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Accessibility and inclusion in tourism have increasingly gained attention in the last decades. However, the research has until recently focused mainly on single viewpoint of the phenomenon. That is the one of physical accessibility. While the development has been positive, there still has not been a lot of research done on accessibility in tourism, which would cover the wide range of viewpoints around accessibility. Along the physical viewpoint, these include also economic, cultural, communicational and political viewpoints, for instance.

Previous studies show that there is certain movement towards tourism for all, which is a wider approach to accessible tourism following the line of thought of design for all. This study aims at addressing a notion that would go beyond tourism for all, accessible hospitality. This notion was developed at Multidimensional Tourism Institute (MTI) during a project that highlighted diversity among tourists. The general aim of this study is to investigate the concept of accessible hospitality by using intersectionality as an approach. Intersectionality has had a minor role in tourism studies, and the research has mainly focused on the viewpoint of the host communities.

Intersectionality takes into account the people’s various backgrounds that place them in different positions in terms of power relations within the society. This study focuses on social media discussions between tourism companies, rainbow tourists and non-rainbow tourists. The data is collected netnography. By approaching the issue of accessible hospitality and the rainbow tourist through intersectionality the study helps understanding accessibility and inclusion in tourism from a broader viewpoint. A discourse analysis is conducted understand how accessible hospitality is generated in social media content between tourism companies and customers.

As a result, three different discourses are constructed and further elaborated for future implications. The study pilots a deeper, more insightful and complex approach to accessibility in tourism by using intersectional approach. Ethical viewpoints include issues with addressing minorities as well as using netnography.
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1. Introduction

Tourism should be seen as a human right. This notion I base on the thought that people have a fundamental right to rest and freedom of movement (see The Universal Declaration of Human Rights.) The basis of my thesis is on the idea of equality and equity regardless of people’s personal traits, religion, sexuality, age and ethnicity for example.

In this thesis, I take part in discussing the right to movement, rest and freedom of LGBTIQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex and Questioning/Queer) community, rainbow community. There has been quite a lot of movement on the rainbow scene during the past decades, which has had an impact on tourism scene as well. In terms of rainbow tourism, for instance Helsinki pride 2017 has inspired various companies to make a rainbow colored gestures in social media as a symbol of support for rainbow tourist. This is a marketing message, but it is seen also a statement. Consequently, there has been some critical voices. It has been questioned for instance, if rainbow theme can be used in marketing. If yes, who is allowed to do that? Are these gestures only commercial, or are they also political? Who is actually allowed to speak for rainbow people and if we include them, do we at the same time exclude some other people? Is holistic inclusion even possible? All the questions support my point that there is a need for a study that clarifies what inclusion or accessible hospitality means for different people, in this case for tourism companies, rainbow community and other customers.

In an ideal scenario, we would not have to organize Pride events or demonstrations to defend people’s rights, but until then, until rainbow colors are in a way trivialized, we need various different voices for these themes, both in academia and in everyday practices. Thus, we have to open new discussions that include the rainbow themes, but do not concentrate merely on the purchase power of the target market, “the pink dollar” (see e.g. UNWTO, 2012, p. 8; Hughes, 2006a, pp. 2—3). Indeed, much of the research done concerning rainbow tourism has been dealing with purchasing power of the rainbow community. Research has been made for instance for clarifying what are their product preferences are and what kind of marketing should be targeted to this market.

Bringing together the concepts of broad understanding of accessibility, hospitality and rainbow tourism, this study expands the somewhat unidimensional viewpoint to the rainbow tourists. Rainbow community is no monolith either.
1.1 From market value to accessible hospitality

There has not been much research made concerning accessibility and inclusion in tourism in the context of the rainbow community. However, it is an accessibility issue as well. In this chapter, I introduce the context of this study.

In general, one could think that discriminating behavior increases due to ignorance, and following this line of thought, one could argue that the more familiar people become with diversity, the less they would feel a need to discriminate, oppress or even act violently towards others. This phenomenon relates to Skeggs’ (2014) notion of the *cosmopolitan*, who takes the privilege of understanding difference. Rossi (2012, p. 23) explains cosmopolitanism as cultural mobility, so this seems to be an appropriate term, when talking about acceptance and how it is enhanced by mobility. Although cosmopolitanism is also used to with critical tension, in this sense, I would see it having positive side effects as well.

There is significant amount of research made about accessible tourism. However, the studies of the view accessibility from a very narrow viewpoint, which leaves a substantial amount of information unnoticed. In search of a wider notion of accessible tourism, this study continues previous work I have conducted in research and development team in the Multidimensional tourism institute (MTI) (see e.g. Harju-Myllyaho & Kyyrä, 2013; Harju-Myllyaho & Jutila, 2016). During this work, we defined the notion of *accessible hospitality*, which represents a practice that takes into consideration the needs of the customer, but not just from the viewpoint of physical accessibility, but the other viewpoints to accessibility as well. These viewpoints are political, socio-economic, and cultural for instance. Accessible hospitality as an idea or a notion includes attitudes, which might get in the way of receiving hospitable service. (Harju-Myllyaho & Jutila, 2016.)

Hospitality as a process should cover the tourists’ journey starting before and ending after the travel takes place. There are indeed many possible customer groups that might suffer from lack of consideration or even discrimination and these groups might become (economically) important in the near future. One of the reasons for tourism as an industry and a field of study is not overcoming the inequalities, according to Morgan and Cole (2010, p. 213) is that it has traditionally focused on those who participate instead of those who do not.
1.2 Purpose of the study

As described above, the theoretical and practical background of this study includes discussions concerning accessible tourism, tourism for all and inclusion in tourism. There are various studies made concerning these topics, but many of them are restricted almost solely to the physical viewpoint of accessibility (see e.g. Eichhorn, 2014). Accessibility in this thesis includes also political, cultural, social and economic and viewpoints, following the writings of e.g. Darcy & Buhalis (2011, p. 27) as well as Jutila & Harju-Myllyaho (2017). Consequently, the number of people suffering from the exclusive structures that are possibly reproduced in or reinforced by tourism, is more significant than one would first think. In this study, I use intersectionality as an approach, which offers a framework, through which accessible hospitality in the context of the rainbow tourists can be understood in a broader way.

The study aims to explore how some groups of people might be seen possessing different subject positions, but also how the World is seen from these positions. In practice, the study deals with the notion of accessible hospitality and how it is generated together between the companies and the customers in tourism social media sites. This includes the people, who do not belong to the special target group, but are a taking part in social media discussions.

I approach this task with following questions:

1. What are the discourses that prevail in social media content generated by tourism companies and LGBTIQ customers in the context of tourism and accessible hospitality?

2. What are the discourses that can be constructed from the social media content generated by tourism companies and non-LGBTIQ customers?

3. How is accessible hospitality reflected in the online communication of tourism companies and their customers?

The study leans on critical approach in tourism (see e.g. Ateljevic, Morgan and Pritchard eds., 2007), which supports my initial idea of producing knowledge that supports equality. Critical tourism research does not only ask what is, but also what should be. If that is not the greatest reason for research, then what is? Research should not be without a purpose. Accessibility in terms of rainbow tourists also helps gaining a new viewpoint for discussing power relations between rainbow tourist, mainstream tourists and service providers. According to Caton (2014, p. 129), feminist discussions have opened doors for more diverse research aiming for more
than mere data transmission. These discussions or encounters, according to her, have even potential pedagogical capacity. They are spaces, in which we are obliged to care about one another (Caton 2014, p. 129.) Thus, within critical or feminist research, it is allowed, if not even advisable, to use research to contribute to change. I regard this one of the most important purposes of this study. Indeed, Anttonen, Lemiäinen & Liljeström (2000, p. 16) state that along with its multidisciplinary nature, feminism is also openly political. It produces visions and requires change. (Anttonen et al., 2000, p. 16.)

Ateljevic, Pritchard and Morgan (2007, p. 13) write that there is space for tourism research that concentrates in tourism identities, relationships, mobilities and consumptions. There are studies made on the body, gender, and post-structural, but they have remained to the margins of the tourism studies. Johnston (2005, p. 2) claims, that this is among other things due to the historical position of tourism research, which is basically seen as a fun industry related to leisure and holidays, and therefore lacks credibility in academia. This position is further compensated by privileging of rational, objective, masculine and heterosexual perspectives. (Johnston, 2005, p. 2.) This might be a logical explanation to the fact that tourism is not often studied with critical perspectives.

In particular, I focus on communication between tourism companies and the extended rainbow tourism market, which includes also the allies. The study paints a more complex picture about accessible tourism and tourism for all by including the viewpoint of rainbow tourism (also known as LGBTIQ). The study provides one stepping-stone for tourism industry to be able to proceed from accessible tourism discussions towards a notion that would be genuinely inclusive and hospitable towards all.

According to Caruana and Crane (2011, p. 1495), tourism is inevitably tied up in to the idea of freedom. More specifically, they state

_Thus, the motivations, activities and experiences of tourists are embedded in cultural knowledge about freedom: how to get it; where it is available; what its limits are; and what it offers to those who realize it._ (Caruana & Crane, 2011, p. 1495).

It is through brochures, advertisements and other forums that tourism texts disseminate a romanticized view of the vacation: the vacation being an essential element for personal liberation. (Caruana & Crane, 2011, p. 1495.) Aitchison (2001) declares that global consumption continuously tests and contests issues of power and representation. This applies also to the tourism
context, since tourism is a scene, which is acting in the forefront of global consumerism. Indeed, many issues can be studied through tourism.

Definition of hospitality depends on language and culture. Also it seems to be something that we all believe we know so much about, whether we work in or study the industry or not. The notion of accessible hospitality has not been thoroughly investigated, but it incorporates an idea that while the concept of hospitality refers to the welcoming attitude towards strangers, accessibility and inclusion are not necessarily a part of it by default. McCabe (2009, p. 669) concludes that there is a clear need to gain more information about people, who are excluded from participation in tourism; their motivations, circumstances. Intersectionality can in this sense, be a link between accessibility and hospitality. In the data, I seek to identify indications of intersectionality as a viewpoint and try to understand accessible hospitality using intersectional approach.

1.3 Methodological and theoretical approach

In this thesis, I apply netnography as a methodological approach (see Kozinet, 2015). Netnography as a method relates to ethnography, hence the name. However, more specifically put, in netnography, data is collected from online advertisements and social media. Caruana and Crane (2011, p. 1496) state, tourism texts that are produced by the tourism industry provide an important sources of cultural knowledge and making meaning, which can provide insights to tourists’ experiences of freedom. In similar sense, tourism texts can provide information on the perceptions of accessibility. I conducted the data collection during 2016-2017 from online discussions of tourism and hospitality companies, which are granted Gay Friendly Helsinki label. Two companies gained my attention due to their vast and open communication and those two I selected for a closer investigation: Hotel Helka and DTM Helsinki. In addition, I included TUI (previously Finnmatkat) to the data, because of the versatile discussions concerning rainbow tourists group in the company Facebook page.

During the thesis work, I have followed social media discussions for over a year and during that time, there has been innumerable interesting discussions in social media. The amount of cases dealing with rainbow communities and rainbow tourists has increased significantly, and the cases imply that there are different viewpoints to hospitality. To make sense of these dis-
cussions, I apply discourse analysis. It provides understanding how people talk about hospitality and accessibility and what kind of discourses they use to reflect with their viewpoints. What hospitality means to people with different backgrounds can be discovered by analyzing the discourses that take place in social media.

The data I analyze by using discourse analysis, since it provides a tool for identifying not only social relations, but also single discussions in relation to larger societal discourses. Thus it can provide answers to the question how the target group accepts the messages and how others users of the online space are responding to them and why. Caruana and Crane (2011, p. 1504) site Parker [1992] as they write that the reader is constructed as a certain type of subject by a discourse. This applies in both in terms what they are and what they can become.

As theoretical approach in the study, I use intersectionality, which is familiar from critical feminism. Indeed, intersectionality is a feminist approach, but it focuses on multiple dimensions of identity instead of being constrained with only female/male binary. (e.g. Crenshaw, 2006.) Concerning hospitality, feminist theories have been used mostly in describing and understanding the situation of the host, not the guest (see e.g. Jennings, 2009, p. 47). One example is Collins’ (2002 as sited in Bhavnani & Talcott, 2012, p. 645) research on the lives of gay men in Malate and Eremita. Her aim was to view specific interconnections among gay life, tourism, urban space and globalization, but in addition, she wanted to address class relationships. In this thesis, however, I take also the viewpoint of the customer and attempt to understand, how the idea of this feminist approach is used to make tourism services more accessible, hospitable and in the end, of better quality. If not for all, at least for most.

1.4 Structure of the study

In the next chapters, I organize this thesis as follows. I first introduce the terms and concepts, as they form the theoretical backbone of the study. These terms were roughly decided in the beginning of the research, but as I have progressed with the study, also the terminology has diversified and become more robust. In chapter two, I focus on rainbow community and rainbow tourism. In chapter three, I focus on accessibility and inclusion: what it means and how it has previously been studied. The chapter will start from a wide concept of accessibility and inclusion and narrows down to cover tourism and hospitality. In chapter four, I introduce the intersectionality as the approach of the thesis. I clarify the meaning of discourse of this thesis
in chapter five. Chapter six introduces the findings of the study. Figure 1 presents the overall picture of the study, where I use the approach of intersectionality as an approach to study the notion of accessible hospitality in the context of rainbow tourism.

Figure 1. General picture of the study
2 Acronyms and rainbows

In 2015, I visited ITB Berlin, one of the most important European travel fairs, and took time to investigate the rainbow tourism section. I was surprised with the unidimensional image that the whole section presented about the target group, which for many of us represents the very essence of tolerance towards difference. Liberal values that are at least on the surface, a prominent feature of the rainbow community, create a prospect of a diverse and tolerant heterogenic group. I have to point out though, that there are studies stating that being gay does not necessarily mean that the person would not represent and support the white patriarchal worldview. (e.g. Nast 2002). This issue is also brought up by Pakkanen (2007, pp.15—6), who writes that the pressure of “coming out” has been criticized of enhancing “normalizing discourse”, which, consequently, means that the gay people coming out (from the closet) are supposed to be attractive and have heterosexual middleclass appearance. (Pakkanen, 2007, pp. 15 —16.) Thus, the way the ITB Berlin rainbow tourism section was set might reproduce the role that the society gives to the rainbow community.

There is an on-going discussion concerning the terminology and concepts of sexuality and gender. Thus, the terms and concepts used to describe the rainbow community vary according to the user and purpose and therefore it is relevant to go through some of the basic concepts. The acronym LGBTIQ stands for Lesbian, Gay, Bi, Trans, Intersex, and Questioning/Queer. According to Seta, LGBTI rights association in Finland, people usually have a gender identity and sexual orientation. Gender is a cultural, juridical and biological entity. It is most of all an issue that is based on people’s own experience. People are not just men and women. They can be simultaneously both, neither or something in between. Every person has a right to their own gender identity and sexual orientation. Respectively, people have the right to define the way they want to be addressed. (Seta – LGBTI rights in Finland, 2016, pp.4—5.) Johnston (2005, p. 3) discusses gender/sex dichotomy and how they are emerging in tourism studies through discussions of embodiment. She draws on queer theory, stating that heteronormativity can have a blatant or subtle way of tainting the way social scientists think and write about sexuality.

