



ASSESSMENT OF EXPECTATIONS AND TENDENCIES ON DEVELOPMENT OF ACCESSIBLE TOURISM: A STUDY ON DEMAND

Zeki Akinci

University of Akdeniz, Turkey

Disability is a phenomenon that has received a growing level of academic and governmental attention for a number of demographic and social factors. Accessible tourism is able to reach large populations with its universal design, and ensures that every individual's participation in tourism activities are honorable, healthy, and independent. The number of people with disabilities is expected to increase. In this regard, for the sake of accessible tourism's development it is necessary to determine the tourism demands of people with disabilities, a group which composes the largest minority in the world (almost 15% of the world's population). The purpose of this study is to investigate the advantages and obstacles relating to accessible tourism, and enable people with disabilities to benefit from tourism activities equally and honorably by producing suggestions for meeting the expectations of this demanding group, thus extending tourism over the whole year.

Keywords: Disability, People with disability, Accessible tourism, Tourism demand.

Introduction

Tourism demand can be defined as; a flow from a tourist generating point to a touristic destination (Yarcan 1994) to meet tourism related needs of people (Usta 2001), number of people who has desire to travel, supported by spare time for touristic purposes and money to realize that desire (Sezgin and Acar 1991) and fullest extent of touristic products and services accepted to be purchased by above mentioned people (Olalı and Timur 1998).

Prerequisite of tourism demand is one's having enough income and spare time, and in the end having desire to travel (Bahar and Kozak 2008). Besides, for the sake of accessible tourism, universal design subject to the people's health state and meeting requirements of the person are travelling from home to destination is necessary measures.

Tourism can contribute to physical, psychological and mental development of disabled people. Furthermore, tourism can enhance personal development and quality of living by enabling persons learn new information, developing cross-cultural communication, widening one's horizons, improving skills of building and maintaining social relationships and increasing capacity of understanding the others. From the social point of view, tourism can be beneficial in many ways such as reducing expenses on social adaptation processes, in terms of social integration and actualizing social equality.

It is estimated that 5% to 20% of world population consists of disabled people (UNESCAP 2010). According to State Institute of Statistics' research on disabled people in Turkey, 2002, proportion of dis-

abled people's population is 12,9% (TUIK 2002). According to this ration, it is estimated that there are almost 8 million disabled people in Turkey. This figure shows that there is a considerable potential of disabled tourists both in Turkey and worldwide.

In our country and worldwide, important legislations have gone in effect for the sake of disabled people. Such legislations are necessary to ease disabled persons' joining to society and to enable them move comfortably in social life. Along with political discussions, studies on disabled people and their tourism rights were carried out (United Nations 2006). Realizing the desire of the disabled to join tourism mobility, and their being seen as a profitable market, have increased number of academic studies on the disabled oriented accessible tourism. It is possible to find studies under various titles like; travelling obstacles of disabled persons (Abeyraine 1995; Cavinato and Cuckovich 1992), their perceptions, motivations, experiences and satisfaction (Daniels et al.2005; Darcy,2002;Yau et al.2004), perceptions of travel agencies' role (McKercher et al.2003) in regarding literature.

It can be seen that researchers usually focus on determining obstacles that disabled people encounter during their travels. It is frequently emphasized that there is a direct inverse relation between travel obstacles and disabled people's intentions for travelling. That's why; obstacles must be eliminated, to encourage the disabled to join tourism mobility (Cavinato and Cuckovich 1992; Israeli 2002; McKercher et al. 2003). However, it is quite questionable to bridge such a direct negative relationship amongst travelling obstacles, disabled persons and tourism participation. That is why; travelling decision depends on a set of complex factors such as; motivation, lifestyle and values, personality and socio-economical peculiarities. Not only, such factors might influence indirect tourism participation, but also, persons might encounter some other external obstacles instead of them or along with them. Such a matter of opinion is supported by learned-helplessness theory. Learned helplessness refers to a condition in which a human develops an inevitable cycle of desperation as an adverse outcome of repetitive past failures to control their environments (because of internal or external obstacles) hence stops trying to attempt from then on.

This remark was supported by Smith (1987). According to Smith; people with disabilities might encounter various barriers, but influence of those barriers on their final decision to travel are clinging to a set of personal qualities including perception of helplessness. Travel intention is created by overcoming various barriers that might be present in several stages of decision making. People with disabilities, might experience barriers that are different in nature and intensesness from those encountered by people without disabilities (Smith 1987).

Tourism barriers consist of factors which decrease participation and hamper participants' relish. Gladwell and Bedini (2004) have classified constraints into psychological, social and emotional barriers. Concurrently, Crawford and Godbey (1987) and Crawford et al. (1991) identified barriers in three discrete models, (i) intrapersonal, (ii) interpersonal and (iii) structural constraints. Intrapersonal constraints are related to one's psychological state including religious beliefs, states of mind, behaviors and personal factors. Contrary to this, structural constraints involves money, time and lack of opportunities, and interpersonal constraints stem from social interactions with family members, friends, colleagues, neighbors, etc. (Jackson 1993; Jackson et al. 1993).

