languages used.

> Sign language tours [to cellars and vineyards] are not really available. There's also the question about the language. Deaf people over 50 learned Spanish sign language, because Catalan was forbidden. Younger generations learn Catalan sign language. (Participant with hearing disability)

<u>Lack of disability awareness and poor customer service</u>

Many of the above barriers stem from the lack of staff disability awareness and poor customer service. Participants with hearing disabilities express how their disability is invisible and staff lack awareness.

> We call it 'invisible disability'. Whether it's museums, restaurants, anywhere really, to be honest they just need to prepare themselves for when a deaf person comes. That is a really big thing to let them (businesses) know. …. It can be quite upsetting for deaf people when the person who works there goes 'oh, oh crikey!' and panics. (Participant with hearing disability)

Participants who had assistance dogs shared their experience of being refused entrance to a restaurant with their assistance dogs. Participants with hearing disabilities also added it is often assumed that only people with vision disabilities have assistance dogs.

> I walked into this restaurant and walked out again. There were a few of us and I've got a dog and they refused and said, 'I am sorry people are eating here and we can't have a dog here'. I said 'look, it's a guide dog'. But they wouldn't have any of it! (Participant with vision disability)

Participants from both groups complained how some staff patronise them, assume what they wanted, or simply ignore them.

> Sometimes people don't have patience with us. Sometimes they can't be bothered, and they walk away! (Participant with hearing disability)

> The woman was looking at me, I said 'Oh, are you ready for me?' She said, 'yes I am looking at you.' … I didn't have my cane with me, so she didn't know. I said, 'look, I am a registered blind, so I don't know whether you are looking at me or not'. (Participant with vision disability)

4.2 Recommendations for improvement

Food tourism providers have a great opportunity to develop accessible tourism products by embedding and enhancing sensory experiences. For example, the smells, temperatures, noises, and tastes in a vineyard tour left a memorable impression on a participant.

> I was amazed by the contrast in the temperature between the sunny vineyards and the subterranean caves of the cellar. What impressed me most was how freezing the metal wine making tanks were. (Participant with vision disability)

> I still have goose bumps when I remember the vibrations in the oil production factory. The floor trembled when the tractor discharged the olives into the machine. (Participant with hearing disability)

Businesses are often concerned about resources required to improve accessibility. This is true, particularly in structural improvement, however there are many ways

they can improve accessibility without significant financial investment and this journey starts with improving staff disability awareness and customer services.

Both groups state that good customer service can make a positive difference. Some places may not be physically accessible, but the inaccessibility can be compensated to a degree with good customer service, often surprisingly simple and basic things.

> We were in a small room, and they started to dim the light and I asked whoever was in charge and they immediately put them up again. Somebody turned them down and he came back to put them up because he remembered. That would make me decide where to go. (Participant with vision disability)

> There is one cafe in the market. There is a lady there who has been learning a little bit of sign language so she will do a little bit of 'good morning' or 'good afternoon', 'what would you like?'… So, we often go there… (Participant with hearing disability)

> They always offer if the [guide] dog wants water or anything. If people can't read the menu they have no problem with reading the menu out. They go out of their way in a non-patronising way. (Participant with vision disability)

> The waiters always come in front of you to make sure you see them and talk slowly for you to read their lips. (Participant with hearing disability)

> They [farms] have got [visual] signage up, ‘do not touch’ and the deaf children can recognise that. They know it means ‘don't touch the animals’ or ‘wash hands after you patted these animals’, some say you can feed them, there is easy clear signage that deaf children can follow. (Participant with hearing disability)

A participant summarised this by saying ‘It is really important for us that people care … A lot of it is not the food but it's service’. It was evident that when people are satisfied with their experience, they become loyal customers. Word of mouth was

very strong amongst these groups and even during the focus groups, participants were recommending businesses to each other. However, the widespread barriers limit people's choices.

> Deaf people always do that. We don't like change, trying to find different things or whatever. If we find one that suits us we stick with it. (Participant with hearing disability)

Focus group participants suggested several cost-effective ways that businesses can improve accessibility, for example, working with disability organisations, updating information and menus online, providing clear signage and pathways, raising disability awareness among staff, and providing a more customer-oriented service.