Gender- and sexual minorities is a sufficient concept, when discussing the rainbow people, but there are also other terms that can be used as hypernyms. Most common way is to use the acronym LGBTI or GLBTI. Sometimes letter Q is added to the end to stand for Queer or Questioning. Sometimes Queer is used as a synonym for LGBTI. Occasionally there is also a letter
A, which would stand for Asexual or Ally. (Seta – LGBTI rights in Finland 2016, p. 5.) The letter A is very significant, since as a community the LGBTIQ is quite small, but with the allies, who support equal rights of people regardless of sexuality and gender, the number of people in this group is larger. The Allies can also be expected to have a similar world view than the LGBTIQ people and, thus, could be targeted with similar marketing messages.

This acronym is a genuine symbol of the diversity of sexual and gender identities. In Finland, and internationally, it is common to refer to LGBTIQ people as “rainbow” community. Rainbow flag is also an international symbol and rainbow colors have high symbolic value in the LGBTIQ community. Waitt and Markwell (2014, pp. 1—3) describe the arrival of the term rainbow to LGBTIQ scene. The symbolic originates from Wizard of Oz, where Dorothy wanted to travel “somewhere over the rainbow”. Heteronormativity in the society enhances gay men’s search for home. Land of Oz has provided them a gay homeland, which they have not found at their parental homes. Story of Dorothy in Wizard of Oz is appealing for many of oppressed groups. This is because of the sense of belonging, the unhappiness in the family home and the desire to go “over the rainbow”(Waitt & Markwell, 2014, pp. 1—3.)

2.1 Normativity and rainbows

In this context it is relevant draw attention to queer theory (Waitt & Markwell, 2014, p. 15; Ilmonen, 2011), which challenges the binary views of homo/hetero, male/female. By doing so, it aims at opposing the existing social hetero patriarchal norms that create oppression. It is important to mention this, because it seems that the global rainbow culture might be actually acting according to, and even enhancing white male patriarchal approach and queer theory is something that is in line with intersectional approach taking into account different aspects to people’s identities that might be subject to oppression. In this thesis is will refer to the group with the symbolical term “rainbow tourism / rainbow tourists” since they are inclusive terms, but at the same time not too narrow in terms of difference within the group. In this thesis, the term rainbow tourist includes also the allies.

Heteronormativity is an issue that needs to be addressed, when discussing rights of the rainbow community. Heteronormativity is a way of thinking, where being hetero is seen as superior and preferred orientation, being more natural compared to others. It also includes an idea of a family formed by two heterosexual parents. Hetero normativity is related to hetero assumption. (Seta
Kitzinger (2005, p. 478) writes that heteronormativity includes taken for granted presumptions, such as a presumption that there is only two sexes and that it is the “normal” and “natural”. Rich (2003) addresses this issues as “compulsory heterosexuality”. This is according to Rich (2003, 35) lesbians are more a hidden population than gay men. This would imply that heteronormativity (or compulsory heterosexuality) is inflicted heavier to women than men. In any case, compulsory heterosexuality is forced onto people by laws, practices and mental pressure. (Rich 2003.)

Rossi (2006, p. 19) frames the term by stating that hetero is not “the normal”, it is something that is being normed and common. Rossi (2006) also ponders if speaking of heteronormativity actually enhances the issue it is trying to overcome. Thus, it might be appropriate to stop emphasizing the prefix ‘hetero’ and start discussing non-normative sexualities and genders, which could move the focus from homo-hetero dichotomy to a new kind of framework. (Rossi 2006, p. 26.) Homonormativity (see e.g. Brown, 2009; Nast, 2002), much like heteronormativity, points to the features of rainbow society, which defines the acceptable and “normal gay”. This leads to exclusion within the group seen as a provider of an asylum for the people oppressed by the heteropatriarchy and heteronormative society. It also assumes that the rainbow people want to be a part of the heteronormative society, which is not necessarily the case. For example, in tourism, heteronormativity and homonormativity become visible in heteronormative tourism acts and processes.

2.2 Rainbow tourism

Imagine a rainbow flag taking off on a journey to space from earth. Imagine it cutting through the atmosphere, and increasing altitude as the background slowly changes from earthly visions to black and bright images of space. This is actually true, since a video of this event, was published by the space travel company Virgin travel that actually declared space as gay friendly. (see Huffington post, 2016.)

Meanwhile on planet Earth, the rainbow symbols are already familiar and visible in tourism. Many tour operators have adopted names from the Wizard of Oz. Waitt and Markwell (2014) mention, for example, Rainbow travel (USA), Friends of Dorothy travel (Australia), Toto tours (USA). (Waitt & Markwell, 2014, p. 2). Getting away from it all is something that we all occasionally need. Consequently, belonging to an oppressed group would mean even greater a
graving for an escape from everyday life. This is confirmed by Waitt and Markwell (2014) as they state that travel is often seen as pursue for utopia, where one can be free from heterosexism. They continue by writing that heteronormativity with its oppressive qualities can be seen as one of the reasons why the gay culture is characterized by high mobility. For gay men travelling provides a (longer) period of time a possibility to be themselves. This behavior it most likely stronger with people, who cannot express their sexuality at home. Similarly to pilgrimage the gay tourist is looking for something extraordinary. Something magical. This is enhanced by group identity. (Waitt & Markwell, 2014, pp. 4—5.)

Southall and Fallon (2011, p. 219) list some facts and figures that can be used to describe the potential and size of the market. For example, in the USA more gay and lesbian travelers hold passports than the American public in general. The difference is substantial, since 88% of gay men and 57% of lesbians hold passports, whereas the same number for general public is 29%. The Gay Days 2009 travel expo attracted a good 13000 visitors. Furthermore 350 Pride events take place annually in global scale. The overwhelming size of gay events can be seen in the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras, which in 1999 attracted almost 750000 visitors. (Southall & Fallon, 2011, p. 219.)

Gay tourism has gained a relatively large portion of media attention in the past decades. The early academic article discussing gay tourism were published decades ago, but according to Waitt and Markwell (2014) lack of critical analysis has been addressed later (e.g. Johnston 2005). Many of the writings have highlighted the affluence of the gay market (also known as the pink dollar) while others have raised up questions concerning political, social and moral effects that are caused by same-sex tourism visibility in heteropatriarchal societies. (Waitt & Markwell 2014, p. 8-10.) Concerning sexuality in tourism Jokinen and Veijola (1994) brought the sexualized body into the discussion. According to Johnston, discourses that center pink dollar actually enhances the Otherness and denies the queer body. To emphasize pink dollar in fact reinforces the binary between hetero and homosexual, since the “average” consumer is considered as heterosexual and gay/lesbian is labeled as Other. (Johnston 2005, p. 21.)

Johnston (2005) is one of the first authors to raise the question of the rainbow tourism from this viewpoint. According to her, tourism is built on basic binaries such as ordinary/extra-ordinary, self /other, tourist/host, same/different. These binaries are never neutral, they are hierarchal. The oppression and Otherness can be seen through the discourses of the body as Johnston describes the way Queer bodies are othered by making white male heterosexual bodies as mere
containers for pure consciousness while others, such as women, gay or disabled are seen bound to their fleshy bodies and cannot think straight. (Johnston 2005, pp.15—16.)

The open and positive discussion concerning rainbow people is new; in Finland a law decriminalizing same-sex relationships passed as late as 1971. Finland was not one of the first countries to pass the law in Europe nor the last. The rainbow flag became a symbol for the sexual minorities in Finland in 1990s. (Mustola 2007, p. 14; 20.) This is seen in both, academia and in practical implications, laws and regulations concerning same sex marriages, parenthood etc. In academia, rainbow theme has existed for a while, but the amount of research made concerning rainbow tourism is still rather modest. In the following chapter, I describe the current state of research around rainbow tourism.

2.3 Rainbow tourism as a field of research

Rainbow tourism has been investigated quite a lot in recent decades in academia. I made a search on Google Scholar and found significant amount of articles, reviews and book chapters concerning the theme. Google Scholar gives a wide perspective, since it scans many different databases. As search words I used ‘pink money’, ‘pink tourism’, ‘LGBT tourism’ and ‘LGBTIQ tourism’. I did not use ‘rainbow tourism’ as a search word, since it did not provide as good results as the other words/phrases. Based on the search, it would seem that much of the research includes some of the themes presented in table 1.
Indeed, various articles touch the subject of rainbow tourism and sexual as well as gender minorities. The viewpoints vary from social aspects to economic and market oriented issues. For instance, Duguay (2016) has investigated how social media, more precisely Twitter, has shaped the expression of WorldPride.

There are also several calls for critical thinking towards gay events such as Prides. For example, Kanai (2014) writes that those, who are the “queer unwanted” [Binnie 2004], have no access to mainstream gay spaces. However, Browne (2008) suggests that besides the discussions of discrimination and abuse, the studies of ‘sexual deviancy’ should include fun and partying in the performance of politics. I clearly see that the discussions of rainbow tourism are a compilation of marketing and market orientation as well as human rights and challenges of homonormative environments.

In Finland, there are not that many authors, who have taken up the challenge of writing about rainbow tourism. There has been, however, some that have been able to take the challenge of explaining some of the multidimensional aspects of rainbow tourism. These are mainly bachelor level thesis studies and some master’s thesis studies. Many of these studies, however, deal specifically with marketing, rather than with accessibility, inclusion or human rights (e.g. Martikainen, 2013; Haimila, 2015; Räisänen). For instance, Haimila (2015) has studied gay tourism marketing. Her focus has been in investigating the possibilities of cooperative marketing of an online Gay Guide Finland. Haimila has studied how to raise awareness of the service to possible cooperators, even if the Gay Guide has no budget for marketing. Kauhanen (2015) has completed a bachelor’s thesis concerning LGBT+ market. The purpose of her study has been in profiling the LGBT+ tourist. Her results propose that gays are most concerned with gay friendliness of the destination above all the other groups in the segment. There are also other thesis studies conducted concerning this target group, but these mentioned here provide a view what are the main lines of discussion concerning rainbow tourism.

As can be seen, rainbow tourism research emphasizes markets and economic value of the target market. However, for instance Waitt and Markwell (2014) ask who is included and who is excluded in gay tourism and how Western gay identity is related to how tourism is enacted, performed and how meanings are created. These and several other questions are left unanswered, according to them, by conventional rationalist tourism knowledge. They base their insight to the fact that in the time of the writing, tourism studies have been leaning on universal
theoretical explanations leaving out the viewpoints of gender, class, ethnicity or sexuality. Nor had it been studied how those structures facilitate or constrain inclusion in tourism. (Waitt & Markwell, 2014, p. 10.) However, Johnston (2005, p. 15-16) touches this issue by writing that in the works concerning tourism in general, the tourist is rarely given a gendered body and, thus, the tourist is male heterosexual by default.

Sexual freedom is not a given in every destination and this particular notion makes rainbow tourism also a question of accessibility. Indeed, according to Waitt and Markwell (2014, p. 24) in some places the governments see homosexuality as a sign of sexual and national destruction. In these places, homosexuality is materialized as Western gay tourist. Even in Europe, which is generally seen as liberal, there are conservative areas and people affecting the way rainbow groups are welcomed. Johnston (2005) conducted focus group interviews with people, who have taken part in Edinburgh Pride. According to her study, the welcoming atmosphere is different in Edinburgh than in Glasgow (Johnston 2005, pp. 36-38). This supports the need to examine rainbow tourism as an accessibility issue, since it shows that there are gaps in accessibility not only towards the rainbow community, but inside the community as well.

It is also worth mentioning that there are some critical notions concerning e.g. rainbow events and the people welcomed to them, which creates an accessibility issue within the group as well. One example of this phenomenon took place in Toronto, where Black Lives Matter Toronto stopped the Gay Pride parade demanding more space in the parade to the queer people of color while requiring that less space would be given to police department (Back2Stonewall, 2016). Another issue concerning the inclusiveness of Gay Pride was published in LGBTQ Nation-portal. According to the portal, all women do not feel welcome to the Pride Parade (LGBTQ Nation, 2016).

After Waitt and Markwell published their book on gay tourism in 2013, there has been more discussion on rainbow tourism as well as inclusive tourism. The discussion on inclusion, however, has been circling around physical issues, which constrain people from participating tourism activities and only lately has the discussion been directed towards tourism for all (see e.g. Eichhorn, 2014, p. 34). This would be a step towards more holistic view on accessible tourism.

Skeggs (2014) makes one important point about inclusion in relation hospitality. According to Skeggs (2014, p. 285) certain spaces bring together groups, who would otherwise be separated from each other. These encounters force the group members to make sense of the others’ bodies and, consequently, in some cases they make people resist or build boundaries. (Skeggs 2014,
Skeggs (2014, pp. 293—314) describes Gay Village in Manchester as an example of such space. Interestingly, she writes that in gay neighborhood, hetero (working class) women’s presence has created awkward feelings for lesbian women, who have felt marginalized in a space that they have politically campaigned for. (Skeggs, 2014, p. 296.) It is especially bachelorette party groups that produce a wrong image of themselves and are resented by the space “owners”. In other words, physical appearance of the women is something that makes the gay space wrong. Their way of being does not suit the order of the gay space, which makes the situation interesting. They are thought to be something of a lower class and not clean in a sense, and that is exactly how some gay venues do not want to be seen. Thus, according to Skeggs (2014, p. 296), it is not merely the academy or government rhetoric and institutionalized structures that reproduces this position for the working class women, it is actually also the liberal gay spaces. One could roughly argue that gay spaces are not more inviting to all, on the contrary.

In this chapter, I have introduced one of the target groups of this thesis, the rainbow tourists. Finally, it should be mentioned that a homogenous group, which is referred as “gay tourists” does not exist in empirical reality (Waitt &Markwell, 2014, p. 6). This is important thought, because it reflects the understanding that sexuality is only one part of peoples’ identities and that is a step towards intersectional thinking. In the next chapter, I introduce accessibility and inclusion as a human right in general and after that proceed to the concepts of accessible tourism, inclusion in tourism and tourism for all. I also present the notion of accessible hospitality.
In Western developed societies, accessibility is supported by public and private entities as well as third sector. European Union, for instance has made initiatives to support inclusion and accessibility both, in tourism and other aspects of society. According to European Union (EU, 2010), its growth is built on inclusion. Inclusion means that people are empowered by employment, education and social cohesion. It is also “[…] about ensuring access and opportunities for all throughout the lifecycle.” Thus, inclusion is something that cuts through different aspects of life and society. In EU 2020 agenda, the focus is in employment and poverty reduction, but it is also stated that the countries should especially pay attention to the groups, who are in a vulnerable situation because of discrimination for instance (families with one parent, elderly, women, minorities, people with disabilities etc.). (EU, 2010, p. 19.)

Finland has answered this call with the Non-discrimination Act (Finlex, 2014.), which came into force 1\textsuperscript{st} of January, 2015. The purpose of the act is to ensure equality and prevent discrimination. It addresses activities conducted in both public and private entities. The private entities include all those, who professionally provide services and goods.