Smith (1987) handled tourism barriers in three discrete models: Intrapersonal barriers consist of factors like; lack of knowledge, health related problems, social inefficacy, physical and psychological addictions, etc. Environmental barriers involve ecological restrictions, transportation obstacles, rules and regulations. Whereas, transactional barriers involve skill-incompatibility and communication obstacles. The common point of all those studies is the presence of negative direct relation between tourism barriers and intention of disabled people to participate in touristic activities or real participation. So, it is generally accepted that if tourism barriers before people with disabilities were removed, their participation would increase. For this reason, relations between travel barriers (intrapersonal, environmental, transactional constraints, and learned helplessness), travel motivation and travel intention, in special case of people with disabilities are analyzed in this study.

Goal, Extent and Method of the Study

The main goal of the study is to increase accessibility of touristic facilities of Antalya for people with disabilities (Visually, hearing and physically) and raising level of their accessing to tourism facilities. Therefore, it is aimed to contribute to extending tourism season to 12 months in Antalya by developing suggestions which would meet expectations of all stakeholders, determining expectations and tendencies of all parties on supply-demand front for determining and applying service standards which would increase accessibility of tourism facilities. The sub goals of the study that are tied to the main goal are;

- a) Determining alacrity of people with disabilities to travel,
- b) Determining reasons that prevent disabled people from travelling,
- c) Determining travel motivations of people with disabilities,
- d) Measuring expectation and satisfaction levels of disabled people,
- e) Measuring tourism related expectations and satisfactions of accompanists of disabled people,
- f) Determining necessary designs to encourage participation of disabled people to participate tourism mobility according to their disability types.

People with disabilities, their families and professionals who look after them take place on the demand front and travel agencies, tour operators and accommodation businesses take place on the supply front within the scope of this qualitative study. On the demand front of the study, fieldwork is executed on tendencies and expectations of people with disabilities, their families and professionals who look after them about their participation to tourism mobility. Propositions which take place in surveys directed to disabled people, aim to determine barriers which prevent their participation in tourism, reasons why they participate in tourism and their intentions. Besides, various questions take place in the survey to determine movement and participation skills, holiday expectations, satisfaction level and demographic conditions.

Within the scope of the project “Barrier-free Antalya, Barrier-free Tourism”, links between three interrelated notions was tried to be discovered, which influence travel intentions. They are: (1) Travel obstacles (internal, external and transactional) (2) learned helplessness and (3) travel motivation. On the other hand, participation skills, holiday expectations, satisfaction levels from their holiday- if they had and demographic features of disabled people were also studied.

A sampling which would represent the universe was chosen by stratified sampling method in big cities Izmir, Istanbul and Ankara where majority of disabled people (visually, hearing, physically) live (N=239). Besides, in the attendant survey form, questions which aim to specify demographic structure of relatives of disabled people and the professionals who look after them. The survey was conducted to 235 attendants from Izmir, Istanbul and Ankara sampling. Findings of related literature and qualitative studies were utilized to prepare the question forms.

Research Findings

Research findings are derived from analysis results of surveys that are conducted to disabled people and their attendants. Findings derived from aforementioned studies and analyses are given in the following chapters. Average values are given in order to show frequencies, percentage distributions and central tendency where available.

Findings Regarding Visually, Hearing and Physically Disabled People

- a) Demographic Findings Regarding Disabled People

239 disabled persons attended the research from Ankara, Izmir and Istanbul. Number of attendants from those three cities is equal as it can be seen in Table 1. As for the disability types; 33,05% of them are visually impaired, 32,22% are hearing impaired and 34,73 physically handicapped. When reason of disability is analyzed it can be seen that majority of disabilities are innate-hereditary. It is determined that 51,46% of them are middle-aged. Number of males with disabilities (63,18%) is almost double of females (34,73%). As for the educational status; 10,88% of people with disabilities have never gone to school, 39,33% have finished primary school. Proportion of high school graduates is 32,64%, higher education school graduates are 11,3% and university graduates are only 5,86%. If we make remark on education of disabled people, it can be said that, they can benefit from educational facilities enough. When it comes to marital status, more than half of the people with disabilities (55,23%) are single. 43,1% of them declared that their monthly income is less than 1000 TL. 67,36% of people with disabilities, who attended the survey, are out of work life. Answers given to the last questions shows that people with disabilities live in difficult conditions. Doubtlessly, shortage of income would be the greatest obstacle for tourism oriented mobility of disabled people. 51,05% of people with disabilities are members to a non-governmental organization (NGO). This shows that, disabled people try to cling to social life through the organizations they belong to. Their NGO membership ratio is far beyond other people.