There are many comprehensive accessibility guidelines available for tourism businesses to improve physical and information accessibility (e.g., VisitEngland, n.d.) so they are not discussed here. However, the importance of disability awareness and customer service need to be highlighted as our participants pointed out:

- Be flexible and adaptable for all customers including people with sensory disabilities.
- Do not assume everyone can see, hear, speak, write and read.
- Offer assistance without patronising or assuming what people want.
- Be patient. Do not give up when communication becomes difficult.

These recommendations are consistent with the concept of "accessible hospitality, a welcoming attitude towards others and willingness to serve all kinds of customers" (Harju-Myllyaho & Kyyrä, cited in Harju-Myllyaho & Jutila, 2016, p.34). Our participants also asserted that businesses should work more closely with them and disability organisations if they want to promote their businesses and this highlights the need for collaboration.

5. Conclusion

There are several limitations to this study. The focus group was an effective method to discuss the participants' common interests as a group but one drawback of such a group setting is that it can be difficult to fully elicit an individual's personal views or experiences. The focus group participants were recruited through the relevant disability organisations and therefore people who do not engage with such organisations were excluded from our focus groups.

Despite these limitations, this chapter contributes to the field of accessible tourism research in several ways. Firstly, it has enhanced awareness and understanding of the needs of people with hearing and vision disabilities, which until recently have received relatively little attention from accessible tourism researchers. People with sensory disabilities are often excluded from quantitative studies, which dominate the accessible tourism field. By adopting the qualitative focus group method, the chapter gave voice to people with sensory disabilities and acknowledged human diversity.

Secondly, for food tourism businesses, the chapter has demonstrated that there are many things they can do to improve accessibility for relatively little monetary cost. The journey starts with developing better disability awareness and customer service. For that, working with disability organisations can help businesses in multiple ways: to improve awareness of hearing disabilities and vision disabilities, to understand the needs and wants of this potential market, and to promote their products and services.

Thirdly, the discussion here has broader implications for all destinations as food and drink are fundamental aspects of any tourism experiences regardless of destination type. Our findings promote the concepts of universal design and the whole-of-life approach in that accessible tourism is tourism experience made available for everyone at the various stages of life, not just people with disabilities (Darcy & Buhalis, 2011; Gillovic & McIntosh, 2020). Given that hearing and vision disabilities often increase with age, improved understanding of such disabilities, for example, can help design accessible tourism for older tourists. Providing an online menu and updating it regularly can be useful for all customers. There are also opportunities for businesses to enhance their products by embedding more sensory elements and

create more memorable experiences for all their customers, with or without disabilities.

However, caution should be taken in that each person with disability has their own needs and wants and should be treated as individuals. This chapter has discussed vision and hearing disabilities as a whole, but there are varying types and severity of hearing and vision disabilities, and there are people with other sensory disabilities and additional disabilities. A 'one size fits all' approach simply will not work. The key message from our participants was to treat everyone as an individual without assuming what people can do or cannot do.

Whilst paying attention to individuals' access needs arising from their disabilities, personal and social contexts, researchers should consider that all people have different personal values, preferences and interests, and seek this human diversity in future studies (Kim & Adu-Ampong, 2024).

References

Agapito, D., & Guerreiro, M. (2023). Designing accessible tourism experiences: slow, sensory and smart framework. *Enlightening Tourism. A Pathmaking Journal, 13*(1), 167-198.

Agapito, D., Mendes, J., & Valle, P. (2013). Exploring the conceptualization of the sensory dimension of tourist experiences. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 2*(2), 62-73.

Bloor, M., Frankland, J., Thomas, M. & Robson, K. (2001) *Focus groups in social research.* Sage.

Boothby, J., Tungatt, M. F., & Townsend, A. R. (1981). Ceasing participation in sports activity: Reported reasons and their implications. *Journal of Leisure Research, 13*(1), 1-14.

Carvalho, M., Kastenholz, E., & Carneiro, M. J. (2023). Co-creative tourism experiences–a conceptual framework and its application to food & wine tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research, 48*(5), 668-692.

Connell, J., & Page, S. J. (2019). Case study: Destination readiness for dementia-friendly visitor experiences: A scoping study. *Tourism Management*, *70*, 29-41.