In 2015, also UN Convention of rights of people with disabilities (PWD) was ratified in Finland. This is meaningful, because it is the first extensive human rights declaration of the new millennium. It has quickly become one of the most signed declaration in the world. Even though this study does not deal with PWD, these issues are important, because this gives perspective to equality issues and give indication of the level, where a country is in terms of human rights. (UN, 2015.) As a well established welfare state, Finland should most definitely take action, when it comes to human rights and continue to raise questions and take down structures that support inequality. Human rights organizations have given notes to Finland concerning mistreatment of transgendered people still at the time of writing this thesis though.

The above-mentioned issues gives indication on the vastness of the scene, where issues of accessibility and inclusion are discussed. As one can see, the problems of discrimination and exclusion of people, who are somehow in a vulnerable situation, are confronted with activities that promote accessibility and inclusion and actively speak against discrimination. In the following chapter, I briefly discuss the concepts of accessibility and inclusion in terms of tourism and hospitality.
3.1 Accessibility and inclusion in tourism and hospitality

According to Alén, Domíngues & Losada (2012, pp. 144—145), the biggest problem with the discussion about accessible tourism is that various words are used to describe a similar idea or issue: accessible tourism, tourism for all, accessible tourism for all and inclusion. These similar terms and concepts causes that the terminology is confusing and, thus, it might diminish the meaningfulness of them. The terms tourism and accessibility were linked in the 1980’s, and the proof of this event is called the Manila Declaration. Alén et al. (2012 p. 145) declare that accessible activity (such as tourism) is actually a synonym for integration. They paraphrase Gómez [2002] writing that

Accessible tourism can be defined as the variety of activities occurring during the free time devoted to tourism by people with restricted capacities, which enables them to fully integrate their functional and psychological perspectives and achieve individual satisfaction and development. (Alén et al. 2012 pp. 144—145.)

Accessibility in tourism, according to Eichhorn (2014, p. 32), means that the tourism services and facilities enable persons with special access needs to enjoy free time without barriers or problems. Alén et al. (2012 p. 145) explain that later during the 1980’s, another term was introduced: tourism for all. Tourism for all means tourism activities that, which take place on people’s free time and all people can access regardless of the varying abilities or disabilities. Person gets individual and social fulfilment from the interaction with the environment. Jutila (2012, p.12) just like Alén et al. connects the concept tourism for all with Design for all. Furthermore, tourism for all, according to Eichhorn (2014, p.34), refers to services that can be enjoyed by all regardless of their individual characteristics. These individual characteristics can include for example abilities, age, race, gender, beliefs, sexual orientation or ideology (Eichhorn, 2014, p. 34). Consequently, rainbow tourists become a part of the tourism accessibility discussions.

Almost identical term with tourism for all is accessible tourism for all, with a slight difference. Instead of focusing on products that are separately created for people with disabilities, it aims at a situation, where all tourists can be active participants in the tourism sector, regardless of their characteristics, abilities and special needs. In addition to the mentioned, there is also the concept of social tourism, aiming to enable travelling for disadvantaged groups. (Alén et al.,
2012, p. 145.) Here I have to note, that Alén et al (2012) refer to accessible tourism, tourism for all and even accessible tourism for all as a concepts that take into consideration persons with disabilities and yet, the concept of accessibility and inclusion can mean much more. According to Harju-Myllyaho and Jutila (2016 p. 36), physical aspect to hospitality is an important issue on the theme, but not the only one. Indeed, Veijola & Jokinen (1994) have emphasized the meaning of the body in tourism. They stated 1994 that up until then the body had been ignored in tourism. (Veijola & Jokinen, 1994, p. 126.) While this might still be issue with tourism in general, I think the situation is quite the opposite.

Inclusion as a term relates to something that is profound. Something that integrates us to be part of society regardless of who we are. Jutila (2012, p. 12) draws a line between tourism for all and inclusion as she writes that while tourism for all refers to more physical environment and design, inclusion refers to present moment and socially accessible environment. She emphasizes though, that all these terms relate to a more open society that is equal for all concerning services, environment and activities as well as intangible services. (Jutila, 2012, p. 12.) Viewing the disabled as a consumer group, according to Burnett and Bender-Baker (2016, p. 5), should define the disability in its broadest construct. That means that the disabled consumer is an individual with physical or mental impairment that considerably limits one or several activities in life at a given point of time. Impairment is a permanent or temporary psychological, physiological or anatomical loss or abnormality of structure or function. (Burnett & Bender-Baker, 2016, p. 5.) I see that in the context of this thesis, accessible tourism is not a correct term, since it does actually have strong connotations to physical accessibility and impairments, whereas rainbow tourists in general represent neither. However, it is obvious that the concepts of ‘accessible tourism’, ‘tourism for all’ and ‘accessible hospitality’ are closely related and even partly parallel and tangled to together, and consequently they can be confusing for some.

Inclusion as a concept in tourism context has been studied for example from the viewpoint of social tourism (e.g. Pritchard, Morgan, Pritchard & Sedgley, 2015; Sedgley, Pritchard & Morgan, 2012), which is actually quite logical, since inclusion means been involved with the society. Morgan (2017) gave a keynote in the 26th Nordic Symposium of Tourism Research in Falun. According to him many people, who would benefit most from tourism, are actually left outside the activity, which has become quite trivial in today’s society. (Morgan 2017.) Thus, inclusion in tourism would be similar to the concept of tourism for all, but there is a small difference. Whereas tourism for all means that everyone can access, I would interpret inclusion
in tourism as a means of bringing people, who are in danger of being excluded from the society, to become active citizens.

Ahmed (2012) describes institutional diversity, which resonates with inclusion, or at least the way I see it. Keeping diversity moving in an institution requires work and in the same way, inclusion requires work (Ahmed, 2012 pp. 31—32) according to the diversity workers interviewed in the book. Diversity is institutionalized, when it becomes a part of the institutions practices without causing trouble. (Ahmed, 2012, p. 27). In terms of rainbow tourists and tourism companies, this would mean that when the company can freely address the rainbow community in advertisements, for instance, without it being too much for some people in the institution, diversity from this viewpoint would be institutionalized. If we think about the topic of my thesis, even if the company would be committed to enhancing diversity, the customers, who are also a part of the company, could “cause trouble”. Anyhow, inclusion means promoting diversity and while Ahmed (2012) writes about ethnicity, I reckon that this includes other aspects as well. In addition, Ahmed (2012, p. 30) states that organizations can be seen as modes of attention. What is valued, gains attention. From this viewpoint, tourism companies promoting diversity, communicate values.

In terms of diversity, Ahmed (2012) states that the rationality, which is often used when diversity is institutionalized could be described as “conditional hospitality”\(^1\). She writes that when diversity becomes a form of hospitality, the organization could be the host, who welcomes the embodied diversity in the form of guests. While writing about ethnicity, Ahmed (2012) manages to catch the idea that I find relevant for this study as well. People of color in her thought are welcomed to white organizations, but there is a condition that they would return the hospitality by integrating into the existing organization culture or by “being diverse” and, thus, letting the organization celebrate their diversity. (Ahmed, 2012, pp. 42—43.) This idea of hosts and guests is quite visible in tourism and hospitality (see e.g. Germann Molz & Gibson, 2007).

Furthermore, Ahmed (2012 p. 42) writes about bodies that stand out on arrival to spaces, where they are not expected. Again, Ahmed is not referring to rainbow people or sexual or gender orientation, but seeing gay people in hetero spaces might be unexpected and surprising for some. According to Ahmed,

---

Ahmed suspects that by saying that the company ‘promotes diversity’ means addressing different groups without actually naming any minority subjects. (Ahmed, 2012, p. 42.)

Above I have covered some of the different aspects of accessibility in tourism, and it seems that the terminology and different concepts are various and overlapping each other. There is a need for a wider concept that would cover some of the other ones. While writing an insight about the future of accessible tourism, a notion of accessible hospitality was introduced by Sanna Kyyrä and myself and (Harju-Myllyaho & Kyyrä, 2013, pp. 8—18) we elaborated the notion further with Salla Jutila in 2016 (Harju-Myllyaho & Jutila, 2016, p. 33—44). Accessible hospitality takes into account different viewpoints, such as a broader concept of accessible tourism and tourism for all. It also includes and emphasizes a proactive attitude that relates to hospitality. Accessible hospitality as a concept includes the idea that hospitality should not depend on people’s features such as age, culture, disabilities or other special needs, or sexual orientation for example. (ESVI, 2017.) It gives us also a possibility to look at the different customer segments in a future-oriented way by recognizing some of the customer groups that until now have been invisible. Accessible hospitality has a strong emphasis on knowledge about difference and how tourism companies use this knowledge. I use the definition of accessible hospitality in this thesis. This will allow the examination of accessibility from a broad concept that would include not only the different aspect to accessibility including social inclusion and therefore rainbow people, but also proactivity. Next, I will go briefly through some of the viewpoints I consider relevant in terms of accessible hospitality.

First, accessibility is used to describe the accessibility of a destination. In other words, flight routes and other means of transportation and marketing channels (e.g. Butler & Waldbrook, 2003). This concerns all tourists and, thus, is not relevant for the purpose of this thesis. Another way is to see accessibility as providing access to tourism without barriers. Sometimes it is referred as barrier-free tourism, which is basically same thing as the term accessible tourism. Kemppainen (2008, p.11), describes barriers as being something that prevent us from doing things. Thus, a barrier is technically a concrete obstacle. It can be something on the street, preventing you from walking, noise preventing you from hearing. In other words, it is always
related to an activity. However, as stated by Kemppainen also lack of something can be a barrier. This is a matter of convention. (Kemppainen, 2008, p. 11.) In terms of accessible hospitality, lack of openness and understanding can become a barrier. For instance, even though sexual orientation is often mentioned in the context of tourism for all, there still is little evidence of specific implications from this viewpoint. What does this mean in practice and how is accessible hospitality understood by the target group?

In any case, so far accessibility has not been discussed much in relation to hospitality (see e.g. Harju-Myllyaho & Jutila, 2016). Accessibility of hospitableness is therefore an emergent idea in tourism research. Consequently, there are some challenges concerning the notion of accessible hospitality. Hospitality in general might include the idea of tolerance and accepting people the way they are, but it is lacking a systematic approach to inclusion and also the kind of understanding that would help in meeting diversity and groups that need special or accessible services. This concerns especially commercial hospitality.

According to Bell (2007, p. 37), commercial hospitality as taking place in economic exchange context, while private hospitality takes place in the home. However, hospitality as a concept has no single conclusive definition, but many. There is also a concept of social hospitality, which can take place in both commercial and private settings. It involves broader social forms and codes. (Bell, 2007, p. 37.) It is commonly described as a relationship between self and others. Earlier it was also used for describing the relationship between self and strangers. Both commercial and non-commercial hospitality get complex, when power relations are taken into consideration in service situations. (see. Höckert, 2015, pp. 94—98.)

As Germann Molz and Gibson (2007, p. 3)² point out, hospitality is one of human civilization’s most ancient themes. People have always been mobile and movement has been global. The authors refer to Kant [1795] as they write that the world is geographically limited and this in the end means that people come in contact with each other. They maintain that the intersection of mobility and hospitality is as relevant as when Kant wrote his reflections on more than 200 years ago. Furthermore, Germann Molz and Gibson (2007, p. 3) write that hospitality has a tendency of reasserting the belonging-ness of the host against the unstability, movement and unbelonging-ness of the guest. Furthermore, I could ask if hospitality as a process can create power relations that enable inequality. By hospitality as a process, I mean a common experience between the service provider and the tourist. The tourists do not come to experience things

² Lashley (2000)
from a vacuum, but rather bring their own experiences with them. Thus, hospitality becomes actually an experience with high subjectivity. At the same time, there is a possibility for individual experiences and experiencing sociability. (García-Rosell, Kylänen, Pitkänen, Tekoniemi-Selkälä & Vanhala, 2015.) Indeed, identity process theory also argues that an individual engages (consciously or uncounsciously) in a dynamic, continual process of constructing an identity. In other words, new experiences are interpreted through the existing identity content. (Breakwell, 2014, p. 118.) So are accessibility, inclusion and hospitality.

Hospitality as a tourism process is also a gendered, sometimes hetero- or homonormative act between the self and the other. Power relations trace back to feminist studies and identity discourses and various forms of discrimination also are tied to unproportioned power relations. Thus, although hospitality in general means accepting the strangers as they are, there is always a form of subjectivity included in the experience from both sides. Several authors have addressed different perceptions of hospitality – among others Kant’s universal hospitality one of them being a well-known French philosopher, Derrida. (German Molz & Gibson, 2007, pp. 3—4.) This is very suitable, because, indeed, hospitality is something that has very philosophical undertones. Dikec (2002, p.228) writes about hospitality by stating that it is often used without critique. According to him, hospitality seems to be taken frequently for granted. Now, we all want to receive hospitable services, when we travel. Hospitality as a competitive force will not gain its full power unless we ensure that it can be enjoyed by most. Even more so, in terms of rainbow tourists, hospitality becomes concerned with attitude rather than just physical barriers. Hence, hospitality in this thesis is one of the important viewpoints. Hospitality combined with accessibility.

3.2 Accessible spaces and communication

In the previous chapter, I introduced some viewpoints to accessibility and inclusion in tourism. Here I want to draw attention to the physical and virtual places, where accessible hospitality is realized. I agree with Bell’s (2007, pp. 41—42) notion that accessible hospitality emerges in physical places, such as restaurants, hotels and airports. In the contexts of this thesis, however, it is also a matter of virtual spaces. According to Bell (2007, pp. 41—42) host-work and guest-work takes place in various forms and countless sites. Bell discusses mobilities and hospitality
in virtual world that creates spaces for encounters of hosts and guests in a new way. Her main idea is that

*Analyses of the micro-practices currently taking place in sites of hospitality such as cafés or city squares, and discussions of future forms of hybrid, ambient or ubiquitous hospitality, reveal the endless ways that hospitality is given and received beyond the classical formulation of the host-at-home and the guest-visitor.* (Bell 2007, p. 42.)

Written a decade ago, Bell’s article describes the way that virtual spaces are actually acting as a space for the guest-host encounters in social media today. In other words, the platforms are spaces, where hospitality as a process takes place in a similar way than in physical reality. Social media is creating spaces, where the encounter is between not only the guest and the host but also the guest and other guests. Consequently, these spaces are also hosting different power relations. In terms of accessible hospitality, the virtual spaces can support accessibility or contest them. It is a place, where different discourses are confronted or even muted by others.

Indeed, also Cuthill (2007, p. 84) states that it is through the performances of service cultures that the spaces for commercial hospitality communicate inclusion and exclusion for different social categories. Virtual spaces also hold the power to include and exclude. This is true in the host-guest encounters as well as in the encounters between guests sharing the same space. As a conclusion, I suggest that accessible hospitality can be built in the social encounters that take place in virtual spaces and to be able to understand how it is done, we would have to understand the different discourses behind comments that take place in the space.

