



## King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1108/EJM-04-2022-0280](https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-04-2022-0280)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Husemann, K. C., Zeyen, A., & Higgins, L. (2023). Marketplace Accessibility: A Service-Provider Perspective. *European Journal of Marketing*, 57(9), 2544-2571. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-04-2022-0280>

### **Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## Marketplace Accessibility: A Service-Provider Perspective

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-04-2022-0280.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	marketplace accessibility, inclusion, disability, visual impairment, Museums, service provision

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Marketplace Accessibility: A Service-Provider Perspective

**Purpose:** This study explores the strategies that service providers use to facilitate marketplace accessibility, and identifies the key challenges in that process. We do so to develop a roadmap towards improved accessibility and disability inclusion in the marketplace.

**Methodology:** We conducted eight semi-structured interviews with service providers (curators, visitor service coordinators, access managers) at museums who run access programmes for customers with visual impairment (VI), along an embodied duo-ethnography of those programmes.

**Findings:** Service providers foster autonomous, embodied, and social access. Resource constraints, safety concerns, and exposed differences between customers compromise access. To overcome these challenges service providers engage in three inclusionary strategies - *informing, extending, and sensitizing*.

**Original/ Value:** This study contributes: i) A service provider perspective on marketplace accessibility that goes beyond removing 'disabling' barriers towards creating opportunities for co-creation. ii) An approach towards marketplace accessibility that fosters inclusiveness while considering the inherent challenges of that process. iii) An illustration of posthumanism's empirical value in addressing issues of accessibility in the marketplace.

**Practical Implications:** We offer a roadmap for policy makers and service providers on: i) which types of access should and can be created, ii) what challenges may be encountered, iii)

1  
2  
3 how to manage these challenges, and, thus, iv) how to advance accessibility beyond  
4 regulations.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **Research Limitations:** Our service provider- and VI-focus present limitations. Future research  
11 should: i) consider a poly-vocal approach that includes the experiences of numerous  
12 stakeholders to holistically advance marketplace accessibility, ii) apply our marketplace  
13 accessibility findings upon different disabilities in other marketplace contexts.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 **Key words:** marketplace accessibility, inclusion, disability, visual impairment, museums,  
22 service provision  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

More than a billion people, equating to 15% of the world's population, are disabled, rendering the disability community one of the largest minority groups (WHO, 2021). The World Health Organization (WHO) defines disability as “the interaction between individuals with a health condition [...] and personal and environmental factors (e.g., negative attitudes, inaccessible transportation and public buildings)”. Given our global ageing population, disability figures are only set to rise, with most of us likely to experience bodily deterioration throughout our life (Goodley, 2017). Despite these developments, and even though holding an estimated disposable income of £7 trillion (Purple Pound, 2022), businesses globally fail to appropriately cater for disabled customers. In 2019, for example, poor accessibility within the UK led to monthly losses of approximately £163 million for restaurants, pubs, and clubs; £267 million for high-street shops; and £501 million for supermarkets (Purple Pound, 2022). Furthermore, UN reports show that within the UK, “more and more disabled people are finding it difficult to live independently and be included, and participate, in their communities on an equal basis” (House of Commons Library Briefings, 2020). In short, marketplace access and disability inclusion remain inadequate and insufficient to say the least. This study seeks to address these issues by exploring the strategies that service providers can use to facilitate marketplace access for disabled customers.

From a marketing and consumer research perspective, issues of equality and fairness for disabled people have informed the concept of ‘marketplace accessibility’, which refers to the creation, maintenance, and experience of a barrier-free market environment that disabled consumers can access and participate in independently, stress-free, and with dignity (Baker *et al.*, 2002; Balabanis *et al.*, 2012; Kaufman-Scarborough, 1999, 2001). The growing stream of literature on this subject explores the lived experiences and coping strategies of disabled customers who face challenges in accessing the marketplace due to architectural-structural as

1  
2  
3 well as interpersonal service-related barriers (Baker *et al.*, 2002, 2007; Dias de Faria and  
4 Casotti, 2019; Falchetti *et al.*, 2016; Kaufman-Scarborough, 1999, 2001; Yu *et al.*, 2015).