Crawford, D.W. & Godbey, G. (1987). Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 9*, 119-127.
Daniels, M. J., Rodgers, E. B. D., & Wiggins, B. P. (2005). “Travel Tales”: an interpretive analysis of constraints and negotiations to pleasure travel as experienced by persons with physical disabilities. *Tourism Management, 26*(6), 919-930.
Darcy, S., & Buhalis, D. (2011). Introduction: From disabled tourists to accessible tourism. In D. Buhalis & S. Darcy (Eds.), *Accessible tourism: Concepts and issues* (pp. 1–20). Channel View Publications.
De Pascale, A., Meleddu, M., Abbate, T., & Pellicano, M. (2023). Is there a gender gap in the propensity to travel of people with disabilities?. *Journal of Travel Research, 62*(3), 517-539.
Devile, E. L., Eusébio, C., & Moura, A. (2023). Traveling with special needs: Investigating constraints and negotiation strategies for engaging in tourism activities. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, *7*(2), 820-843.
Devile, E., & Kastenholz, E. (2020). Accessible tourism experiences: The voice of people with visual disabilities, *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 10*(3), 265-285.
Dias de Faria, M., Ferreira da Silva, J., & Brantes Ferreira, J. (2012). The visually impaired and consumption in restaurants. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 24*(5), 721-734.
Domínguez Vila, T., Darcy, S., & González, E. A. (2015). Competing for the disability tourism market–a comparative exploration of the factors of accessible tourism competitiveness in Spain and Australia. *Tourism Management, 47*, 261-272.
Ellis, A., Park, E., Kim, S., & Yeoman, I. (2018). What is food tourism?. *Tourism Management, 68*, 250-263.
Eusébio, C., Alves, J. P., Carneiro, M. J., & Teixeira, L. (2023). Needs, motivations, constraints and benefits of people with disabilities participating in tourism activities: the view of formal caregivers. *Annals of Leisure Research*, ahead-of-print, 1-25.
Figueiredo, E., Eusébio, C., & Kastenholz, E. (2012). How diverse are tourists with disabilities? A pilot study on accessible leisure tourism experiences in Portugal. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 14*(6), 531-550.

Gassiot, A., Prats, L., & Coromina, L. (2018). Tourism constraints for Spanish tourists with disabilities: Scale development and validation. *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica, 64*(1), 49-71.
Gillovic, B., & McIntosh, A. (2015). Stakeholder perspectives of the future of accessible tourism in New Zealand. *Journal of Tourism Futures, 1*(3), 223-239.
Gillovic, B., & McIntosh, A. (2020). Accessibility and inclusive tourism development: Current state and future agenda. *Sustainability, 12*(22), 9722.
Gillovic, B., McIntosh, A., Darcy, S., & Cockburn-Wootten, C. (2018). Enabling the language of accessible tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *26*(4), 615-630.
GOD (Girona Open Data) (2023) Establiments dedicats a activitats econòmiques. https://terra.girona.cat/opendata/storage/f/2023-02-27T11%3A57%3A45.691Z/activitats2022.csv (accessed February 27, 2024).
Harju-Myllyaho, A., & Jutila, S. (2016). Viewpoints on inclusion in tourism–From accessible tourism to accessible hospitality. *Matkailututkimus*, *12*(2), 33-44.
Hemsley, B., Almond, B., Given, F., Darcy, S., L'Espoir Decosta, P., Dann, S., Carnemolla, P., Freeman-Sanderson, A., Debono, D., & Balandin, S. (2023). Craving inclusion: a systematic review on the experiences and needs of people with disability eating out. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, ahead-of-print, 1-16.
Ho, C. H., & Peng, H. H. (2017). Travel motivation for Taiwanese hearing-impaired backpackers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 22*(4), 449-464.
Huber, D., Milne, S., & Hyde, K. F. (2018). Constraints and facilitators for senior tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 27*, 55-67.
Hung, K., & Petrick, J. F. (2010). Developing a measurement scale for constraints to cruising. *Annals of Tourism Research, 37*(1), 206-228.
Jackson, E. L., & Searle, M. S. (1985). Recreation non-participation and barriers to participation: Concepts, and models. *Loisir et Societe/Society and Leisure, 8*(2), 693-707.
Jensen, M. T., Chambers, D., & Wilson, S. (2023). The future of deaf tourism studies: An interdisciplinary research agenda. *Annals of Tourism Research, 100*, 103549.
Kim, S., & Adu-Ampong, E. A. (2024). Disabilities, functionings and capabilities: the capability approach in accessible tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, ahead-of-print, 1-15.