According to Cole and Erikson (2010, p. 107), who cite the Universal Declaration of the Human Rights, the right to freedom include the rights to work and join a trade union but also the right to rest, to leisure and freedom of movement. However, though this might paint us a picture, where tourism is an industry lacking considerations of the non-participants, there is also a contradictory viewpoint, where tourism is seen as a contributor to the understanding and respect between peoples and societies (Cole and Erikson, 2010, p. 208). Cuthill (2007, p. 85) declares that it is these venues [restaurants and cafés and café-bars], which are spaces for identifying and interpreting cultural changes, since the shifting tastes in eating and drinking out reflect and reproduce the features of the era in general. Consequently, the venues and processes of hospitality industry and the way they are used by the customers and personnel alike, can help understanding the specific way the society welcomes difference in general and why.
The discussion on rainbow tourists relates to the concept of gay space. The idea of gay space has been developed to challenge the heterosexist nature of space. A gay space provides a sense of safety, because one’s behavior does not need to be changed to conform the heterosexual norm, and if it would be the case that a space is heterosexual, a gay space, if related to a community that is marginalized, becomes symbolically significant. (Kuffner 2002, pp. 28—30.) Kuffner has studied the construction of gay space in tourism brochures using content analysis and semiotics.

Lack of communication adds to the experience of exclusiveness and means that there are groups whose needs are not met properly or are currently invisible in tourism, and their number will increase in the future. When discussing information and knowledge, tourism as an industry and a field of study, is both confronted by the challenge and equipped with tools to overcome prejudices faced by difference. The more people are exposed to difference, the smaller will the obstacles will become on the path to accessible hospitality. As an industry, tourism can actually act as a space, which welcomes all, despite the personal background of the tourist. UN World tourism organization, UNWTO (2001) has introduced the Global code of ethics for tourism, which explicitly says that tourism should be a contributor of the following:

*The understanding and promotion of the ethical values common to humanity, with an attitude of tolerance and respect for the diversity of religious, philosophical and moral beliefs, are both the foundation and the consequence of responsible tourism; stakeholders in tourism development and tourists themselves should observe the social and cultural traditions and practices of all peoples, including those of minorities and indigenous peoples and to recognize their worth.* (UNWTO, 2001.)

Again, this text would refer to the hosting communities. Yet, in my viewpoint, this should also be looked at from a different angle too: from the point of view of the tourist, who ultimately will construct new mental models and build identities on travels and travel related activities.

As Duguay (2016) writes:

*Twitter further shaped the WorldPride public through its magnification of popular accounts and functionality for self-promotion, which invites users to tweet about personal but nonconfrontational topics. Therefore, the WorldPride Twitter public did not give rise to counterpublics with strong messages challenging heteronormativity, nor did it form queer publics where nonnormative discourses were discussed widely among mixed audiences.* (Duguay, 2016, p. 292.)
Thus, the means of communication, social media platforms for example, have an impact on gay spaces, even if they do not stir up extreme conversations. The possibility is there though.

Berg & Edelheim (2012, p. 84) write about images used in the marketing of Greek islands. According to them viewing the islands from tourists’ and tourism organizations’ viewpoint, it can be seen that the brochures draw on the stereotypical island imagery as a means to attract tourists. Furthermore, Edelheim (2006, p. 202) argues that there is a danger in the sense that business interests are less concerned in producing images of the society that are objective but just a commercial one. Edelheim (2006, p. 211) has researched the hegemonic messages that tourist brochures sell. He concludes by saying that by introducing more matured people and people with disabilities in travel brochures would make these minorities more visible and bring them towards social norm. Although, I do not study touch this viewpoint in this thesis per se, it helps understanding the tension between inclusion and exclusion. Images can give an impression that only people, who are represented in them, are included and welcomed. Even if it would be unintentional, there might be people who can feel that they are excluded from the clientele.

In this chapter, I have opened some of the main notions and concepts concerning accessible and inclusion in tourism. In the light of the different discussions, I would say that all the variations of accessible tourism have the same goal, which is to provide inclusion to people, who would otherwise be excluded from some of the trivialized activities of the society, such as tourism. But how can we understand the various needs of people, all the different viewpoints and categories of accessibility.
Intersectionality as an approach can provide a framework for understanding diversity. In terms of accessible hospitality, the different viewpoints to accessibility can be used as a tool for understanding customers and their individual situations better and, thus, provide better customer service and quality. It is a step forward towards accessible hospitality. The different identity categories used in intersectionality also relate to identity, which makes it a relevant term for my study. Identity as a term is quite useful in describing the differences between individuals. People rarely have merely one, but many identities, and they are constructed and communicated in a network of other complex individuals. There are always factors in our personal characteristics that might influence the way we experience hospitality and acceptance.

In intersectional approach, identities are based on, for instance, gender, ethnic background, age class identity categories, for instance. These factors are the result of peoples’ personal histories and they constitute our present reality. This viewpoint is supported by constructivist worldview, but is not rejected by critical theories either. It challenges the positivist epistemologies, which approaches the phenomena as they are seen (see. e.g. JYU, 2015). Caton (2014, p. 132) writes about ‘false consciousness’, which is sometimes used by critical theorists. One situation can be seen from two different viewpoints: an enlightened view in which people recognize the socially constructed nature of the system that constrains their life chances and an unenlightened view in which people accept their circumstances as natural and inevitable. (Caton, 2014, p. 132). Similarly, the situation of tourists, can be seen through a complicated or constructed view or as an unenlightened view, which places some people to positions, where they were born in an unchangeable position. The latter would leave little room for improvement.

4.1 Intersectional identities

Accessibility and inclusion connote identity, which in turn, makes them subject to questioning how the identities are formed and maintained. According to Hall (1999, p. 22) there is a notion of postmodern subject, which has been conceptualized as a subject that doesn’t have a solid being or a stable identity. The identity becomes fluid and it alters and forms all the time in relation to the customs, which are used to represent and address in the cultural systems. This is
a notion that speaks for but also contradicts the viewpoint of intersectionality, since people take
different identities in different contexts and they alter as they get experience, for example as
tourists. However, there have been, according to Hall (1999, pp. 22—35) several views of iden-
tity and they have changed in history. Interesting for this study is the viewpoint of sociology.
According to sociologists, the individual is attached in group processes and collective norms
and thus an alternative notion of the birth of an individual is through the subject being part of
larger social relationships. The subject’s identity is continuously negotiated through the envi-
ronment and as globalization makes the identities become more shattered and blurred. Rossi
(2012, p. 31) backs this idea by saying that in certain way and in certain environments individ-
uals are formed as raced, gendered and sexualized and all these categories impact each other.
This makes studying accessible hospitality ever more interesting, yet more challenging. Hall
(1999, p. 35) also describes the isolated, estranged person in exile that rises against an anony-
mous crowd. In late modern era, the person is viewed as a tourist, by e.g. Urry, (1990). Social
identities are important concerning this study because when we belong or relate to a group, we
consequently exclude ourselves from some other groups. Furthermore, identifying ourselves
belonging to a group influences the way others see you and this guides our behavior making us
separate ourselves from groups we do not see fitting to our identities.

Hall (1999, p. 139) discusses the meanings that we create and present about the people and
places that are considerably different from ourselves. The otherness is, according to Hall, mys-
terious and fascinating. Now, he is referring to differences in race, but similarly the thought
can be extended to cover also other aspects of difference. Representations make politics (Hall,
1999, p. 139.) and thus, the way difference is presented in advertisements and discussions for
instance, has an impact in the way we value and judge things and people. It would be applicable
to conclude that the way different groups are portrayed and discussed in the context of tourism
influences the way other customers, tourism staff and the group itself sees it. The representa-
tions reinforce the common beliefs, whether they are true or not.

Hall (1999, pp. 189—200) writes also about stereotyping. According to him, stereotyping peo-
ple differs from typing people, because typing means for example dividing people to different
social categories/groups that define identity. These are for example gender, age, nationality,
etnicity, language group, and sexual orientation to mention few. Hall cites Dyer [1977, p. 28],
who utters that categorizing things to wider groups, lets us make sense of the world and that
the information certain people “send” is read through the categories we consider them to fall
into.
Stereotyping is a way of categorizing people, but it highlights some of the easily identified and described features of people and simplifying them. Thus, it features, simplifies and sets differences. Furthermore, stereotyping includes the idea of dualism, the idea of normal and acceptable separated from abnormal and unacceptable. Everything that doesn’t fit and everything that is different is shut out and that means that stereotypes build walls between us and them. Stereotyping also tends to go hand in hand with inequality and power relations. Power also includes the idea of symbolic power, which is produced through the practices of representation. (Hall, 1999, pp. 189—200.)

Stereotyping and mainstreaming are ways of understanding difference. In some destinations rainbow tourism is seen as mainstream, but in others, it is considered as a deviant tourism practice. In some people’s minds, same sex relationships are deviant, while others consider them rather trivial. Southall and Fallon (2011, p. 228) describe mainstreaming from a different perspective. They say that some gay travelers might not be inclined to choose a gay venue as a destination, but would rather go to a mainstream holiday.

Based on the description in this chapter, it can be maintained that peoples’ identities are a complex system in which different identities intersect and form unique situations and standing points for each of us. Identities and especially intersecting identities can be seen as forming a basis for how we perceive different things, utterances and situations. Thus, how we see ourselves against others and how we feel accepted and included or treated by others. In the following chapter, I briefly focus on how intersectionality relates to inclusion and accessibility before proceeding specifically to intersectionality in the field of tourism and hospitality.

4.2 Intersectionality as an approach to inclusion and accessibility

As stated above, the identities we perform through different activities are consequences of the unique intersections, where different identity traits collide and merge. Quite different from rainbows, but in a similar stance, Richards, Morgan, Pritchard and Sedgley (2010, p. 22) write that concerning visually impaired travelers the emphasis should be for the tourism sector to treat people as individuals rather than a homogenous group categorized as “the blind” or “the visually impaired”. Also a recent Finnish television documentary, made by Yle (2016), Finnish public broadcasting company, about a deaf traveler in America described some of the challenges met by black deaf people caused by not only the hearing problem, but also with other
identity categories such as ethnic background. Thus, the experiences of individuals depend on not just one individual trait but many. (Yle, 2016.) From the viewpoint of intersectional approach, this would be the intersection of ethnic background and able-bodiedness. However, in a similar vein, it could be located in other identity intersections as well. Like sexual orientation and ethnic background or able-bodiedness for instance.

According to Ilmonen (2011, p. 2) intersectional research is usually focused on research questions that ponder upon the meaning systems of for example human relations art, culture in relation to ideologically, nationally, socially, gender wise or sexually formed ways of knowledge production. Knowledge production move power positions from subject to another and while doing so the subject builds his/her relationship on the surrounding reality. The subject gains different intersecting identity positions. Intersectional researches seek to find out how different social and cultural categories are attached to each other in the society and how they project unbalanced power relations. Intersectionality aims at exposing power structures that repress the subject. Intersectionality is also a contextual approach in the way how it is not trying to answer questions such as “what is the phenomenon” but rather keeping the focus in answering the questions “what does the phenomenon tell us”. (Ilmonen, 2011, p. 2.) For example concerning social media conversations, it is important to understand the reasons people post the things they do. In terms of tourism, it helps understanding the viewpoints of different customers.

Intersectionality brings together different dimensions of discrimination based on identity categories and acknowledges that there might be multiple factors affecting the experienced discrimination at the same time. From my research point of view this is very interesting, because it helps understanding the complex field in which accessible hospitality is generated – or not. Also, in her article Crenshaw (2006, p. 9) discusses the abuse of colored women and points out that the experiences of the women of color are formed in the intersection of race, gender and class, and therefore they are not restricted only one of the three dimensions. There are also other socioeconomic and cultural viewpoints for example. Thus, the different factors affecting people’s experiences are various and overlapping. For example, cultural factors cannot be separated from the economic or gender- or sexuality related factors. Ilmonen (2011, p.4) describes intersectionality as a research approach that takes into consideration socially and culturally produced categories such as ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, geographical position, age or other position that is significant in building individual or collective identity. Interestinglyhe same notion could be made about tourism and hospitality.
Understanding the ways in which barriers are built brings us to discuss the enablers and accessibility of travelling. Enablers and the opposite – the barriers – are described e.g. by Rojek (2009), who writes about disposing free time; time that can be used for tourism activities. Rojek (2009, pp. 5–6) describes the concept of free time by writing that even though one might have free time in his/her disposal, one might not be at liberty to dispose it just as you please. There might be matters of inequality and scarcity to consider. Time disposal is dependent on income. The capability to dispose of non-working time includes economic conditions and is culturally coded. It mirrors the distinctions of class, bodily health, gender, ethnicity and educations. Rojek (2009) underlines the individual’s freedom to make choices, but emphasizes that the choices that people take are situated in relation to scarcity. By scarcity he means the unequal distinction of economic, social, cultural and political resources and how people are situated concerning them. (Rojek, 2009, pp. 5–6.) In terms of accessible hospitality, this would turn the question of rainbow tourists to the question of class in addition to sexual and gender orientation.

Crenshaw has also discussed the intersectional worldview in a way that it is not actually the identities that are in the focus but the structures that let the intersections act as a vehicle for discrimination (Crenshaw, 2016). This is how the aim of intersectionality is not only to reveal some of the neglected or discriminated intersections, but also to challenge the surrounding structures. Veijola and Valtonen (2007, p. 17) describe tourism as an industry where so called personal experiences are created and conditioned through standardized or customized processes and where the most productive is “the customer who meets and follows the profit-driven standards.” Tourism would as an industry represent those structures as well.

Asking questions like “Why travel, when you cannot see?” are typical in categorizing people as the visually impaired or the blind. Now, this is just an example, given by Richards et.al. (2010), of a narrow view concerning a single group, but it shows clearly that tourism experiences tend to lack inclusion of those, who do not fit in. Some authors have discussed inclusion in tourism from the perspective of size of the body (e.g. Small & Harris, 2011; Valtonen, 2015). Other scholars have tested the theoretical potential of intersectionality to other thematic such as sexuality (e.g. Conaghan, 2008, p. 26) and consumerism (e.g. Gopaldas & Fischer, 2012).

According to Okolosie (2014), there has been some critique against intersectional theory. Intersectionality is claimed to be too academic and used only by black feminist voices, who highlight race before considering other marginalized categories. However, she emphasizes the fact...
that despite the contradictive opinions, listing difference serves in bringing forward those, who are invisible in the feminist discourse. It brings forward those, who are experiencing the full weight of “imperialist white–supremacist capitalist patriarchy”\(^3\). The way Okolosie is describing intersectionality actually still does bring the ethnicity to the center of the discussion, but within this study, I stress the fact that not only women of color are faced with intersectional oppression. If the intersectionality as a theory is stressed by the fact that given intersectional identities are invisible, then surely it should include other categories besides ethnicity and gender. Besides gender and ethnicity, also sexual orientation, age and class should be stressed when discussing intersectional identities. Gender and ethnicity are important, however. Johnston’s (2005) research included interviews of people at gay parade and she came across a notion that white people, who answered the questionnaire, did not understand the question about ethnicity, while people, who wrote for example Chinese, did not have difficulties in understanding what was meant by it.

4.3 Intersectionality in accessible tourism

Intersectionality is not much used in tourism and hospitality. In studies related to tourism, such as leisure scholarship intersectionality has been used quite little as well (Watson & Scraton 2013, p. 35), but in leisure studies, social exclusion emerges more often than in tourism. Watson and Scraton (2013, p.42) describe intersectionality as following: "Thinking of intersectionality in various leisure contexts contributes to establishing how leisure is simultaneously liberating and constrained." This would hold true in the tourism studies as well. They also state that the appeal in intersectionality is that it offers the opportunity to take a more nuanced approach to identity categories (2013, p. 37). As Ateljevic and Hall (2006, p. 138) describe: *As part of post-structural deconstruction of tourism, the cultural complexities of gender, race, class and ethnicity in the production and consumption of tourist spaces and experiences have become critical in our understanding of tourism phenomena.* The different identity categories are used in tourism research but concerning the discussions of accessible tourism and tourism for all, the implications they provide seem to be rather absent as, although mentioned quite often in terms of tourism for all.