Table 1. Demographic Finding about People with Disabilities. (N=239)

		Number	Percentage (%)
Place of Residence	Ankara	76	31,8
	İzmir	82	34,31
	Istanbul	81	33,89
Disability Type	Visually	79	33,05
	Hearing	77	32,22
	Physically	83	34,73
Cause of Disability	Disease in Childhood	61	25,52
	False Treatment	20	8,37
	Innate-Hereditary	112	46,86
	Elderliness	3	1,26
	Accident (Occupational, etc.)	31	12,97
	Others	12	5,02
Age	15-24	41	17,15
	25-34	63	26,36
	35-44	60	25,1
	45-54	53	22,18
	55+	22	9,21
Gender	Female	88	36,82
	Male	151	63,18
Education Status	Never Been to School	26	10,88
	Primary Education	94	39,33
	High School	78	32,64
	Higher Education School	27	11,3
	Bachelor's Degree	14	5,86
Marital Status	Married	90	37,66

	Single	132	55,23
	Widow	17	7,11
Job Status	Yes	78	32,64
	No	161	67,36
Monthly Personal Income	Less than 1000TL	103	43,1
	Between 1001TL-2000TL	31	12,97
	Between 2001TL-3000TL	1	0,42
	N/A (No Answer)	30	12,55
	No Income	74	30,96
Monthly household Income	Less than 1000TL	82	34,31
	Between 1001TL-2000TL	80	33,47
	Between 2001TL-3000TL	20	8,37
	Between 3001TL-4000TL	1	0,42
	N/A (No Answer)	56	23,43
NGO Membership	Yes	122	51,05
	No	117	48,95

Table 2. Mobility and Participation Skills of the Disabled

		Number	Percentage (%)
Ability to use computer	Yes	170	71,13
	No	69	28,87
Ability to use mobile phone	Yes	204	85,36
	No	35	14,64
Ability to make inter provincial journeys	Yes	204	85,36
	No	35	14,64

b) Mobility and Participation Skills

When mobility and participation skills of disabled people is analyzed (Table 2) we conclude that 71,13 of them can use computer and 85,36% can use mobile phones. Besides, 85,36% have declared that they can make inter provincial journeys. This data seems quite favorable. On the other hand, average point of answers given to the 5 point likert scale question about their need for an attendant during their tourism intended travels is calculated to be **3,28**. This average shows that people with disabilities need attendants in general. For this reason, in order to encourage disabled people to join tourism mobility, appropriate ambient should be designed for their attendants as well.

c) Travel and Holiday Organization

Answers of disabled people to the questions about travel and holiday organizations are presented in Table 3. 76,47% of the participants reflected that they go on holidays. Length of their holidays is generally less than 15 days (60,9). Another important finding is that 12,18% of the participants do not go on holidays every year regularly. 56,41% of the people with disabilities do not buy services for their holiday organizations. Organizations of those who get support for their holiday organizations are done by travel agencies (34,72%) and their relatives (22,22%), (Table 3).

Table 3. Finding about Holiday Behavior and Holiday Organizations

		Number	Percentage (%)
Going on holiday	Yes	156	76,47
	No	48	23,53
Length of holidays	15 days or less	95	60,9
	15 days to 1 month	21	13,46
	More than 1 month	21	13,46
	Do not go on holiday every year	19	12,18
Destination preference for holidays	Domestic	151	96,79
	Abroad	5	3,21
Buying service for holiday organizations	Yes	55	35,26
	No	88	56,41
	Occasional	13	8,33
Who organizes holidays	Travel agency	25	34,72
	Get support from relatives	16	22,22
	Others	31	43,05

Table 4. Average Satisfaction Values of Disabled People from Touristic Products and Services

	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation
Accommodation facilities			4,28	1,06
Accessibility of service areas			3,88	1,39
Knowledge and education level of guiding and supporting staff			3,57	1,54
Meeting service demands on time			3,88	1,38
Meeting health related needs on time	1	5	3,79	1,43
Entertainment facilities			3,83	1,40
Ease of urban transportation			3,77	1,48
Presence of facilitating settings			3,20	1,66
Food quality			4,09	1,11
Reasonable pricing			4,01	1,13
Cleanliness and hygiene			4,06	1,22

d) Satisfaction Level from Touristic Services

Descriptive statements as average and standard deviation values, minimum and maximum values according to 5 point scale regarding their satisfaction levels from past holiday experiences are given in Table 4. As the general average value is calculated to be 3,86 for all touristic products and services, it is possible to classify the products and services into two categories as satisfactory and unsatisfactory ones.

According to this classification, products and services that get lower points than the average point are considered to be the unsatisfactory ones, and the ones that get higher points than average point are considered to be the satisfactory products and services. The average values given in Table 4 are close to each other. Products and services like, “knowledge and education level of guiding and supporting staff”, “meeting health related needs on time”, “entertainment facilities”, “ease of urban transportation” and “presence of facilitating settings” have points lower than the average, so they are classified as less satisfactory. On the other hand, “accommodation facilities”, “accessibility of service areas”, “meeting service demands on time”, “quality of food”, “reasonable pricing” and “cleanliness and hygiene” are the products and services that are found to be more satisfactory. According to their average points, “accommodation facilities” is the most satisfactory and “presence of facilitating settings” is the least satisfactory services and products.