Lee, B. K., Agarwal, S., & Kim, H. J. (2012). Influences of travel constraints on the people with disabilities' intention to travel: An application of Seligman's helplessness theory. *Tourism Management, 33*(3), 569-579.

Li, F., Su, Q., & Ma, J. (2023). How do food authenticity and sensory appeal influence tourist experience? The moderating role of food involvement. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *25*(1), 109-122.

Marketing Sheffield (n.d.). Amazing Food & Drink in Sheffield. https://www.welcometosheffield.co.uk/visit/food-drink/ (accessed February 27, 2024).

Michopoulou, E., & Buhalis, D. (2013). Information provision for challenging markets: The case of the accessibility requiring market in the context of tourism. *Information & Management, 50*(5), 229-239.

Molina-Collado, A., Santos-Vijande, M. L., Gómez-Rico, M., & del Cerro, J. S. (2024). Sensory versus personal environment as antecedents of the creative food tourism experience. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *118*, 103688.

Muskat, B., Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Li, G., Vu, Q., & Wagner, S. (2023). The interplay of sensory and non-sensory factors in food tourism experiences. *Tourism Review*, Ahead-of-print, ahead-of-print.

Noghan, N., O'Connor, P., & Sigala, M. (2023). Accessible tourism: how people with vision impairment and blindness experience tourism and "see" the invisible. *Tourism Review*, ahead-of-print, 1-6.

Nyman, E., Westin, K., & Carson, D. (2018). Tourism destination choice sets for families with wheelchair-bound children. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *43*(1), 26-38.

Page, S. J., Connell, J., Price, S., Owen, S., Ledingham, K., & Clare, L. (2023). Operationalizing transformative tourism: Creating dementia-friendly outdoor and nature-based visitor experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 00472875231217735.

Parker, A., & Tritter, J. (2006). Focus group method and methodology: current practice and recent debate. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, *29*(1), 23-37.

Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Brandt, Y. (2011). Dimensions of hotel experience of people with disabilities: an exploratory study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23(5), 571-591.

Qiao, G., Cao, Y., & Zhang, J. (2023). Accessible Tourism–understanding blind and vision-impaired tourists' behaviour towards inclusion. *Tourism Review, 78*(2), 531-560.

Sedgley, D., Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., & Hanna, P. (2017). Tourism and autism: Journeys of mixed emotions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *66*, 14–25.
Shin, H., Nicolau, J. L., Kang, J., Sharma, A., & Lee, H. (2022). Travel decision determinants during and after COVID-19: The role of tourist trust, travel constraints, and attitudinal factors. *Tourism Management, 88*, 104428.
Sim, J., Waterfield, J. (2019) Focus group methodology: some ethical challenges. *Qual Quant 53*, 3003–3022.
Smith, R. W. (1986). Physically disabled children and parental time use. *Journal of Leisure Research, 18*(4), 284-299.
Tan, W. K. (2017). Repeat visitation: A study from the perspective of leisure constraint, tourist experience, destination images, and experiential familiarity. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 6*(3), 233-242.
Tomej, K., Hansen, M., & Blichfeldt, B. S. (2023). Travel information needs of informal carers of people living with dementia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-13.
Visit Britain (n.d.). The value of the purple pound. https://www.visitbritain.org/business-advice/value-purple-pound (accessed February 27, 2024).
Visit England (n.d.) VisitEngland Accessible and Inclusive Tourism Toolkit for Businesses. https://www.visitbritain.org/business-advice/make-your-business-accessible-and-inclusive/visitengland-accessible-and-inclusive (accessed February 27, 2024)
Xie, L., & Ritchie, B. W. (2019). The motivation, constraint, behavior relationship: A holistic approach for understanding international student leisure travelers. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 25*(1), 111-129.

Funding details.
This work was supported by the European Commission under Grant 127-G-ENT-PPA-14-7722.

Author bios

Seonyoung Kim is a Principal Lecturer in Tourism Management at Sheffield Business School, Sheffield Hallam University, UK. She researches tourism

governance, tourism policy and planning, sustainable tourism, destination marketing and accessible tourism.

Ariadna Gassiot-Melian is a tenure-track lecturer at the Faculty of Tourism, University of Girona, Spain. She researches accessible tourism, tourism narratives, text-mining and cruise tourism.

Lluís Prats is Associate Professor in Tourism Management at the Faculty of Tourism, University of Girona. His main research areas are Destination Management, and Behavioral Science, including inclusive tourism.