\(^3\) With the quote she refers to bell hooks (2000).
Intersectional approach provides interesting insights to the subject of accessibility in tourism. One of the well-known early authors, who have written about intersectionality, is Kimberle Crenshaw. According to Crenshaw (2006, pp. 7—8) the race, gender and other identity categories are often seen as domination or in another words “as intrinsically negative frameworks in which social power works to exclude of marginalize those who are different.” She however adds that the problem with identity politics is the fact that it does not include the intra group differences, not that it would not overcome difference. She talks about the intersection of race and gender in relation to violence encountered by women.

In tourism context, intersectionality has mainly been used in describing the experiences of host communities (e.g. Buzinde & Manuel-Navarrente, 2013) or the role and experiences of the employers (e.g. Smith, Martinez & Sabat, 2015). In addition to these, queer travelers have been the focus of intersectional studies (see e.g. Hamid-turksoy, Van Zoonen & Kuipers, 2014). Puar (2002) has raised the question of the unidimensionality of queer tourism and studied lesbians’ travelling through intersectionality while Gao and Kerstetter (2015) have studied the tourism experiences and restrictions of older Chinese women. Intersectionality in tourism studies provides on one hand a possibility to enhance the understanding of difference and different customer groups. On the other hand, it helps seeing the structures that produce inequality through tourism. Intersectionality, is thus, a complex issue, since it can help identify how some groups of people might be seen possessing different subject positions, but also how the World is seen from these positions.

According to Hall (2010, p. 34) tourism is a part of a mobility gap. This means that whereas the hypermobile or the kinetic elite travel more than ever, many do not travel far for leisure or business at all. Hall is actually one of the authors that challenge the tourism scholarship to take part in discussion for the non-participants, which is an issue that is more familiar within the leisure discourse. As mentioned above, Morgan (2017) discussed this issue as tourism poverty.

Accessibility as a broad concept brought together with intersectional approach gives a very distinct perspective for this study. There are many implications that multidimensional exclusion is a part of the rainbow culture as well. For instance, according to media, lesbians do not feel welcome in Pride (see e.g. LGBTQ nation 2016). Another example (Hughes and Deutsch 2009, pp. 454—463) describes how the travelling habits of aged gay men differ from those of their younger counterparts, which consequently can lead to exclusion.
There again, we come to realize that people seldom take only one position, but many times we identify them as a part of a group from only one dimension. There are multiple identities within all of us that can cause experiences of exclusion or even discrimination. The different aspects to accessibility – such as economic, political, communicational, cultural and physical (e.g. Jutila, 2013) - have a common ground with the different identity categories used in intersectional approach and identity literature (e.g. Crenshaw), and as such, accessibility can be studied by approaching them through different categories. The different categories are also mentioned in terms of tourism for all (Eichhorn, 2014, p. 25). The connection between intersecting differences and viewpoints to accessible tourism is not straight forward, but following this line of thought, I have put together a table that helps clarifying what I mean by it.

*Table 2 Accessibility and intersectionality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility in tourism</th>
<th>Socioeconomic</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social status, social background, economic affluence etc.</td>
<td>gender, able-bodiedness, size etc.</td>
<td>ethnicity, Sexual orientation etc.</td>
<td>cultural background, Sexual orientation and identification, religion etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 2, one can see different intersecting differences falling under different dimensions of accessibility, based on their similar stance. Why this is important? Intersectional approach is a tool for exposing the complex structures that create inequality and, as seen in the table, can in a similar vein, be seen as a tool for understanding the diverse need of accessible services. In figure 2, there are different viewpoints intersecting each other. They are exemplars of different dimensions of accessibility intersecting each other. Communication is one hand one of the dimensions but one the other hand at the same time a fundamental part of all aspects of inclusion and as such taken as a separate factor in the puzzle.
Figure 2 also demonstrates how the field of tourism is in this study the context in which all the activities are taking place.

In terms of hospitality, accessible hospitality could also reasonably be called intersectional hospitality, since accessibility is a term that gives a quite narrow view to the subject that is in fact very complex and intersectionality would be a better way of describing the many dimensions. However, even this approach would restrict accessible hospitality to the intersections of differences, as I mentioned before. Yet, accessibility viewed as a broad concept puts pressure in understanding where experiences of exclusion on one hand and accessible hospitality on the other, are formed and how they could be understood. Richards et.al. (2010, p. 31) describe the perceptual barriers to find balance between being seen as “normal” and requesting additional assistance that are experienced by many.
While the intersectional approach is used less in tourism studies, as a field tourism has an interesting role in creating, altering and maintaining subject positions through social constructions. It also contributes in building people’s identities. It has influence on and is influenced by politics. In addition, it is noteworthy that tourism is a powerful way of educating people about tolerance and acceptance. Similar thoughts were also brought up by Morgan (2017), who stated in his keynote in the 26th Nordic Symposium of Tourism Research that tourism can make a contribution to social good in the form of social tourism. It can also contribute to social and personal capital, which creates also a space for tourism poverty for those, who due to a reason or another cannot travel. (Morgan, 2017.) Caton (2012, p. 1920) asks if tourism is a space, where we can indulge the tendencies of impatient, impetuous child or is tourism “merely functioning as a larger life context in which our desires for more complex and hard-won forms of pleasure are increasingly dulled in favor of instant gratification and ego fulfillment”. (Caton, 2012, p. 1920). If this is true, then tourism must in return provide a space, in which we can see some of the fundamental life forces coming together for us to examine. Caton (2012) backs my idea by stating that tourism is an ideal metaphorical context for collision of self and other in life more generally. (Caton, 2012, p. 921). For instance, in the context of rainbow tourist, this would mean that tourism is reflecting the way society sees and accepts difference in terms of sexual and gender minorities, or even celebrates difference.

Kuntsman (2007) writes about the intersection of sexual orientation and national/ethnic background describing the experiences of queer people with Russian origins immigrating to Israel. She makes a case of the Russian-speaking queers feeling torn between the Russian past and Israeli present and the feeling of Otherness and wanting to belong. Kuntsman asks, what are the “places of our own” for queer immigrants and what kind of dreams about hospitality arise, when Russian speaking queers immigrate to their national home state. She finds that in the case of a queer restaurant, which is focusing on guests with Russian origins, the customers’ experiences of hospitality vary a lot. While some of them were delighted and felt at home, some felt disgusted. The critique, found Kuntsman, was due to the food and drinking culture of the club that were seen as “Russian drunkenness” and bad “Soviet offerings. (Kuntsman, 2007, p.146-148.) “Queer immigrants simultaneously desire and recent this Israeliiness and the de-ethicized queer scene where any immigrant presence becomes a foreign country, and where a place of belonging at once a compelling fantasy and lost ideal. ” (Kuntsman, 2007, p. 157.)

A different kind of setting including non-Finns in the rainbow scene was seen in Finland almost a decade after Kuntsman wrote her article (HS, 2016; HS, 2017). Gay restaurants in Helsinki
refused to welcome customers with refugee background due to lack of identification documents to proof that they are old enough to enter the restaurants. In Finland, the officials have in fact given some instructions which documents can be accepted by service providers, but in the end, it is the service providers’ responsibility to make sure that the guests are as old as they say they are. (HS, 2016.) This is an indication of the fact that even though, the tourism industry welcomes the rainbow tourists and all other minorities alike, they might not feel welcomed.

In this chapter, I have provided an insight to intersectional approach as a way of understanding difference. Yet, I must conclude this chapter by stating that intersectionality is a complex framework, which has many scholars and critical voices. Thus, it is challenging to use it as a comprehensive framework, it can provide viewpoints to the individual identities and the positions that the subjects are placed according to the identity categories they seemingly fall into.
Netnography

Bhavnani & Talcott (2012, pp. 639—640) describe feminist approach to ethnography. They write that while there has been quite many different insights to feminist research, what is agreed on, is that feminist approaches contribute to documenting visibility and makes women’s voices audible. They argue that feminist ethnographies (or narrative approaches to research) that pay attention to the axes of inequality (as in intersectionality) and to locations offer a way to see where continuities and discontinuities in women’s lives speak to each other. I could add that in intersectional research it is not just the lives of women but also other genders that can be made visible with feminist research. However, Bhavnani & Talcott (2012, p. 641) also criticize the metaphor of intersectionality as a crossroad for different categories of identity that produce oppression, saying that it is a too static way of thinking and makes us not see the persons as agents. According to her, the term intersectional in this sense could be replaced with interconnections. (Bhavnani & Talcott, 2012, p. 641.) Bhavnani & Talcott (2012) frame the need to conduct feminist ethnographic research:

*The methodological consequences of such an approach are what concern me here. To tease out the relationship between production and reproduction, to ensure that the agency of people is captures, and to see the tangle of the interconnected, and to see the tangle of the interconnected configurations of axes of inequality require that we conduct our empirical research by interrogating the actual lived experience of people.* (Bhavnani & Talcott, 2012, p. 641.)

Likewise, the aim of this thesis is to capture a glimpse on how accessibility is understood, acted out and lived in social media discussions. Thus, the real lived experience in the context of this thesis I collected from social media writings.

Mkono and Tribe (2016) have contributed to the social media related research by introducing user roles in online tourism space. They state that it can be suggested that the users of tourism social media can have different roles depending on the uses and gratifications they are seeking from a particular social media experience (Mkono & Tribe, 2016, p. 3). Similarly, it was possible for me to recognize the roles that companies, social media users and other instances take in social media platforms and in the inclusion discourses and how they perform these roles in terms of rainbow tourism. Langer and Beckman (2005, p. 191) see that netnography is a good way of gaining information on sensitive subjects, where the informants might not be willing to
talk to the researcher. This might not be the case of rainbow tourists, but it is a good standing point in gaining relevant information on a topic that might sparkle controversial opinions or be even a tabu. According to Kozinets (2015, p. 3) netnography has been used in various fields of research to describe different styles of interaction, online rules and practices, innovative ways of collaboration etc. Kozinets states that the online aspect to research with endless access to, what is basically archived social interactions changes the practice of ethnology and even the practice of social sciences in general. That alongside with the live access to the people posting online. (Kozinets, 2015, p. 4.)

Thus, according to Kozinets (2015, p. 4) netnography is located somewhere between big data analysis and discourse analysis. There is something to note though. Kozinets (2015, p. 10) advices us not to underestimate the fluidity and instability of human social realm. He continues by stating that when we study online interaction, we try to or at least would like to recognize some of the social categories; nationalities, ethnicities, localisms, religions and occupational identities for example. However, we should be viewing them not as solid states of being, but rather as liquid elements. To some degree, people choose their cultural identifications and try to act as standard members of these cultures. On contrary, cultures do not have rights over the members. What Kozinets means, is that the people, who log onto some online community, do not instantly become part of a culture. However, in this thesis, even though people are not relating to the other individuals in the conversation, it has to be noted that they relate to other communities that influence their perceptions of the surroundings. Netnography is relevant for this study, because it is designed to address the complex relations and cultures that individuals develop online. When analyzing the way people generate hospitable environment online – or don’t – requires having up-to-date approach.
In figure 3, I present the research phases to clarify, how the study was conducted.

![Figure 3. Research conduct](image)

5.1 Data collection

In this thesis, it is acknowledged that context and contextualization of a discourse, as Blommaert (2005) frames it, “are dialogical phenomena”. It is not only the speaker (or in the cases of this thesis the writer), who creates the context, but everyone in the communication process. (Blommaert 2005, p. 43.) In the cases that follow, the focus is in the different participants of the social media discussions, the motivations of the participants and reactions to the statements of other users. These are studied from the viewpoint of intersectionality.

I started this study by scanning through webpages of tourism companies introduced under Gay Friendly Helsinki label. What I discovered is that the companies actually do highlight acceptance, tolerance and inclusion and that to these companies, the rainbow community represents just that. However, other dimensions of accessibility (besides sexual or gender orientation) are not explicitly described or they are plainly absent. DTM Helsinki, for instance, addresses the issues of inclusion by stating that with them, people can be themselves. Themselves in this case means, that people can be open about their sexuality. Difference is indicated with pictures of men, women and drag, which clearly is the primary target group of this restaurant. (DTM 2016a.) Café Cavalier is a café that defines itself as gay friendly. Cavalier’s website also informs people with special diets. (Café Cavalier 2016.) That is one way of addressing physical
accessibility and hidden impairments, since it relates to food allergies. Preparedness for special diets can also serve people with diet requirements related to cultural or religious background.

Concerning hotels, the scanning results indicate a more versatile addressing of accessibility issues. Interestingly two of the hotels say that they welcome guests of all kinds; Sokos Hotel Albert by inviting people as they are (Original Sokos Hotel Albert, 2016) and Hotel Katajanokka by stating that with them people can be who they are (Hotel Katajanokka, 2016), since it is written in to their values. Omenahotelli Lönnrotinkatu is the only one of the companies, in addition to Hotel Helka, that actually discusses economic affluence and, thus, socioeconomic accessibility (Omenahotelli Lönnrotinkatu, 2016). Interesting is also the fact that information about accessibility is not easily found on the websites of any of the companies, even though some of the hotels belong to bigger chains. However, for the mainstream hotels, it might be easier to address physical accessibility than the other dimensions of accessibility, because the latter tend to be more abstract in nature.

It seems that accessible hospitality is included in both active and passive messages by the companies. However, many of the companies take into consideration one minority group they think is included in their own target market or at least suits it nicely. Other aspects of accessibility are usually simply not present of they are communicated insufficiently. For example, a company might include images of gay and lesbian couples in their marketing, targeting the rainbow tourists themselves but also the kind of post-modern cosmopolite described by Skeggs (2014, pp. 288—291) for instance. However, the people are usually presented in a very heterogeneous and heteronormative way. In other words, I would question why some images are not present in marketing. Alternatively, is it just as mentioned before, to reproduce the view of the exotic Other that people are expecting to see? Indeed, it this relates to the concept of institutional diversity described by Ahmed (2012). Inclusion is stated by welcoming all without having to name any minorities.

However, based on the scan on the websites of the Gay friendly Helsinki labeled tourism companies, it is reasonable to suggest that the tourism companies want to present or promote inclusion in their offerings. Yet, the way they inform the potential customers about the inclusive services and venues, should they need them, is very important. The companies’ values often include accessibility and inclusion, but in an abstract level. The values behind accessibility have to be acted out, because only then they can be lived and experienced by the customer.
After this wider scanning of gay friendly companies, I chose the following companies for further investigation, which I conducted by following social media discussions and other media content of the companies. These companies were

- Don’t Tell Mother Helsinki (DTM): A restaurant targeted to rainbow tourism market
- Finnmatkat (Now Tui): A tour operator marketing a gay friendly destination/hotel
- Hotel Helka: hotel, which is not specialized in rainbow tourism, but is founded by NMKY, which is an NGO.