Table 5. Average values expectations which would increase their participation to tourism

	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation
Decline of prices			4,62	0,95
Arrangements according to disability levels	1	5	4,62	0,80
Increasing opportunities to go on holiday with family members and attendants			4,45	1,04

e) Basic Expectations that Would Increase Participation to Tourism

Descriptive statistics like minimum and maximum values to 5 point scale, average and standard deviation are given in Table 5. Average values of disabled people’s replies to questions like, decline of prices, new arrangements according to disability type and increasing opportunities to go on holiday with their family members and attendants, are quite high. They remark that making new arrangements in these fields would increase participation to tourism mobility.

f) Expectations of Disabled People from a Good Holiday

When answers about their expectations from a good holiday are in question, it can be seen that (Table 6) highest expectations are going on holiday with their families, going on holiday with their friends and going on holiday on their own, respectively. Their both expect going on holiday on their own, and with their families and friends can be seen as a contradiction. Main reason of this contradiction is their exigency for attendants. But, it can be said that, even if they go on holiday with companions, they are in need of moving independently- alone or with their friends. Besides, they have expectations like doing sports, swimming in sea, and entertaining themselves. There is relatively low expectation on visiting historical places.

Table 6. Average Values Regarding Expectations of Disabled People from a Good Holiday

	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation
A holiday with friends is a good holiday			4,51	0,94
A holiday with family is a good holiday			4,82	0,54
Having a holiday alone is a good holiday			4,56	0,80
Seeing new places	1	5	3,98	1,44
Having rest			3,69	1,42
Entertainment.			4,04	1,31
Swimming in sea			4,15	1,26
Doing sports			4,28	1,06
Visiting historical sites			2,29	1,19

g) Expectations of Physically Disabled People from Accommodation Facilities

Expectations of disabled people from accommodation facilities are questioned separately according to disability types. Expectations of physically disabled people from accommodation facilities are given in Table 7. General average value of expectations is 4,7. “Arrangements in car parks for the disabled”, “accessibility of usage areas by elevators”, “arrangements in restaurants for disabled persons’ access”, “suitability of rooms for staying with attendants”, “special pricing for disabled customers” are in high expectation group, whereas “suitability of rooms and parts of rooms (wc, bathroom, etc) for using wheelchairs in”, “ suitability of slope and width of wheelchair ramps”, “presence of elevator for disabled persons’ in pool area” take place in lower expectation group.

Table 7. Average Values of Expectations of Physically Disabled People Regarding Arrangements in Accommodation Facilities

	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation
Arrangements should be done in car parks for disabled people.			4,86	0,44
General usage areas should be accessible by elevators.			4,84	0,48
Rooms and parts of rooms (WC, bath) should suitable for wheelchair usage.			4,77	0,77
Arrangements should be done in restaurants for disabled people.	1	5	4,82	0,52
Elevators should be built in pool areas.			4,70	0,72
Rooms should be suitable for staying with attendants.			4,82	0,68
Slope and width of wheelchair ramps should be suitable.			4,77	0,70
Staff should be informed enough.			4,78	0,66
Special prices should be applied for disabled people.			4,83	0,46

h) Expectations of Visually Disabled People from Accommodation Facilities

Expectations of visually disabled people from accommodation facilities are given in Table 8. Considering the fact that the general average value is 4,81, expectations like, “Arrangements in car parks for disabled people”, “Accessibility of general usage areas by elevators”, “directions to rooms and parts of rooms (WC, bath, etc) with detectable surface stripes should be available”, “presence of detectable surface stripes in general usage areas”, “presence of audio warning systems” and “knowledge of staff” take place in the higher expectation group and “suitability of rooms for staying with attendants”, “special pricing for disabled people” and “presence of elevator access to pool area” are in the lower expectations group. As it can be seen, arrangements that should be prioritized are different from those of physically disabled persons. This shows that satisfaction of disabled persons from arrangements and regulations would differ according to their disability types.

i) Expectations of People with Hearing Impairment from Accommodation Facilities

Arrangements that people with hearing impairments think should be done within accommodation facilities are given in Table 9. General average value of the expectations is 4,33. Expectations like, “suitability of rooms and parts of rooms (wc, bathroom, etc) for using wheelchairs in”, “presence of flashing alarm systems, to use when necessary or in emergency cases”, “knowledge of the staff” and special pricing for people with disabilities” take place in high expectation group, and answers with lower values than average, like “suitability of rooms for staying with attendants”, “arrangements for disabled people in car parks”, “accessibility of general usage areas by elevators”, “presence of written direction signs” are in low expectations group. The prominent subject here is necessity of making the arrangements and regulations in accordance with guest profiles and expectations of groups of people with different disabilities.