7  
8 Despite offering rich and meaningful insights, marketing research on accessibility is  
9 limited to a consumer-centric understanding of marketplace accessibility, and lacks a service-  
10 provider perspective. Specifically, we do not understand service providers' strategies to  
11 facilitate marketplace accessibility, including the practices that they engage in, and the  
12 challenges they face, when removing architectural-structural as well as interpersonal service-  
13 related barriers. Thus, we ask: What are the strategies that service providers use to facilitate  
14 marketplace accessibility? And, if any, what are the challenges they face in that process?  
15 Unpacking service providers' strategies towards marketplace accessibility, and identifying key  
16 challenges, is important as it can generate key insights for developing a roadmap towards  
17 improved accessibility and disability inclusion in the marketplace.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 To answer our research questions, we studied access programmes designed for  
32 customers with visual impairment (VI) in London-based museums in the UK. We chose access  
33 programmes in museums as our research context as they are often seen as being at the forefront  
34 of facilitating marketplace accessibility which is partly due to funder requirements (Sandell,  
35 2003). Arts Council England, for example, makes funding decisions dependent on how creative  
36 and cultural organizations "reflect the communities they work in"  
37 (<https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/blog/opening-inclusion>) and whether they take action to  
38 remove "social and institutional barriers that prevent people from creating, participating or  
39 enjoying arts and culture" (2018, p. 3). This has led to many museums making disability  
40 inclusion part of their mission and adopting a proactive approach towards developing access  
41 programmes. We chose to focus on VI as globally approximately 2.2 billion people are  
42 affected, and due to an aging population, numbers are rising year by year (WHO, 2021).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Theoretically, we draw from a posthuman understanding of disability to explore how  
4 service providers in museums make their offer (in this context art and historic artefact  
5 collections) accessible to VI customers. Posthumanism, and its three underlying key principles  
6 - interdependence, embodiment, and relationality - received recognition among disability  
7 theorists (Goodley *et al.*, 2014; Liddiard *et al.*, 2019; Murray, 2020). Posthumanism critiques  
8 the tragic view of disability (Goodley, 2017) by celebrating diversity, embracing the linkages  
9 between humans, technology, objects, and animals, and acknowledging the inherent  
10 connectedness among humans (Braidotti, 2013). From this perspective, disabled people, who  
11 often have strong interdependences with other people (carers, nurses, support workers), objects  
12 (wheelchairs, canes), animals (service dogs), and whose bodies may be perceived as ‘different’  
13 from the mainstream, are quintessentially human. This inclusive approach and outlook of what  
14 it means to be ‘human’ (Braidotti, 2013) is why we chose this theoretical lens.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Our analysis reveals that to facilitate marketplace accessibility, service providers of VI  
32 access programmes foster three interrelated forms of access: autonomous, embodied, and  
33 social, each of which resonates with posthuman thought on interdependence, embodiment, and  
34 relationality. Autonomous access refers to facilitating an independent marketplace experience  
35 at the customers’ own discretion; embodied access refers to providing a safe market  
36 environment that allows customers to engage in multi-sensory experiences, while social access  
37 refers to facilitating relationship-building and creating a sense of belonging in the marketplace.  
38 We also find that challenges such as organizational resource constraints, safety concerns, and  
39 exposed differences between customers compromise access. To overcome these challenges,  
40 service providers engage in three inclusionary strategies—informing, extending, and  
41 sensitizing.