The discussions used as data were in the open social media platforms of the companies. In this study, the used platform was Facebook pages of the companies. I followed the discussions during 2016—2017.

5.2 Discourse analysis

The data I analyzed using discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is different method - but a close relative - to semiotic analysis and examines the use of language as an activity, not just as representing things. Researchers conducting discourse analysis, just like semiotic analysis, are interested in constructing meanings. According to Johnstone (2002, p. 7) discourse analysis can answer innumerable amount of questions and it is used in various fields of study. Discourse analysts can contribute in analyzing questions concerning social relations, include questions of dominance, oppression and solidarity. Discourse analysis is also useful if the interest is in personal identity and social identification. In general, discourse analysis can contribute in answering any question concerning humans in society. (Johnstone, 2002, p. 7.) Based on this notion, I see discourse analysis as a suitable method for answering questions concerning accessible hospitality and inclusion in tourism.

This study discusses identities, which relates to stereotypes, since many times our opinions about others is based on stereotypes. If we think about stereotypes in terms of tourism, we tend to think different groups, who can be seen as unfit and unacceptable in tourism. On one hand, the stereotypes can help us understand different cultures and sub cultures, but on the other hand, they can lead people to narrowmindedness. As kind of a counterforce, accessibility can be used as a tool for fighting inequality and uneven power relations. There are various openings for tourism that is accessible for all, but there seems to be quite little concrete suggestions how tourism for all should be approached theoretically or accomplished in practice. The “red
thread” through accessibility in tourism, tourism for all and finally accessible hospitality, could be found in intersectional theory.

The use of language is always involved in reproduction or reformation of culture. The culture is made known and understandable with different tools such as speech and activities, which are not from this viewpoint contradictory to one another; they both actively mold reality. Use of language is not merely a means of describing things, but something more complicated and fundamental. (Suoninen, 1999, p. 20.) In the thesis meaning production is the way difference is valued and addressed in online discussions and, consequently accessible hospitality is understood, reproduced and communicated.

Different researches stress different questions of discourse analysis. Some researchers guide their research with “what” questions and others with asking “how”. These are informed by the research questions. (Jokinen & Juhila, 1999, p. 70.) In this thesis there is mixture of both. There is also certain involvement of rhetoric and responsivity in the conversations. Rhetoric is a way for companies to persuade the customers to buy or sympathize with the company (Juhila, 1999, p. 76). What makes the communication of companies responsive in this study is the interactive environment in social media.

The discourse analysis was conducted as follows: Following the discussions in the company websites and in the case of DTM in the stakeholders social media sites, I followed different discussions between three companies and their customers. Common to these discussions was that they all related to rainbow community in one way or another. After this, I read the conversations to analyze what kind of elements were present in the discussions with the purpose of constructing different discourses. The elements I specifically classified were:

- Subject: Who presents the utterance, customer or a company? Can the subject have an agenda? What kind of position does the subject seem to have?
- Emotions: What are the emotions present in the utterances?
- Argument: What is the justification or argument behind the statement? Is there a story behind the utterances?
- Does the utterance include the viewpoint of accessible hospitality or intersectionality? If so, how?

The objects of the analysis, I base on the theoretical viewpoints of the study. I chose to use the subject as one of the reference points in the analysis, since in terms of intersectionality and
accessible hospitality, identities and subject positions plays an essential role (see chapter 4). In addition, the research questions require considering the subject. Emotions reflect the way we perceive things, and thus they can provide information about the attitudes the subjects have towards rainbow community and inclusion. Arguments and narratives can open some of the motivational factors behind the utterances. What are the assumptions that might lie behind the utterances and what kind of worldview does the subject possess? Also Hirsto (2011, p. 64) considers motivations as an object for discourse analysis.

5.3 Ethical questions

The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK), appointed by the Ministry of Education and Culture in Finland, has drawn a general guideline for responsible conduct of research in co-operation with the Finnish research community. According to the guidelines, research integrity is based on for instance upon the idea that the research is conducted with integrity, meticulousness and accuracy. This applies to all, phases of the research from conducting to recording, presenting and evaluating research results. (TENK, 2012, p. 30.)

Ethical issues concerning this study relate to data collecting and analyzing. Netnography is an online-based research method, which brings some newly discovered ethical issues. These include for example the definition of public space, and keeping people anonymous. Websites and Facebook pages that I used in this thesis can be considered public, because anyone with access to Internet can access these pages. I do not used people’s names, so the people cannot be identified from the text. It should be noted as well, that when writing to public sites in social media for instance, people already agree on the fact that anyone can read their writings. In any case, the privacy of the social media users is not threatened in this research. What is noteworthy in data that is collected from social media postings, is that the researcher can not know the background of the users, so some of the information stays hidden. Thus, peoples backgrounds cannot be used as background variables as well as in many other studies.

Accessibility issues and issues concerning special needs, culture, religion or sexual orientation are the kind of things that I have used some time to ponder upon. Sensibility in research conduct is definitely an issue here. There is always a certain need to ponder the appropriate terminology, for instance. Yet, De Poy and Gilson (2010), as cited in Heller and Parker Harris (2012, p. xi), state that focusing on such issues as correct terms, might hinder the actual ability to make a
difference, and in the end change things. Thus, clinging too much on the specific terminology concerning rainbow tourism, could hinder the progress of the issue in the field but also in the academia.

I also acknowledge the Western viewpoints of the research. However, it is not the purpose of the study to address the issue that actually pierces somewhat every study ever made about tourism. There is always a threat that the research will on some level reproduce the oppressive structures, but there is also a possibility to make research that overcomes this threat. According to Rossi (2012, pp. 22—23), C. Lander addresses research on “whiteness”, when he writes ironically about the diverse accomplishments of persons perceived as white. According to her, we need research to be able move away from this kind of irony. She perceives that intersectional approach to ethnicity, gender and sexuality that sees these categories as cutting through and reformulating each other, can work as a way to write about whiteness, for instance, without reproducing the structures that normalize whiteness. I want to take Rossi’s thought to the context or tourism. There is a need for research that takes a fluid approach to social structures, accessibility and hospitality to be able to overcome the threat of a Westernized, heteronormative viewpoint to accessibility.

Iina Koskinen (2017) writes in Demos Helsinki’s blog that the impact of academic research can be realized only when someone has read the article, and that due to increased knowledge, that someone has altered his/her behavior. Thus, the aim of research is change. Research has an impact when it changes society. Only one study or even a research project does not probably lead to major paradigm changes or changes in society, but it can be accomplished one project at the time. (Koskinen, 2017.) I seek change as well. The topic of accessible tourism as a theme is meaningful for me for several reasons, but the most profound reason is that I myself, or someone close to me, has been in situations, where adjusted services were needed. Or in a situation, where such services have not been available. This is usually the case for all of us. We at least know someone, who belongs to a social or cultural minority, faces daily physical barriers or it otherwise restricted from taking part in different activities in society. I do not represent the target group of this thesis, since I argue that the rainbow community is not a homogenic group. Thus positioning myself in relation to the whole community would not be without troubles. I understand my position as a Finnish married cis-woman can be seen as a place for criticism. However, I definitely see more value in writing this paper than in choosing another topic.
Waitt and Markwell (2014, p. 31) discuss about themselves writing about gay women. They are gay men and, thus, they do not feel appropriate to assume that they would know women are experiencing things and are for that reason restricting their analysis to discuss merely the experiences of gay men. (Waitt and Markwell, 2014, p. 31.) On one hand, I understand the viewpoint, but on the other hand, I believe that a researcher should be able to position oneself regardless of the personal attachment to the issue.

Knowledge is always political, states Johnston (2005, p. 126). Veijola (2017) offered a viewpoint to this thought on a lecture stating that tourism is actually political too. Why political aspect is interesting from the viewpoint of my thesis is that we all make political decisions, whether we do it consciously or not. What is noteworthy about politics, is that people usually want the same thing; better life for all or at least for most, but opinions how to get to the optimal future vary a lot. Better future is not always better for all. Thus, the impact of knowledge, when taking action in case of being confronted with oppression or on contrary, staying quiet, when witnessing discrimination, depends on one hand on the accuracy of the information we have, and on the other hand, what we do with the information. Taking no action is political statement as well.

In chapter five, I have introduced the methodological approach of the study. The chosen methods serve the purpose of understanding how accessible hospitality is realized the discussion of tourism companies and customers in the context of rainbow tourism. Through netnography, it has been possible to understand how inclusion is understood and reflected by the different participants in the context of rainbow tourism: tourism companies, rainbow tourists and non-rainbow tourists.
Based on the analysis I constructed three different discourses, which I named “Managerial diversity discourse”, “Love and happy holidays to all!” and “The Grump”. Here, I present the results of the discourse analysis and introduce the three discourses.

The discourses logically represent the viewpoints of companies, rainbow tourists and non-rainbow tourists. Alongside with the different subjects and the positions they occupy, the discourses represent various emotions from gratitude and joy to resentment and rejection. The discourses also differ from one another according to the way they include intersectional viewpoints. It seems that even if the discourses include different viewpoints, they all can be addressed with intersectional approach. The discourses help understanding the different viewpoints to accessible hospitality by providing a viewpoint to the multidimensional issue from different levels (figure 4).

Figure 4. The three discourses
6.1 Managerial diversity discourse

This discourse draws upon the utterances, where the subject is a tourism company or a company representative. Companies represent the “official” side of the discussions and this is one of the important aspects of the discourse. The official status of the companies gives this discourse a specific sense of “political correctness”. In figure 4, there is the general outline of the discourse.

The managerial or “official” bearing is seen for instance in the Facebook posting by which DTM responded to the critique concerning its decision of not granting access to the restaurant for immigrants without official Finnish identification documents (see HS, 2016; HeSeTa RY, 2016; DTM, 2016). The company does indicate that it works as a legal entity, which is guided by official instances, such as Valvira (Finnish National Supervisory Authority for Welfare and Health), to whom it has to answer in terms of who they let into the venue. Thus, even if wanting to grant access to all customers, it might not be able to. In Finland, restaurants are under supervision of Finnish National Supervisory Authority and breaking laws concerning restaurant venues that sell alcohol can disturb business. This is acknowledged by every restaurant and the legislation is taken very seriously. In Finland, authorities are well-respected and regulations are followed quite precisely. It is the Finnish way. All the decisions that were made by DTM employees and further communicated in the utterances of the company Facebook page refer to the laws and regulations.

Figure 5. The managerial diversity discourse
The company is happy being able to give good news, since the official instance has clarified the instructions. The utterance reflects enthusiasm and new beginnings.

*Good news! From this evening on dtm accepts residence permit as a document to prove the customer’s age.*

*Valvira has against its former statement declared today in Helsingin Sanomat newspaper that a restaurant can juxtapose a residence permit and a driving license, which are both admitted by officials, but not official identity documentary. Consequently we will change our practices and challenge other restaurants to make the same decision*¹ (*DTM, 2016.*)

One feature of this discourse is the references to a holistic viewpoint to accessibility. Indeed, there are indications to intersectional approach and accessible hospitality. The companies indicate that besides being a venue that welcome rainbow community, they welcome people with different cultural backgrounds for instance. This would be then in the intersection of sexual or gender orientation and cultural background just as Crenshaw (2006) describes the intersection of ethnic background and sex. Accessible hospitality in this sense is built with the desire to not exclude anyone from the clientele. In other words, to include everyone, without categorizing. In this sense, this would draw back to intersectional approach (e.g. Crenshaw, 2006) and to the institutional diversity (Ahmed, 2012).

As an example of this holistic approach, Hotel Helka seems to have intersectionality in their line of communication as a strategically planned activity. In fact, the hotel refers to several laws as it states that it wishes to dissociate itself from any discrimination based on gender, age, ethnic background, religion or conviction, health, physical abilities, disability or sexual orientation. A recently published article by Dream Wear Club, stated that Helka offers a sanctuary to the people in need – including the employees. In the article, the hotel declares for instance that it has a specialty in the reservation system that allows choosing “other” as a gender in addition to the traditional either-or options of male and female. Gender issues are also addressed in the future plans, because the hotel plans on setting up a unisex dressing room and

---

¹ *Hyviä uutisia! Tästä illasta lähtien dtm hyväksyy asiakkaan iän todistamiseen Maahanmuutoviraston myöntämän oleskelulupakortin.*

Valvira on vastoin aikaisempaa ohjeistustaan ilmoittanut tänään Helsingin Sanomissa, että ravintola voi rinnastaa oleskelulupakortin ajokorttiin, jotka ovat molemmat viranomaisen myöntämä, mutta eivät virallisia henkilötodistuksia. Siksi käytäntömme muuttuu nyt ja haastamme muut ravintolat mukaan tekemään saman linjauksen.” (*DTM 2016.*)
unisex customer toilets. In addition, in the future they plan to unify the work uniforms, so that it would be similar for all the employees. (Dream Wear Club Ry, 2016, pp. 29—30.)

Hotel Helka declares in the company website that they constantly work on achieving quality service atmosphere (Hotel Helka, 2016a) and that they want to be a hotel, where no discrimination takes place. This is seen also in the Hotel interior. This, in my viewpoint includes the intersectional thought and as such an indication of accessible hospitality.

![Picture 1. Hotel Helka is a discrimination free zone (Picture courtesy: R. Saukko)](image)

The managerial discourse of diversity also features the rainbow tourist as customers, and for example, Finnmatkat’s posts indicate that they welcome all kinds of customers. This means that the subject is a company, and the decisions have no personal attachments. Welcoming attitude towards rainbow tourists is therefore a part of company policy (as indicated by Hotel Helka in the article mentioned above). Another example of this line of communication would be a reply by Finnmatkat to a Facebook posting of a customer. The customer felt hurt, because of an advertisement featuring gay men. Indeed, Finnmatkat does refer to responsibility and equality being a part of this responsible business.

*It is unfortunate that you feel like this about our advertisement. Our purpose is in no way to exclude anyone from our clientele, quite opposite – to serve all different target groups equally. We want this message to be reflected in our marketing as well. As a responsible company, we guide our employees and cooperators in taking a tolerant and open attitude*
towards difference. You as well as our own team has the right to own opinion, and nobody
is wished to be pushed away from our clientele or our staff because of that. With this adver-
sitement we would like to tell that everyone is equal in Finnmatkat. Hopefully you will de-
spite of this continue using our services. (Finnmatkat 2016.)

We trust that the customers discuss with their children according to their own worldview. However as a responsible company, we want guide our employees and cooperators to having a tolerant and open attitude towards different people. The purpose of this adver-
sitement is to describe the diversity of our clientele and the fact that as Finnmatkat cus-
tomers, everyone is treated as equal. (Finnmatkat 2016.)

The original posting from Finnmatkat featuring gay men was posted with an accompanying
note as follows.

Go to a dream holiday with your love. Novelty! Sensimar hotels for two (Finnmatkat
2016)

This is a clear message of inclusion to the target market. As such, it can be seen as a proactive
initiative towards the rainbow tourists. In addition to this interesting issue, attention has to be
drawn to the conversation that followed after Finnmatkat published the campaign in Facebook.
The campaign was a clear statement and consequently, it raised also contradictory reactions.
The campaign quickly gathered 285 comments (5.11.2016), almost 500 shares and thousands
of reactions in Facebook. Interestingly enough, by stating that the service is especially for two,
they exclude for instance families from the target market of this advertisement.