Table 8. Average Values of Expectations of Visually Impaired People from Accommodation Facilities Regarding Arrangement to be done

	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation
Arrangements should be done in car parks for disabled people.			4,86	0,44
General usage areas should be accessible by elevators and there should be buttons with braille in elevators.			4,84	0,48
Directions to rooms and parts of rooms (WC, bath, etc) with detectable surface stripes should be available	1	5	4,77	0,77
There should be detectable surface coating throughout general usage areas.			4,82	0,52
Elevators should be built in pool areas.			4,70	0,72
Rooms should be suitable for staying with attendants.			4,82	0,68
There should be audio warning systems.			4,77	0,70
Staff should be informed enough.			4,78	0,66
Special pricing should be applied for people with disabilities.			4,83	0,46

Table 9. Average Values of Expectations of People with Hearing Impairment from Accommodation Facilities Regarding Necessary Arrangements

	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation
Arrangements should be done in car parks for disabled people.			4,13	1,36
There should be written direction signs in rooms and parts of rooms (wc, bathroom)			4,36	1,18
There should be written direction signs in general usage areas.	1	5	4,30	1,18
Rooms should be suitable for staying with attendants.			4,09	1,28
There should be flashing alarm systems, to use when necessary or in emergency cases.			4,36	1,18
Staff should be informed enough.			4,47	0,94
Special pricing should be applied for disabled people.			4,66	0,78

j) Major Travel Obstacles before Disabled People

Average values of travel obstacles of participant persons with disabilities are given in Table 10. Travel obstacles are split into groups like, internal obstacles, transactional obstacles, external obstacles and learned helplessness. General average of internal obstacles group is 2,50. Average of transactional obstacles group is found to be 2,69. Average value of external obstacles group is 3,97. General average value of learned helplessness, which is considered to be one of the major obstacles, is 1,95. Finally, average value of travel intention is calculated to be 3,92. When average values are evaluated, it can be seen that the most important obstacles before travelling of disabled people take place in external obstacles group. These obstacles are; environmental arrangements, transportation facilities and physical conditions. Participant persons with disabilities do not consider other disability groups as obstacles for them to travel. Besides, they are very purposeful for travelling.

Table 10. Average Values of Travel Obstacles and Travel Intentions of Disabled People

	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation
INTERNAL OBSTACLES				
I am afraid of doing something on my own.			2,20	1,42
I am afraid of being with other people.			1,83	1,15
Joining tourism mobility requires being more skilful than I am.			2,63	1,44
I am afraid of disturbing other people if I join tourism mobility.	1	5	2,46	1,46
The idea of being in need of other people to help me to do something disturbs me.			2,73	1,45
I will encounter too many rules and regulations if I join tourism mobility.			3,16	1,39
I am destitute of knowledge that would prevent my being uncomfortable and uneasy.			2,48	1,39
TRANSACTIONAL OBSTACLES				
The thought, that I would be exposed to pitying glances of other people if I join tourism mobility, disturbs me.			2,67	1,44

I am afraid of being ignored by other people if I join tourism mobility.			2,56	1,38
I am afraid of being hurt by other people if I join tourism mobility.			2,58	1,40
I am afraid of being centre of other people's attention if I join tourism mobility.	1	5	2,46	1,38
To feel excessively protected would disturb me if I join tourism mobility.			2,91	1,49
Excessive politeness of other people would disturb me if I join tourism mobility.			2,71	1,46
Feeling prejudices of other people would make me feel uneasy if I join tourism mobility.			3,07	1,42
I am afraid of experiencing communication obstacles if I join tourism mobility.			2,90	1,50
I do not think that I can harmonize with other people when I join tourism mobility.			2,38	1,39
EXTERNAL OBSTACLES				
Physical conditions are insufficient in touristy regions.			3,82	1,27
Disabled oriented arrangements and facilities are insufficient in touristy regions.			4,19	1,09
Environmental conditions are inconvenient in touristy regions.	1	5	3,90	1,23
Transportation means for disabled people are insufficient in touristy regions.			3,97	1,18
LEARNED HELPLESSNESS				
Joining tourism mobility is not an activity which would make me happy.			2,00	1,21
Being a tourist would put a strain on me and give me pain.			2,02	1,25
Being a tourist would put me in a gloomy mood.	1	5	1,79	1,12
Far be it from me to be a tourist.			1,94	1,22
There cannot be a peaceful and comfortable tourism medium for me.			1,99	1,23
TRAVEL INTENTION				
If I find an opportunity to be a tourist, I will use it right away.	1	5	3,98	1,26
I will go to any lengths to improve my skills for travelling.			3,87	1,22

k) Travel Motivations of Disabled People

Disabled persons' general average value of travel motivations is quite high at 4,36. Disabled people who took part in the research have very high motivations for travelling. Having rest, entertainment, cutting loose from physical and psychological oppression and sharing something new with their beloved ones are relatively higher motivations.

Table 11. Average Values of Disabled People' Travel Motivations

	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Average Value	Standard Deviation
Entertainment			4,42	0,83
Experiencing different things			4,33	0,97
Perceiving special ambient of touristy places			4,18	1,05

Visiting places in touristy regions that overlap with my fields of interest			4,32	0,92
Taking rest and relaxing			4,50	0,81
Cutting loose from physical and psychological oppression of daily life			4,46	0,86
Resting my head and recessing the race against time			4,44	0,85
Sharing something new with my beloved ones	1	5	4,51	0,80
Coming together with people, with whom share common interests			4,43	0,86
Being able to move independently			4,28	1,02
Enjoying nature and view			4,41	0,92
Learning new things			4,38	0,91
Coming to gather with people from different cultures			4,34	0,99
Looking for adventure and excitement			4,03	1,22
Developing my skills and abilities			4,29	1,01
Getting in touch with other people (Feeling the sense of belonging to a group)			4,31	0,98
Developing new perspectives on life			4,31	1,01
Having peace of mind			4,51	0,86

1) Relations between Variables (Correlation Analysis)

In this part, relations between obstacles to travel, intentions to travel and motivations to travel are studied by correlation analysis. According to the obtained data, there is a positive relation between travel intentions and travel motivations at level of 56% (Table 12). This figure shows us that disabled persons with high travel motivations also have high travel intentions. On the other hand, there is a negative correlation between travel obstacles and travel intention (Table 13). Travel obstacles have adverse impact on travel intention. There is a negative correlation between travel obstacles and travel motivations, as well (Table 14). Travel obstacles have adverse impact on travel motivations, too.