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 This study makes contributions to the literature on marketplace accessibility as well as  
57 on posthumanism. First, we offer a service-provider perspective on marketplace accessibility,  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 which reveals that efforts to facilitate marketplace accessibility extend beyond reducing  
4 architectural-structural as well as interpersonal service-related barriers (Baker *et al.*, 2002,  
5  
6  
7  
8 2007; Dias de Faria and Casotti, 2019; Falchetti *et al.* 2016; Kaufman-Scarborough, 1999,  
9  
10 2001; Yu *et al.*, 2015) towards creating opportunities for co-creation and participation. Second,  
11  
12 we outline an inclusive approach to marketplace accessibility designed to enable customers to  
13  
14 feel “independent and competent [rather than] disempowered and incapable” (Yu *et al.*, 2015,  
15  
16 p. 122) while taking into account the challenges that service providers encounter when working  
17  
18 towards this approach. Finally, we contribute to the existing literature on posthumanism, which  
19  
20 is largely theoretical, by showing empirically how the three principles of posthumanism  
21  
22 address issues of accessibility and disability in marketing.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 In the following sections, we offer theoretical foundations, discussing marketing  
28  
29 research on marketplace accessibility as well as introducing posthumanistic theory. We  
30  
31 continue by describing our methodological approach and presenting the findings. We conclude  
32  
33 by discussing our findings and outlining our key contributions.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

## 39 **Theoretical Foundations**

### 40 *Marketplace Accessibility*

41  
42  
43  
44 Marketplace accessibility refers to the creation, maintenance, and experience of a barrier-  
45  
46 free market environment that disabled customers can access and participate in independently  
47  
48 (Baker *et al.*, 2002, 2007; Balabanis *et al.*, 2012; Kaufman-Scarborough, 2001). It has become  
49  
50 a “global issue, one that is important to nations, businesses (large and small), and customers  
51  
52 throughout the world” (Baker *et al.*, 2002, p. 227). Marketplace accessibility is not only key in  
53  
54 creating a fair market (Baker *et al.*, 2005; Falchetti *et al.*, 2016) but also holds the potential to  
55  
56 be a lucrative and a financially attractive business strategy given that globally disabled people  
57  
58 are one of the largest minority consumer segments (Purple Pound, 2022).  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Public discourse on marketplace accessibility gained momentum in the late 1990s after the  
4 USA issued the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the UK decreed the Disability  
5 Discrimination Act (DDA). Both legislations are aimed at removing access barriers to the  
6 marketplace by mandating that service providers make accommodations to provide access  
7 (Baker *et al.*, 2002; Goodrich and Ramsey, 2012; Kaufman-Scarborough, 1999, 2001; Pavia  
8 and Mason, 2012). A positive outcome of these legislations is that they have significantly  
9 widened physical access to marketplaces and society. However, their prioritization of  
10 physicality has resulted in many companies working to meet legal disability regulations, which  
11 often do not fully meet the needs and requirements of disabled people thus failing to improve  
12 accessibility in practice (Beudaert, 2020; Higgins, 2020; Reeve, 2020).

13  
14 From a marketing and consumer research perspective, the past 20 years have given rise to  
15 a growing body of work investigating marketplace accessibility (Baker *et al.*, 2002, 2005, 2007;  
16 Echeverri and Salomonson, 2019; Falchetti *et al.*, 2016; Higgins, 2020; Kaufman-Scarborough,  
17 1999, 2001; Navarro *et al.*, 2014, 2015; Pavia and Mason, 2012, 2014). This work is informed  
18 by research on consumer vulnerability (Baker *et al.*, 2005; Falchetti *et al.*, 2016; Dias de Faria  
19 and Casotti, 2019), consumer normalcy (Baker, 2006), marketplace exclusion (Mason and  
20 Pavia, 2006) and marketplace stresses (Balabanis *et al.*, 2012). It has predominantly focused  
21 on exploring 1) the lived experiences and 2) the coping strategies of customers with physical  
22 or sensory impairments who navigate a “disabling [market] environment” (Kaufman-  
23 Scarborough, 2001, p. 432). Assuming a social model of disability, which views disability as  
24 socially constructed by the environment rather than as an impairment of the body or mind  
25 (Goodley, 2017; Imrie, 1997; Shakespeare, 2004), this research stream identifies two core  
26 barriers that impede an accessible marketplace experience.