Accessible hospitality in the light of these discourses is built upon corporate social responsi-
bility, which makes it a part of business management activities. Besides the managerial stance

5 “Ikävää, että olet tätä mieltä mieltä mainoksestamme. Tarkoituksemme ei missään nimessä ole rajata ketään pois
asiakaskunnastamme, vaan pain vastion [sic] - palvella kaikia erilaisia asiakasryhmiämme tasavertaisesti. Ha-
luamme tämän heijastuvan myös mainontaamme omia työntekijöitä-
tamme ja yhteistyökumppaneitamme suhtautumaan erilaisuuteen suvaitsevasti ja avoimesti. Niin sinulla kuin
työtiimimmekin jäsenillä on oikeus omaan mielipiteeseensä, eikä ketään haluta raivata pois niin asiakaskun-
 nastamme kuin työntimistämämekään sen takia. Mainoksellamme haluamme kuvata sitä, kuinka kaikki ovat yh-
denvertaisia meille Finnmatkoille. Toivottavasti käytät tästä huolimatta palveluitamme tulevaisuudessa!”
(Finnmatkat 2016.)

6 “Luotamme siihen, että asiakkaat keskustelevat lastensa kanssa henkilökohtaisen maailmankatsomuksensa
mukaisesti. Haluamme kuitenkin vastuullisesti toimivana yrityksenä ohjeistaa omia työntekijöitämme ja yhteis-
työympäristöltämme suhtautumaan erilaisiin ihmisiin suvaitsevasti ja avoimesti. Tämän mainoksen tavoite
onkin kuvata asiakaskuntamme laajjuutta ja sitä, kuinka kaikki ovat Finnmatkojen asiakkaina yhdenvertaisia.”
7 “Lähde unelmiesi lomalle rakkaasi kanssa. Uutta! Sensimar-hotellit kahdelle”
of this discourse, it also indicates happiness, welcoming and love. Thus, the managerial discourse of diversity is a mixture of CSR strategies and welcoming attitude, which aims in generating accessible and welcoming services for all regardless of their background or identity. From the examples of Finnmatkat and Hotel Helka, I see, that companies do use both managerial discourse on diversity, when they discuss rainbow themes through social media. The general aim of the companies is to keep the space friendly, and the atmosphere light. Neither, Finnmatkat nor Hotel Helka are focused on rainbow tourists, but they want to show variety of services, where different customers would find something suitable and where people would feel safe. In the example below, I would stress the word welcome.

_Everyone is welcome to Helka, regardless of gender and sexual orientation!_8 (Hotel Helka, 2016).

It seems that open and consistent communication from companies increases the positive feedback. Helka’s staff has noted that their customer base has got stronger after starting the campaign. (Hotel Helka, 2017). Indeed, Rossi (2012, p. 27) is spot on, when she asks: When equality of genders is officially discussed in Finland, but in a society, which is not very experienced in cultural diversity, what social position an immigrant woman can have compared to a white Finnish male? What possibilities these intersections enable and what do they rule out? (Rossi, 2012, p. 27.) This note ties together the essence and importance of intersectionality, which can serve as a starting point for inclusion and accessible hospitality. It might even be the closest we can actually get to holistic inclusion in tourism and the service sector in general. However, intersectionality as a standing point or an approach for marketing seems not to be without challenges.

If we think about intersectionality as a viewpoint the way it is seen by Crenshaw (2006) or Okolosie (2005), or the viewpoint of accessible hospitality (Jutila & Harju-Myllyaho, 2016), it would mean that the company would be addressing a complex system of different identities of the diverse rainbow tourism market as well as the non-rainbow tourists. In terms if this study, it seems that the managerial diversity discourse includes the message of inclusion, but by choosing the inclusive and open attitude to communication requires understanding on the fundamental laws of inclusion and exclusion as a subjective experiences. In this case, I see that addressing “all” with the same campaign is not possible and this means that the company is forced to choose, which is not a bad thing in general. In the end, in managerial discourse the

---

8 “Kaikki ovat tervetulleita Helkaan, sukupuolesta ja seksuaalisesta suuntautumisesta riippumatta!”
general argument for accessible hospitality is ‘service for all’, which means in the viewpoint of this thesis ‘service for most’.

Later, staff of Helka has opened their strategies concerning inclusion in a blogpost. In the post, they write that they had for long thought that they has an exceptional atmosphere in Helka and they wanted to also show it outside the company, which is why they wanted to start a campaign that would help to open up the company’s values as well as their own. They expected for varying reactions, and were happy that most customers took the campaign positively. There were, as expected, some negative responses, but the general feedback was good. (Hotel Helka, 2017.) They heartwarmingly write:

Because it is not worth to answer anger with anger, we aim at an open conversation with all people, who have something to say to us (Hotel Helka, 2017.)

Mattila, marketing professor from Aalto University, claims that companies do not exploit Pink money well enough and that the Pride Week in Helsinki could be a potential valuable season for companies. However, rainbow people are a rarely seen theme in marketing. (Koivuranta, 2017.) I would continue this opening by concluding that companies should utilize the power of inclusion in various ways and all year around, not just on one particular week. What Hotel Helka has managed to prove with the vast campaign promoting equal rights for all that inclusion is not only an ethical issue, but also a way of marketing and a way of making visible the values that the companies along with their staff hold important.

This kind of “tolerant attitude” towards ethnic and religious minorities does not go, however, without critique either, as pointed out by Žižek (2017), who writes that cultural battles are in fact battles of classes. This draws the conversation a little far from the discourse of hospitality, yet provides some reasons that lies beneath the different utterances people make. Now, according to Žižek (2017, p. 63), feminism in its tendency to defend minorities, can act as an ideological tool, by which upper class places itself higher than “lower intolerant class”. Social class would be then a lens, through which all other aspects of exclusion could be studied. Consequently, that would in one sense, make this a Being this the case, I would have to wonder, whether holistic inclusion is feasible and if intersectional feminism is actually the closest we
can get to the idea of equity and inclusion. Intersectionality does not show in the communication of DTM and Hercules and it seems that the customers are not convinced.

6.2. “Love and happy holidays for all!” discourse

Here I introduce a discourse I call “Love and happy holidays for all!” This is a one-liner from a Finnmatkat’s a customer’s on Finnmatkat Facebook page, but I used it to name this discourse, since it manages to capture the overall attitude that is reflected within it. Namely, the discourse draws back to the idea of tourism for all (e.g. Eichhorn, 2014) than accessible tourism, and the ‘for all’ concept is close to accessible hospitality and leans to the idea of multiple inequalities, as intersectionality does (see table 2). In the light of this discourse, it is relevant to ask again whether the concept of accessible tourism is even possible to realize. The overview of the discourse is presented in figure 6. Another comment by a social media user shows that for example the Finnmatkat campaign with the gay men was interpreted as an advertisement but also as a proactive and provocative statement of inclusion and welcoming attitude towards difference.

The comment states as follows:

Thank you a thousand times for this advertisement! It is nice to see, that you have the courage to defend equality and equity in advertisements and in the comments. As a company, you are a pioneer and we could use even more this kind of statements in Finland.

10(Finnmatkat 2016, customer.)
Indeed, one of the explicit features of this discourse are the mixed feelings of love, happiness and thankfulness. This is the dominant feature of this discourse and the general atmosphere of the discourse is positive. Many of the comments praised the Finnmatkat campaign and thanked the company for the courage of sending out a message of inclusion. They also framed Finnmatkat as a pioneer, which consequently would mean that not accepting rainbow tourists would be “outdated” as a worldview.

Another special aspect of this discourse was the demand for inclusion for all. This was similar feature to the Managerial Diversity discourse described above, but in a more critical sense. For in instance, Helsinki Seta Ry (HeSeTa Ry) called for intersectional, holistic take on hospitality. They represented the rainbow community as they wrote about DTM incident (not granting access to immigrants due to missing paperwork):

*We are disappointed with legislation, which enables a restaurant to decide, whether or not to let in a customer with a residence permit.*
Restaurants that have gender- and sexual minorities and their friends as their target group, seems to have very little understanding of the community. Is minority culture, community and solidarity so far from Finnish rainbow scene that is has space for Finnish consumers only.\(^{11}\) (HeSeTa Ry, 2016.)

What HeSeTa is actually referring to in this Facebook posting is that there is a need for more extended inclusion. It has to be acknowledged, though, that as Ahmed (2012) stated about institutionalized diversity as a form of hospitality, all are welcomed, but nevertheless, the institution holds the right to choose. Now, as stated before, diversity is institutionalized, when it becomes a part of the institutions practices without causing troubles. In a wider sense, especially in the hospitality industry, we have to ask, if this includes also the idea of having no troubles with other customers. The message includes an idea of intersectionality, since it refers to people, who might be oppressed through belonging to more than one minority at the same time. Indeed, intersectionality can in this case expose some unbalanced power relations, as pointed out earlier by Ilmonen (2011, p.2), or at least some tensions created by different intersecting categories.

I have to wonder, if this intersection of ethnic background and non-normative sexual orientation is a position, which places the subject to a position, where he/she would be discriminated against on one way or another. In other words, is this a case, where the subject would bear the full weight of “imperialist white-supremacist patriarchy” as described by Okolosie (2014)? Indeed, as notions, tourism for all and accessible hospitality include quite a few identity categories (e.g. Eichhorn, 2014), but there is not much concrete examples on how these notions works in practice. Intersectionality, as seen through this discourse, can help understanding the practices and challenges of accessible hospitality and tourism for all.

The message from HeSeTa was actually not entirely targeted to the restaurant, but to the legislative authorities as well. It also included an indication to the extended rainbow tourism market, which includes the allies as they write “and their friends”. At the same time, the message is a

\(^{11}\) “Olemme pettyneitä lainsäädäntöön, joka mahdollistaa sen, että ravintoloitsijaa voi valita päästäääkö oleskeluluvalla olevan asiakkaan sisään ravintolaan vai ei.”

“Ravintoloilla, joiden kohderyhmänä ovat seksuaali- ja sukupuolivähemmistöihin kuuluvat ihmiset ja heidän ystävänsä, tuntuu olevan kovin vähän ymmärrystä itse yhteisöstä. Onko vähemmistökulttuuri, yhteisöllisyys ja solidarisuus niin kaukana suomalaisesta sateenkaariskuenestä, että tilaa löytyy ainoastaan kantasuomalaisille kuluttajille?”
critique targeted to DTM and other restaurants and a unifying message of inclusion to the rainbow community using words such as “minority culture”, “community” and “solidarity”. The message sent is – thus – about inclusion and acceptance.

A holistic, intersectional approach was also seen in DTM and Hercules including the immigrants, who were not granted access to the venue. Rainbow community is seen as a safe haven for all. This would include not only rainbow community, but other oppressed groups as well. However, the interpreting party of an online utterance can be anyone since the space is open for public. People read the postings through the lenses of their own reality. That is why the same sign can take different meanings based on the interpreting person, whose identity is built in the net of intersecting identity categories. A customer had a commented the posting by saying.

As a doorman I might be just a little careful in a situation, where a group of people from a Muslim country is entering a restaurant favored by minorities. 12 (HeSeTa, 2016, customer/social media user).

The person behind the comment suggests that people from Muslim countries might cause danger for rainbow customers of the restaurant. “..I would be careful..” is stated to defend the decision of the doormen in DTM. However, the writer cannot know what the logic behind the doorman’s behavior is. In this case, according to the restaurant, the reason for denying access was the fact that they did not have the necessary documents to prove their age. Comment written by a customer was greeted by another person saying.

Not racist much. (HeSeTa 2016, customer/social media user).

This note, made by the other person, was sarcastic. Irony, sarcasm and humor in general, are actually interesting features of this the discourse at hand. There were several postings that had a humorous or ironic feeling incorporated. This on one hand can be seen as an indication for requiring tolerance for all regardless of their personal traits, orientation or beliefs. On the other hand, however, comments like this indicate also that some opinions are regarded as being above others and thus, it is allowed to make jokes about the more conservative people. It might be that the more critical opinions are disregarded by sarcastic notions or asking some people to “pull their heads from the barrels” or “not to force their awful hetero lifestyle on people.” There

12 “Portsarina minäkin ehkä olisin hieman varovainen tilanteessa jossa ryhmä muslimi maasta tulevia pyrkii vähemmistöjen suosimaan ravintolaan.”
comments were quite witty and made with smileys oftentimes, but there was a sting of criticism in these comments as well. One might wonder if these comments were in defense of social justice and inclusion or a way of raising oneself above others. Like in the comment that says:

_Sometimes coffee is just coffee, not a Halloween product to scare people scared when born. Helka has done a great culture act!_13 (Hotel Helka, 2016).

Thus, gay spaces are never neutral in the sense that they might reproduce existing structures (Skeggs, 2014). In this case, this would mean that there are conservative reactions against liberal comments. However, in addition, reproducing the existing structures can also be seen in the more liberal comments, which play a role in the reproduction of the structures that repress minorities by strengthening the binary between minority/majority, normal/non-normal, enlightened/misguided etc.

The racism discussion was interesting also because it reflects the status quo of Finnish society concerning the immigration discussions. As Cuthill (2007, p. 85) frames it, changes in the restaurants reflect and reproduce the features of the era. In Finland critique against immigration and people defending the right to an asylum have been colliding in recent years. This creates a situation, where many issues are reflected to the ongoing critical conversations. There on one hand is a general tolerance towards difference and on the other hand discriminating attitudes towards immigrants.

The person, who posted the comment, was immediately labeled as racist. The “Love and happy holidays for all!” discourse incorporates a high sense of right and wrong, however, there are collisions between many rights and wrongs perceived by different people from their own standing points.

Intersectional thought incorporates the issue of race and/or ethnicity and such services that take into consideration the hospitable attitude, ethnic background and sexual orientation is very challenging. In the light of this thesis, I would say that in some cases, it might even be impossible, but the customers do respect the effort.

---

13 “Joskus kahvi on vain kahvia, ei Halloween tuote jolla pelotellaan syntymässä säikähtäneitä. Helkan toiminta on hieno kulttuuriteko!”
The third discourse I constructed is actually named after a Finnish novel, The Grump (Kyrö, 2010). This discourse was drawn from one of the Facebook postings, but it represents the overall attitude that cuts through this discourse. The Grump is a person, who complains about everything. In addition, the Grump does not appreciate novelty or change wants things to stay as they are. This discourse has some special features incorporated, such as feeling of wonder and exclusion. The overview on The Grump discourse is presented in figure 7.