Table 12. Coefficient of Correlation between Travel Motivation and Travel Intention

		Travel Intention	Travel Motivation
Travel Intention	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	1	0,561*
	Sig.(2-tailed)		,000
	N	239	239
Travel Motivation	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	0,561*	1
	Relevance	,000	
	N	239	239

* Correlation coefficient is relevant at $p = 0.01$ level.

Table 13. Coefficient of Correlation between Travel Obstacles and Travel Intention

	Travel Intention	Travel Obstacles
--	------------------	------------------

Travel Intention	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	1	-0,253*
	Sig.(2-tailed)		,000
	N	239	239
Travel Obstacles	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	-0,253*	1
	Relevance	,000	
	N	239	239

* Correlation coefficient is relevant at $p = 0.01$ level.

Table 14. Coefficient of Correlation between Travel Obstacles and Travel Motivation

		Travel Obstacles	Travel Motivation
Travel Obstacles	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	1	-0,273*
	Sig.(2-tailed)		,000
	N	239	239
Travel Motivation	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	-0,273*	1
	Relevance	,000	
	N	239	239

* Correlation coefficient is relevant at $p = 0.01$ level.

Table 15. Demographic Findings Regarding Attendants (N=235)

		Number	Percentage
Place of residence	Ankara	75	31,91
	Izmir	76	32,34
	Istanbul	84	35,74
Disability type provide support for	Visual	75	31,91
	Hearing	81	34,47
	Physical	79	33,62
	1 st degree relative (mother, father, sibling)	164	69,79
Affinity to the disabled person he/she supports	2 nd degree relative (aunt, nephew, niece)	32	13,62
	Neighbor	18	7,66
	No kinship - volunteer	16	6,81
Gender	No kinship - paid	5	2,13
	Female	159	67,66
	Male	76	32,34
Education	Uneducated	25	10,64
	Primary education	79	33,62
	High school education	78	33,19
	Associate's degree	19	8,09
	Bachelor's degree	30	12,77
NGO membership	Postgraduate	4	1,7
	Yes	47	20

	No	188	80
Working condition	Yes	107	45,53
	No	128	54,47
Social security	Yes	186	79
	No	49	21

Demographic Findings about Attendants of People with Disabilities

Demographic findings about attendants of participants with disabilities are given in Table 15. 69,79 % of attendants are first degree relatives of persons with disabilities. If second degree relatives are added to this party, 83,41 % of all people with disabilities are looked after by their relatives. Proportion of the ones who cared by a paid professional is only 2,13 %. More than half of the attendants (66,66 %) are females. It is a remarkable fact that education level of attendants is low. Contrary to persons with disabilities, 80 % of attendants are not members to any NGOs. 79 % of them have social security.

Results and Suggestions

Results and suggestions based on research findings to increase accessibility of touristic facilities and accessing level from tourism possibilities of disabled people (visually, hearing, physically) in Antalya are given in this part of the study.

- a) Important findings are reached when demographic conditions of participants with disabilities are studied. A very important finding show up, when we study the reason of disability, though it is not directly related with the purpose of this study. The research shows us that majority of disabilities of the participants are innate. More than half of the people with disabilities are middle-aged. Education levels are low in general and more than half of them are single. Majority of them are out of working life. Most of them take place in low income group, in terms of monthly personal and household income. Briefly, these results show us the fact that people with disabilities live under difficult circumstances in general. Having low income is the major barrier before disabled persons that prevent their participation to tourism mobility. 51,05% of people with disabilities are members to an NGO according to their disability type. This shows that disabled people try to keep up with social life via their NGO memberships.
- b) Majority of participants with disabilities can use mobile phones and computers; they can also go on interurban travels. However, researches show that disabled persons need attendants while travelling. This fact reveals that it is hard to consider disabled persons' tourism aimed travels without their family members and attendants.
- c) Although majority of disabled people do not have the opportunity to go on holidays every year regularly, they note that they are unable to have holidays longer than 15 days and they organize their holidays by themselves. This reveals the fact that, tourism aimed travels of disabled people is not organized. Therefore, they cannot benefit from advantages of pre-organized package tours like other people do. Undoubtedly, the reasons for their being unable to get service for holiday organizations are their insufficient income level and rareness of travel agencies and tour operators which provide service for disabled people.
- d) It is possible to classify touristic products and services as satisfactory and unsatisfactory ones when past holiday experiences of disabled people are examined. According to this classification, the most satisfactory products and services based on past holiday experiences of people with disabilities are; accommodation facilities, access to service areas, meeting service needs and demands on time, food quality, convenience of prices, cleanliness and hygiene. On the other hand, products and services classified as less satisfactory are as follows; knowledge and ed-

education of guidance and support staff, meeting health related needs and demands on time, entertainment facilities, urban transportation means and presence of facilitating settings for people with disabilities.