27  
28 The first barrier involves architectural-structural issues and refers to the design and  
29 positioning of materials within commercial settings. These can include inappropriate size,  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 height, and width of aisles, ramps, and doors (Kaufman-Scarborough, 1999); crowded floor  
4 space (Kaufman-Scarborough, 2001); sharp-edged furniture; high-intensity lighting and sound  
5 systems (Dias de Faria *et al.*, 2012); and inadequate store signage (Yu *et al.*, 2015). In the  
6  
7  
8 1990s, Kaufman-Scarborough (1998, 1999) called for retailers to adapt their traditional retail  
9  
10 models to incorporate those living with disabilities and issued a framework of reasonable  
11  
12 access to help retailers better meet this call. Despite this, almost thirty years on, physical  
13  
14 inaccessibility remains a challenge (Beudaert, 2020; Higgins, 2020). The second barrier  
15  
16 revolves around interpersonal service-related issues, which predominantly refer to service  
17  
18 providers treating disabled customers differently from non-disabled customers (Kaufman-  
19  
20 Scarborough, 1998, 1999). Examples include the ignoring of disabled customers by service  
21  
22 providers, and experiences of ‘overhelping’, which are often perceived as patronizing and  
23  
24 infantilizing by disabled customers (Kaufman-Scarborough, 1998, 1999, 2001; Yu *et al.*,  
25  
26 2015). Such behaviours can indeed further disenfranchise disabled customers to an extent of  
27  
28 being internally oppressive and emotionally disabling at the psychological level (Higgins,  
29  
30 2020; Reeve, 2020).

31  
32  
33 To manage these access barriers as well as to increase feelings of independence, disabled  
34  
35 customers employ adaptive or coping strategies (Baker *et al.*, 2002; Balabanis *et al.*, 2012;  
36  
37 Beudaert *et al.*, 2017; Echeverri and Salomonson, 2019; Falchetti *et al.*, 2016; Mason and  
38  
39 Pavia, 2006; Yu *et al.*, 2015). Such strategies involve disabled customers balancing feelings of  
40  
41 dependency and independence when accessing the marketplace (Baker *et al.*, 2002). Coping  
42  
43 strategies vary widely, “including the degree of independence desired and achieved” (Baker *et*  
44  
45 *al.*, 2002, p. 215). Falchetti *et al.* (2016), for example, discuss how factors such as emotional  
46  
47 well-being, acceptance of the disability, and perceptions about market access barriers influence  
48  
49 disabled customers’ coping strategies, which can range from switching to new products and  
50  
51 services, asking for and receiving help from others, preferring retailers that meet their needs,  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and raising social awareness. Successful coping and adaptation to marketplace barriers  
4 positively affects the well-being and self-image of disabled customers, reducing perceived  
5 vulnerabilities (Bruce and Bannister, 2019; Dias de Faria and Casotti, 2019; Falchetti *et al.*,  
6 2016; Yu *et al.*, 2015).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 This body of research reveals how the responsibility to adapt or cope with inaccessibility  
13 is mostly placed on the customer rather than on the marketplace, or the service providers  
14 therein. Indeed, Beudaert *et al.* (2016, p. 63) highlight how customers living with sensory  
15 impairment arrive at self-transformation when they accept their new disabled reality and  
16 negotiate “new ways of consuming and enjoying life”. Thus, they adapt to fit the marketplace,  
17 not the other way around. Beudaert *et al.* (2016) call for service providers to take more  
18 responsibility in catering for disabled customers. They suggest that service providers should  
19 go beyond mere legal requirements and implement strategies and plans that include sensorial,  
20 embodied approaches that better support disabled customers in navigating the marketplace.  
21 That is, service providers need to find innovative ways to challenge marketplace exclusion and  
22 to facilitate inclusion via their access programmes (Kaufman-Scarborough, 2016; Saren *et al.*,  
23 2019).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 In sum, marketing and consumer research prioritizes customers’ lived experiences and  
41 coping strategies, and thus overlooks how service providers can facilitate marketplace  
42 accessibility. Specifically, we do not understand service providers’ strategies to facilitate  
43 marketplace accessibility, including the practices that they engage in, and the challenges they  
44 face, when removing architectural-structural as well as interpersonal service-related barriers.  
45 Thus, we ask: What are the strategies that service providers use to facilitate marketplace  
46 accessibility? And, if any, what are the challenges they face in that process? We follow the call  
47 of Beudaert (2017) by adopting an embodied posthuman perspective of disability, which has  
48 received recognition among disability theorists (Goodley *et al.*, 2014; Liddiard *et al.*, 2019;  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Murray, 2020) due to its inclusive approach and outlook of what it means to be ‘human’  
4  
5 (Braidotti, 2013).  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 *Posthumanism and Disability*