An indication to hospitality and accessibility is also seen as a broader concept (Harju-Myllyaho & Jutila, 2016) is present also in this discourse, but from a different angle. This is seen in many of the comments that declare that the customers will change the travel agent due to Finnmatkat’s campaign. For instance, a typical comment would be as follows:

Finnmatkat, I write to you for the first time. During the years, I have traveled one and another thanks to your trustworthy image and professional team. Your service has been great. Now today our love has suffered a bump and your video is the reason for that or who ever came up with this video or what’s worse, let it out to the public. Did you think that with this video you offend many old, faithful customers. I do not think that there are only a small group of people us “Grumps”, “intolerants”, “stone-agers” and what ever name others want to call people like me (and does not matter anyway); there are many of us, just that not everyone speaks up their opinions (most likely because it is not tolerated)...14 (Finnmatkat, 2016, customer)

---

14 kirjoitan teille ensimmäistä kertaa. Olen vuosien aikana reissannut yhden jos toisenkin matkan teidän luotettavan imagonne ja osaavan tiiminne ansiosta. Palvelunne on ollut loistavaa. Nyt tänään tuli ryyppy rakkau- teemme ja videonne on siihen syynlinen tai kuka ikinä onkaan ideoinnut [sic]sen ja vielä pahempaa, kuka on päästänyt sen julkisuuteen. Tuliko mieleenne, että te kyseisellä videolla pahoitatte monen vanhan, uskollisen matkustajan mielen. En usko, että meitä “mielensäpahoittajia”, ”suavitsemattomia”, ”kivikautisihmisä” ja millä nimellä ikinä kukaan haluakkaan minunkaltaisia kutsua (joka muuten on aivan se ja sama) on vain pieni osa; meitä on monta, kaikki eivät vain tuo mielipidettään esille (johtunee siitä, ettei toisenlaisia mielipiteitä suvaita)...(Finnmatkat 2016.)
Thus, the person, who posted this comment, indicates that actually, by including rainbow tourists to the advertisement, the company excluded some other people. Many of the critical comments argued that including rainbow tourists excludes older people and families with children for instance. Regarding this discourse, the subject would be a customer or the potential customer of the company and by making a choice of including one target group in this case would seem to mean excluding another.

Within this discourse, intersectional approach can provide a way to see some inter- and intragroup differences in the customer base of rainbow tourists and non-rainbow tourists. As Crenshaw (2006, pp. 7—8) points out, different identity categories are often seen as domination, and as such frameworks that place people in marginalized positions. In this perspective, it is not only the rainbow tourists, who are marginalize, it is also the non-rainbow tourists and in this case, especially the Grump, since the Grump is in a way restrained to the explicit categories, which become implicit. Consequently, the Grump ends up reproducing the existing structures within the society.

Edelheim (2006; 2007) has analyzed tourism brochures to expose the possible hegemonic messages that they are sending. According to him, choosing marginalized groups to tourism advertisements, portrayed as tourists, would make them more visible in the society and thus they would become more of a social norm (Edelheim, 2006, p. 211). Following his thoughts, it can
be argued that picture painted about the rainbow tourists in the tourism communication has an impact to the social norms as well as the general acceptance. In fact, some of the utterances asked what is actually making the campaigns representing rainbow tourists so deviant. This might mean that for some, rainbow imagery is already something very trivial, while for others it is still a little disturbing, which means that they have not become a social norm. Consequently, not being inside a social norm might be a excluding factor for some.

The comments that construct this discourse rely on heteronormative institutions and structures, such as nuclear family with a mother and a father and oftentimes they are justified with religious thought. Indeed, the thought of tourism being built on basic binaries, such as ordinary-extraordinary, self-other or tourist-host and the thus, the queer bodies are seen as other, whereas families with mother and father are seen as normal and acceptable (Johnston, 2005, p. 15-16) can be seen in this discourse. As a standing point, it is the case of seeing only one ‘right way’ to live, which is according to the given circumstances. Thus, being born to a certain body, would automatically restrain the individual to a certain position, a certain (heterosexual)life. This would represent Caton’s (2014, p. 132) description of the unenlightened view, where people accept their circumstances as natural and inevitable.

Concerning Finnmatkat rainbow campaign, some of the non-rainbow tourists actually felt excluded because of the advertisement. These included for instance people with religious ideologies, people with children and seniors. This was quite surprising, because Finnmatkat is targeting also these groups with different campaigns.

Have you in Finnmatkat considered that children also watch your advertisements... At least I don’t like explaining to children what those two guys are doing... Is it not the purpose to promote warm holiday destinations and not the fact it is nice being gay and oh it is nice to kiss a hairy uncle....

Finally, this discourse includes a notion of “the pinkwash”. This means, that part of the discussion indicated that the gay theme is too visible in society and as such is “too much”. People often seem to think that society is being pink washed or turned too gay for them. The Grump feels offended or threatened by this too.

---

15 Oletteko finnmatkoilla [sic] ajatelleet että lapset katsovat myös mainoksiannen... mä en ainakaan tykkää selittää lapsille mitä nuksetä setää tekee.. eikö tarkoituksena ole mainostaa lämpimiä lomakohteita eikä sitä että on kiva olla homo ja ompas mukava pussata toista karvasta setää.....” (Finnmatkat 2016.)
In a comment in Hotel Helka’s Facebook page, a customer wrote:

*What a hotel, why do you have to promote gay theme so strongly? I have stayed at your hotel many times. Some people mix business and private life. This is no doubt a conscious choice and a hope that by differing as a gay friendly hotel, everyone would go to a rainbow hotel. It might be that this play will turn to bad results, at least I will pass – find some hetero hotel for myself, where I’m cherished.* (Hotel Helka, 2016, customer.)

This kind of commentary is very common, when people criticize material that includes content representing gay people. People do feel excluded if they do not relate to the target group. I would be inclined to ask whether it is possible to include some controversial target groups without excluding some others at the same time.

If our social being, even as separate individuals depends on the others (Veijola, 2014, p. 71), then it should be obvious that accessible hospitality and welcoming atmosphere is created and maintained in a similar way in social media platforms. A collective sense of acceptance is produced and promoted by posting approving comments like hearts, thank you notes and lovable emojis. My original assumption was that negative comments would disturb the welcoming atmosphere. However, it seems to be quite the opposite. When a negative comment is posted on the comment section in social media, it is immediately tackled by the host (company) or the other social media users.

---

7. Discussion

Against my initial thought, the Grumps do not really increase sense of exclusion in the tourism companies’ social media space. There is critical discussions though, since the conservative people are challenged by other customers, who regard rainbow tourists as a group that should be valued as equals with mainstream tourist. Nevertheless, there are power relations involved in hospitality, as suggested by Höckert (2015, pp. 94—98). In this case, the power emerges in the way someone holds the power to choose who is welcome. One could ask if it is possible to challenge the existing power relations through tourism by providing access to non-participating but possible hosts and guests. However, it is interesting how people, who do not like the idea of welcoming rainbow tourists to the same space with them, might feel excluded, even though it is not the purpose of the company.

The constructed discourses indicate that accessible hospitality is created together between the companies and customers. Consequently, accessible hospitality should be seen as a co-creation process, where also the people, who disapprove play an important part. In an online environment, there is always an element of unpredictability, though, due to the fact that even moderated spaces, which are open for commenting can act as vehicles for conversations that create sense of exclusion. Words are not only words; they actively construct our reality.

![Accessible hospitality constructed diagram]

*Figure 8 Accessible hospitality constructed*
Based on the discourses, accessible hospitality is constructed as a mixture of institutionalized diversity (Ahmed 2012) from the company’s side and subjective opinions and feelings of the customers (figure 8). However, in this case, I would refer to institutionalized diversity as managerial diversity. This is a complex system of inclusion and exclusion built on the subject positions of the participants and expressed through attitudes towards others. Indeed, accessible hospitality is a co-creation process.

In the case of commercial hospitality, it is the company’s responsibility to create a space, where everyone can feel welcomed and safe, which means that they are indeed the ones with the power to welcome or unwelcome. However, based on the analysis, I claim that the companies and customers have the same goal: generating accessible hospitality. Yet, opinions differ, how this should or could be accomplished. I would compare this situation to politics, where all parties want the same thing (better public services, for example), but the opinions vary how to reach the goal. It takes a lot of will and attitude from the companies to keep the atmosphere light and welcoming. In other words, intersectionality is present in the discourses in different ways, depending on the perspective.

In commercial hospitality, it is genuinely important inclusion to be promoted both actively and proactively. The critical voices towards minorities can be accepted in the company social media platforms, however, the company must make clear that it holds inclusion as a value. In addition, in this case, I have to note that the utterances of social media users were not violent or very strong. In such a situation, the company should consider taking actions, such as banning the writer. Hate speech should not be tolerated in any situation. Jantunen, who claims in an interview (Juusela, 2017) that the line between information war and hate speech is thin, also points out this issue. According to Jantunen, common people, who spread hate speech, are the same as free workforce for political hate campaigns. People spreading hate speech are, however, often being oppressed themselves too. (Juusela, 2017.)

The results of the discourse analysis underline the importance of open-minded discussions, positive attitude and proactivity in the communication. They also emphasize the importance of understanding the complexities of social media communications. The other customers in the same online space are creators of the welcoming atmosphere just like the company’s social media team. Yet, the data also reflects the notion that open discussion has gained some new directions in Finland, where people feel that they are free to say anything in the name of
Some of the social media users did use humor in making a statement and it can make the space more welcoming. However, sarcasm is not probably the way to go, since it raises the speaker above others. The people behind critical voices have the right to feel welcomed as well. Moreover, they too are entitled to have good quality service. The difference between the rainbow-tourists and their allies and the Grumps is that the Grump calls for inclusion, but in return does not want inclusion to cover people, who is deviant or does not fit the norms. Thus, inclusion for the Grump is very normative and in that sense does not fulfill the criteria for tourism for all or accessible hospitality. There can also be a possibility that also the rainbow tourists and allies end up reproducing the existing normative structures, since by acknowledging that there are people, who are welcomed and others, who are not, the discourses also acknowledge the structures behind the phenomenon.

Accessible hospitality cannot be anything but intersectional to say the least. I would say at least, since intersectionality seems to locate people in certain spaces, which makes it a little problematic, a paradox in a sense. Yet, the concept of intersectional accessibility is worthy of a closer look. Rossi (2012) states that even Finland does not have background of racial issues, inequality can be tied into other social institutions (health care, police force, education, politics and justice, for instance). This is silent inequality, which is not always conscious and, thus, it is more difficult to fight against it. (Rossi 2012, pp. 26—27.) Thus, intersectionality can act as a framework to understand silent inequality.

Based on the data, I argue that accessible services are always proactive services. By this, I mean that e.g. persons with disabilities or other special accessibility requirements usually want to know whether the destination or the venue is accessible or not. Thus, also the other aspects of accessibility (social, political, cultural and economic) should incorporate the viewpoint of proactivity in the sense of acting before problems occur is a better way than acting reactively should be in every company’s agenda. This shows explicitly in the research data concerning DTM, where an incident occurred and was then informed later.

Much of the studies in the field of tourism have concentrated on the “exotic Others”. According to Adams (2004, pp. 114—115) many studies are conducted to clarify how the images of ethnic Others are appealing, exoticized and sexualized. She continues but stating that the images of this kind are important for cultural tourism and they are disseminated via brochures for example. In other words, these images construct “mythic” Others for tourism consumption. The images shape the expectations of the tourists, motivate them and alter their conceptions about
the people before actually visiting the destinations. But not only do they have an effect on the tourists’ mental images about the destination and the peoples, they also impact the way the inhabitants in the destinations see themselves. (Adams 2004, pp. 114-115). This description by Adams (2004) gives me a possibility to ponder upon whether the online discussions and campaigns enhance the feeling of inclusion for the target market or are there, in fact, also opposite impacts. Moreover, if some people are included, does it mean that others are excluded?
8. Conclusions and limitations

In this thesis, I have studied the discourses that can be constructed from the social media content generated by tourism companies and customers in the context of LGBTIQ tourism. Through the discourses, I studied how accessible hospitality is reflected in the online communication of tourism companies from the viewpoint of intersectionality.

The discourses I named “Managerial diversity discourse”, “Love and happy holidays for all discourse” and “The Grump discourse”. The Managerial diversity discourse features accessible hospitality as company policy and quality customer service. Intersectionality as an approach is expressed as a genuine will to welcome and serve all customers equally. Political correctness is an essential a part of this discourse. Love and happy holidays for all discourse is a joyful discourse. The general atmosphere is positive and light. There is a trace of humor expressed in the discourse, but it can sometimes turn into sarcasm, which might come out as patronizing. In terms of inclusion, Love and happy holidays discourse is intersectional by default, since it incorporates the notion “for all”. Yet, the discourse is not without contradictions. The Grump discourse is the most conservative of the three discourses, expressing feelings of exclusion, because the subjects do not want neither to see the rainbow tourists on their holidays or advertisements, nor to be connected to them. Not being comfortable with this group, is explained with notions children and older people being neglected as a target group, due to inclusion of rainbow tourists. Accessible hospitality is understood in a similar way, but the viewpoint varies.

As a conclusion, the notion of accessible hospitality is a complex system, where every participant’s goal is quite the same; to be included. Based on the data in this thesis, I claim that different customer groups and companies have a genuine will to generate hospitality that would be equal for all regardless of personal trait, such as sexual orientation, age or class. The customers wish is to feel welcome and the companies’ genuine will is to offer that. There is a small paradox in this equation, however. It is in the fact that including rainbow people making them visible seems to automatically lead to a sense of exclusion for some. Identity intersections such as sexual orientation and aging or sexual orientation and ethnic background, for instance seem a little challenging to handle by only one company.

Yet, the tourism companies have and important role in generating accessible hospitality in social media, in other words, making people feel welcome regardless of their backgrounds or
personal traits. The companies, however, are only one piece of the puzzle. The social media space is a shared space, where all people have equal right and the users are generating content and atmosphere as well. People do not come to the social media platform from a vacuum and thus. Thus, they see things through their own lenses. To quote Anais Nin, *We don’t see things how they are, but how we are.*

Hence, more than anything, accessible hospitality needs openness and open-mindedness. However, understanding the heterogenic target groups, such as rainbow tourists is important. Intersectional approach helps understanding the heterogeneity of the customers better, even though as a framework it is quite theoretic and stiff. It can still bring a practical viewpoint to accessibility, since for example the concept of “tourism for all”, constitutes of the different categories or viewpoints to accessibility, but does not give practical examples of how to execute the idea of “for all”.

The limitations of this study includes the researcher bias, since I do not wish to take a position regarding the target group. In this regard, I trust the data and my own ability to form objective analysis based on it. A limitation might also be the case-study type of approach. Thus, the results might not be scalable. I would suggest that in the future a more general approach to the theme would be useful, for instance in the form of studying the strategic approach to accessible tourism in Finland. The idea of accessible hospitality could also be supported by including other customer groups to the study as well. This would serve the idea of hospitality that is accessible for all. Limitations of the study include also the fact that I collected the data from a secondary source and, thus, it would be of use to gain more understanding by interviewing companies and customers.

With this study, I have taken part in discussions concerning accessibility and inclusion in tourism and hospitality. The results improve understanding the complexity of the issue and helps understanding how tourism and hospitality companies generate accessibility together and how they understand accessible hospitality in the first place. Intersectionality is used in this study as a cut-through approach, which gives and impression of the complex nature of accessibility.
Acknowledgements

I would like to take the opportunity to thank my supervisor José-Carlos García-Rosell for support and patience and Kirsti Lempiäinen for her important and punctual comments on the theory. I also thank Heli Ilola for her finalizing comments on the text.

Thank you dad, for asking every time we have met during the past year, if I am finished with my thesis.

Lastly, I would like to thank my colleagues at Multidimensional Tourism Institute for their humor, laughter and inspiration.

While this thesis has been a very important learning experience, I would like to quote one of my favorite poets (even if out of context):

“Nevermore, nevermore.” – Poe
REFERENCES