- e) Persons with disabilities remark that, decline of prices, new arrangements according to disability types and possibilities of going on holidays with family members and attendants would increase participation of disabled people to tourism mobility. It is important to make improvements in these fields with public and private sector co-operation.
- f) When average values of questions regarding expectations of disabled people from a good holiday are studied; beginning from the highest expectations respectively; going on holidays with their families, with their friends and on their own. It can be seen as a dilemma, their having expectations to go on holidays on their own and also having expectations to go on holidays with their families. Main reason of that is their need for attendants. But, even if they go on holidays with their attendants, it can be said that they are in need of moving independently on their own or with their friends. Besides their expectations on doing training, swimming and entertainment are also high. Seeing historical places is less expected. Even though it is hard for disabled people to travel without their attendants and families, they want to move independently when they are on holiday in touristic places. That is why new arrangements are highly necessary which would enable disabled people going on holidays as other people. Furthermore, disabled people wish for entertainment and sports activities within holiday packages, which will be prepared for them.
- g) Necessary setting and arrangements in accommodation facilities are asked to participants separately according to their disability types. Each group with different disabilities have different expectations about arrangements to be done in accommodation facilities, but averages of all disability groups' answers to the questions about arrangements are quite high. This means, they highly agree with the idea of making below arrangements. The prominent arrangements that disabled think they are necessary are as follows:
 - Making necessary setting and arrangements in car parks,
 - Accessibility of general usage areas of accommodation facilities by elevators,
 - Making arrangements in restaurants for disabled persons' access,
 - Rooms' being suitable to stay in with attendants,
 - Special pricing for the good of disabled people,
 - Rooms' and parts of rooms' (wc, bathroom) being suitable for using wheelchairs in,
 - Wheelchair ramps' being with suitable slope and width,
 - Placing elevators for disabled near pool areas,
 - Presence of audio warning systems,
 - Instructing the staff,
 - Detectable warning surface applications general usage areas,
 - Presence of flashing alarm systems in rooms for using when needed or in emergency cases
 - Written direction signboards in general usage areas.
- h) According to the research, disabled people are highly intending to travel, which shows that there is a high disabled tourist potential in big cities of Turkey like Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir. When demographic variables of persons with disabilities analyzed, it is obvious that families and attendants of disabled persons have quite little income, but this does not affect travel intentions of disabled persons negatively. Thus, new legislations and incentive regulations are highly necessary in order to ease disabled persons' tourism aimed travels.

- i) When we analyze obstacles of disabled people to travel, we see that their major complaint is about external (environmental) obstacles. External obstacles form the biggest barrier before touristic aimed travels of disabled people. Disabled people do not see internal or transactional obstacles as strong before barriers before their travels for touristic purposes. On the other, it is determined that learned helplessness, which is accepted as one of major travel obstacles is not seen so by people with disabilities. Despite presence of many constraints, disabled people do not feel themselves desperate.
- j) Travel motivations of participants to the research have been found to be quite high. Taking rest, having fun, cutting loose from physical and psychological pressure and sharing something in common are the motivations with highest average values.
- k) Relations between travel intentions, travel obstacles and travel motivations have been analyzed. According to the analyses done by correlation analyses method, there is a positive relation between travel motivation and travel intention, and there are negative relations between travel obstacles and travel motivation, and travel intention and travel obstacles. To make a general assessment, we can assume that removing travel barriers will lead to increase in travel motivation and this will increase travel intention.
- l) When demographic variables of attendants are analyzed, we face the fact that 83,41% of attendants are first or second degree relatives of the disabled. Only 2,3% of people with disabilities are looked after by paid professionals. Majority of attendants are women and poorly educated. Nearly half of the attendants of disabled persons are in work life and 79% are under social security. To make an evaluation here in accordance with the purpose of the study, in order to ease participation of disabled people to tourism mobility, their families must be supported as well.

Suggestions on Antalya's Being Able to Become an Accessible Tourism Destination

- a) Tourists with and without disabilities, who visit Antalya should be able to get touristic products and services together.
- b) Special products and services should be prepared peculiar to disabled tourists in the region.
- c) The infrastructure of the region should be modified in order to conform to international disability standards.
- d) Superstructure facilities in the region should be conforming to international standards for disabilities.
- e) Tourists with disabilities should be able to benefit from touristic products and services from a service chain designed according to disability types.
- f) A holistic and participatory administration model should be developed in the region for planning and practicing new arrangements to enable people with disabilities join touristic activities.
- g) Expectations of different disability groups (hearing, visually, physically) from tourism should be determined well.
- h) Disabled people should participate themselves in product and service developing processes.
- i) Legal legislations of a sustainable financial incentive to encourage disabled people to join tourism mobility should be prepared.
- j) An analysis should be performed on international and national accessible tourism demand.
- k) In order to develop accessible tourism various incentives (VAT exemption, long-term credits with low interest rates, etc.) should be provided to tourism businesses by the government.