11  
12  
13 For centuries, society has been socialized to a restricted view of what it means to be human.  
14  
15 This view has been “modelled upon ideals of white masculinity, normality, youth and health”  
16  
17 (Braidotti, 2013, p. 68). Failure to fit these ideals leads such groups and individuals (i.e., the  
18  
19 non-male, non-white, the aged, and the disabled) to be socially cast out as “less than” (Braidotti,  
20  
21 2013, p. 28) and devalued deviants. Posthumanism, however, supports a de-centering from  
22  
23 such anthropocentrism, shifting the logic and questioning its audience, “to think critically and  
24  
25 creatively about who and what we are actually in the process of becoming” (Braidotti, 2013, p.  
26  
27 12). From a disability perspective, posthumanism critiques the tragic view of disability, that  
28  
29 perceives disability as something in need of curing or fixing (Goodley, 2017, p. 2), and calls  
30  
31 for further cognizance of human differences and assemblages with fellow humans, animals,  
32  
33 and technology (Dolezal, 2017; Goodley *et al.*, 2014; Liddiard *et al.*, 2019; Murray, 2020).  
34  
35 This is demonstrated by the key principles underlying posthumanism – *interdependence*,  
36  
37 *embodiment*, and *relationality*.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 The principle of *interdependence* highlights assemblages between humans, and  
44  
45 between humans and non-humans (Dolezal, 2017). Interdependence “works across  
46  
47 differences” (Braidotti, 2013, p. 49), and postulates that all humans - not just disabled people -  
48  
49 rely on assemblages. After all, regardless of our abilities, we are all interdependent and indeed  
50  
51 “temporarily able-bodied” (Goodley, 2017), with none of us immune to bodily deterioration  
52  
53 (Shakespeare, 2004). Within posthumanism, interdependence is not seen as the opposite to, but  
54  
55 rather a gateway towards, independence (Goodley *et al.*, 2014). With reliance on non-humans  
56  
57 or humans seen not as requiring fixing, but rather a pathway to enabling people to achieve their  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 best self. From this perspective, disabled people, who often have strong interdependences with  
4 other people (carers, nurses), objects (wheelchairs, canes), animals (service dogs), and whose  
5 bodies may be perceived as ‘different’ from the mainstream, are quintessentially human - an  
6 understanding and acknowledgement that the disability community has been fighting for, for  
7 decades (Liddiard *et al.*, 2019; Reeve, 2020). Interdependence, therefore has been found to be  
8 a prerequisite for achieving disruption and innovative power (Liddiard *et al.*, 2019; Murray,  
9 2020), shattering normative humanistic ideals on the need to be independent (Goodley *et al.*,  
10 2014; Dolezal, 2017).

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 *Embodiment* is the second principle within posthumanism. Embodiment is the central way  
23 by which we build and understand our sense of self (Dolezal, 2017). Thus, posthuman  
24 embodiment focusses on how we interact and interpret our lived realities through our bodies  
25 (Braidotti, 2013). Our bodies, after all, are “our active vehicles for being in the world”  
26 (Goodley, 2017, p. 71). Therefore, the social world and our bodies are in symbiosis, whereby  
27 in opening ourselves up and engaging with society, we ultimately inform and create society  
28 (Goodley, 2017). Posthumanism, and specifically its component of embodiment, speaks  
29 against body conformity, permitting “a tangible shift in the representation, materialization and  
30 hence, conception of disability and non-normative modes of human embodiment” (Dolezal,  
31 2017, p. 72); a shift that perceives diverse bodily configurations as embodied strengths not  
32 weakness (Goodley *et al.*, 2014).

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*Relationality* is the final principle underlying posthumanism. Posthumanism asserts that  
there is an underlying desire within all human life to connect and build a sense of community  
(Braidotti, 2013). The principle of relationality moves us away from “humanist individualism”  
towards collectivism, connectedness, and community-building (Braidotti, 2013, p. 144).  
Braidotti (2013, p. 50) describes relationality as an “affirmative bond” that strengthens human  
interaction through a “flow of relations with multiple others”. This “flow of relations” occurs

1  
2  
3 both within and outside of one's community, with the objective of offering a renewed sense of  
4  
5 community and sense of belonging across different bodies, persons, and places (Goodley *et al.*,  
6  
7 2014). Relationality, thus, refers less to a need for assistance, help, or care - as in  
8  
9 interdependence - but rather points to the social needs of humans. Relationality is therefore  
10  
11 affirming through its openness and respect for, rather than control over, differences. In short,  
12  
13 posthumanism celebrates diversity, embraces the linkages between humans, technology,  
14  
15 objects, and animals, and acknowledges the inherent connectedness among humans (Braidotti,  
16  
17 2013). We adopted this theoretical lens to shed light on how service providers can facilitate  
18  
19 marketplace accessibility once we noticed that our data set resonated closely with the three  
20  
21 principles of posthuman thinking. We unpack the methodological consideration in more detail  
22  
23 next.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 **Research Method**

### 30 *Research Context*

31  
32  
33  
34  
35 To gain a deeper understanding into marketplace accessibility from a service-provider  
36  
37 perspective, we decided to explore access programmes in museums. Museums offer touch tours  
38  
39 (also known as tactile tours) to visually impaired (VI) customers and their companions as part  
40  
41 of their access programme. Museums have a mission and responsibility to make their  
42  
43 collections accessible to all in society, as shared by curators from the Tate and Attenborough  
44  
45 Art Museums in this short video discussing disability and art ([Disability Arts International, 2018](#)).  
46  
47 This focus on access is partly due to funding requirements (Sandell, 2003) as well as  
48  
49 their often community-centred ethos (Fletcher, 2013). Our focus on museums, thus, stems from  
50  
51 their implementation of, and expertise in, facilitating marketplace accessibility, from which,  
52  
53 we believe, wider lessons can be learned.  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 Touch tours are designed to make anything visual accessible to those who cannot, or  
59  
60 can only partially, perceive or process it. These tours have two core elements: 1) audio

1  
2  
3 description and 2) touch. Audio description is an oral account of any visual content (e.g., photo  
4 of a sandy beach, turquoise sea and blue sky). In addition, these tours provide the opportunity  
5 to touch the actual artefact, a replica, or raised print (prints that can be traced with fingers) of  
6 it. We focus on VI as a select disability due to its rampant global spread and its impact on  
7 consumer lives. Within the UK over 2 million people live with sight loss, calculating to around  
8 340,000 registered as blind or partially sighted (NHS, 2022). VI unfolds in different degrees of  
9 severity. Most people who are considered legally blind still receive some visual stimulation,  
10 yet some possess no light vision at all (WHO, 2021). Consumer and marketing research has  
11 shown that customers with VI have limited access to the marketplace (Baker *et al.*, 2001;  
12 Balabanis *et al.*, 2012) which can yield detrimental impacts on consumer wellbeing (Falchetti  
13 *et al.*, 2016).