- l) Various social tourism projects should be developed to ensure disabled people's utilization from tourism.
- m) In accordance with demands of disabled tourists, products and services enriched with special and indigenous cultural values should be developed.
- n) Businesses that conform to accessible tourism standards should be certified by ministry of tourism under titles like "Disabled-friendly hotel".
- o) In all tourism related education institutions, lessons about accessible tourism should be added to curriculum.
- p) All touristic establishments' employees in the region should be trained on service standards of accessible tourism.
- q) All national and international stake-holders should contribute to preparation of Antalya for accessible tourism.
- r) Special transportation and accommodation means should be planned in order to facilitate accessibility of tourism establishments for tourists with disabilities.
- s) Disabled NGOs should take active roles in decision making and supervising processes while developing the region for accessible tourism.
- t) New legislations should be adopted to encourage disability-friendly touristic businesses.
- u) Co-operation of public and private sectors is of crucial importance to develop accessible tourism.
- v) Educations should be provided for people who will be employed in accessible tourism businesses.
- w) Because of current costs and administrative infrastructure, it is difficult to re-arrange Antalya for barrier-free tourism rapidly, so priorities must be determined well.

Consequently, in order to develop accessible tourism, which is very comprehensive and multifaceted, and meet the demands, it is crucial for public institutions, NGOs, universities and tourism establishments to work cooperatively and in coordination. In this context, actualizing universally designed accessible tourism plans and standards within tourism master plan is the primary and basic condition of this process.

References

1. Aberraine, R.I. (1995). "Proposals and guide-lines for the carriage of elderly and disabled persons by air." *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(3), 52-59.
2. Bahar, O. and Kozak, M. (2008). *Turizm Ekonomisi*. Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.
3. Cavinato, J.L., & Cucukovich, M.L. (1992). "Transportation and tourism for the disabled: an assessment." *Transportation Journal*, 31(3), 46-53.
4. Crawford, D. W., & Godbey, G. (1987). "Reconceptualizing barriers to family leisure." *Leisure Sciences*, 9(2), 119-128.
5. Crawford, D. W., Jackson, E. L. and Godbey, G. (1991). "A hierarchical model of leisure constraints." *Leisure Sciences*, 13(4), 309-320.
6. Daniels, M. J., Rodgers, E. D. and 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.
7. Darcy, S. (2002). "Marginalized participation: physical disability, high support needs and tourism." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 9(1), 61-72.
8. Gladwell, N. Y. and Bedini, L. A. (2004). "In search of lost leisure: the impact of care giving on leisure travel." *Tourism Management*, 25, 685-693.
9. UN.(2006). *Some Facts about Persons with Disabilities*.

- <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/facts.shtml> (accessed November 01,2013)
10. TUIK.(2002). Turkey Disability Survey. <http://kutuphane.tuik.gov.tr/pdf/0014899.pdf>. (accessed October15, 2013)
 11. Israeli, A. A. (2002). "A preliminary investigation of the importance of site accessibility factors for disabled tourists." *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(1), 101-104.
 12. Jackson, E. L. (1993). "Recognizing patterns of leisure constraints: results from alternative analyses." *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25, 129-149.
 13. Jackson, E. L., Crawford, D. W. and Godbey, G. (1993). "Negotiations of leisure constraints." *Leisure Sciences*, 15, 1-11.
 14. Mckercher, B., Packer, T., Yau, M. K. and Lam, P. (2003). "Travel agents as facilitators or inhibitors of travel: perceptions of people with disabilities." *Tourism Management*, 24, 465-474.
 15. Nicassio, P., Wallston, K., Callahan, L., Herbert, M. and Pincus, T. (1985). "The measurement of helplessness in rheumatoid arthritis: the development of the Arthritis Helplessness Index." *Journal of Rheumatology*, 12, 462-467.
 16. Olalı, H., Timur, A. (1998). Turizm Ekonomisi. Ofis Ticaret Matbaacılık, İzmir.
 17. Schlaffino, K. and Revenson, T. (1995). "Why me? The persistence of negative appraisals over the course of illness." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 601-619.
 18. Sezgin, O.M. and Acar, Y. (1991). Turizm. Baştem Yayınları, No.1, Ankara.
 19. Shaw, G. And Coles, T. (2004). "Disability, holiday-making and the tourism industry in the U.K.: a preliminary survey." *Tourism Management*, 25, 397-403.
 20. Smith, R.W. (1987). "Leisure of disabled tourists: barriers to travel." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(3), 376-389.
 21. Usta, Ö. 2001. Genel Turizm. Anadolu Matbaacılık, İzmir.
 22. Yarcan, Ş. 1994. Turizm endüstrisinin yapısı. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayını, İstanbul.
 23. Yau, M. K., Mckercher, B. And Packer, T. L. (2004). "Traveling with disability: more than an access issue." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(4), 946-960.