### 31 *Data Collection*

32  
33 We adopted an interpretive and qualitative research approach (i.e. Belk *et al.*, 2013)  
34 and combined semi-structured interviews with service providers of touch tours in museums  
35 with an embodied duo-ethnography of those tours. Data collection took place between  
36 November 2017 and July 2018. During this time, we purposively sampled eight museums in  
37 London to include a range of medium to large museums as well as a range of visually accessible  
38 experiences (see Table 1). We started with museums that had a reputation for being leaders in  
39 access programmes. We employed snowball sampling by asking our interviewees about other  
40 museums they considered to be leading in access provisions. We worked to ensure that our  
41 sample represented diversity with regards to the type of museum. Our sample therefore  
42 includes museums that have a strong focus on paintings as well as those that display historical  
43 artefacts and those where the site itself is the purpose of the museum. Ethical approval was  
44 gained prior to data collection.

----- Please insert table 1 about here -----

Within our museum sample, we conducted eight interviews with those members of staff in charge of designing and running touch tours (i.e. the curators, visitor service coordinators, or access managers; see Table 1 for interviewees' job titles). The interviews were semi-structured in style with respondents becoming "conversational partners" (Rubin and Rubin, 1997, p. 7). That is, we prepared a topic guide with questions on specific topics, but also allowed respondents the freedom to bring up, and dive into, topics that they considered important to access provisions in museums. Several respondents, for example, brought up the role of technology in delivering touch tours – a topic we had not anticipated prior data collection. Overall, each interview began with questions about the organization's understanding of access and inclusion, followed by questions on the service provider's approach to developing and designing access provisions generally and touch tours specifically. We then continued by inquiring about the challenges service providers face, and improvements they made, with regards to developing and running touch tours. Towards the end of the interview, we asked service providers what they would like to do in terms of access provision if they had unlimited resources. The last question was chosen to tease out their perceptions of shortcomings in their own service provision as well as their vision for the future. Interviews lasted, on average, 45 minutes. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed, totalling 158 single-spaced pages.

To supplement and triangulate our interview data, we conducted an embodied duo-ethnography of the touch tours set up by our interviewees. Through this duo-ethnography, we became part of the assemblage of the event under investigation providing us with more in-depth and relational data (Barad, 2007). It enabled us to observe the strategies our interviewees referred to in action and thus provide deeper insights on their organisational approaches and strategies (Roslie *et al.*, 2021). Our duo-ethnographic team was comprised of both a fully

1  
2  
3 sighted (author 1) and a registered blind (author 2) researcher. The first and second authors  
4 participated in all eight touch tours as regular visitors. During the tours, author 1 observed the  
5 interactions between author 2 and the tour guide(s) and took pictures thereof. Despite including  
6 the pictures in our interpretive analysis, we decided not to incorporate pictures in the  
7 manuscript due to the unique artwork shown, which may reveal the museum's identity.  
8 Following the tours, both authors took field notes separately before engaging in sense-making  
9 debriefs. Our field notes helped us capture our perception of how the access strategies described  
10 during interviews were implemented in the actual tours. Moreover, we were able to capture the  
11 difference in such perceptions between a fully sighted and a registered blind person. The  
12 ethnographic data was important to help deepen our understanding of the nuances of access  
13 provision in museums. The field notes ranged from one to three pages per site and researcher.  
14 In total, author 1 (sighted) captured 10 single-spaced pages of field notes, and author 2  
15 (registered blind) captured 17 pages. In our field notes, we reflect on our psycho-social-  
16 emotional and embodied experiences of physically moving through the museum space, which  
17 often permits access through passageways that are generally inaccessible to the public, as well  
18 as interacting, often more readily, with the guide and fellow visitors.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 *Data Analysis*

43  
44  
45 We coded the interview and ethnographic data thematically and iteratively throughout  
46 and after the period of immersion (Spiggle, 1994), with movement back and forth between data  
47 (emic) and theory (etic) permitting a holistic understanding (Arnold and Fischer, 1994;  
48 Thompson, 1997). In this process, we integrated the interview and ethnographic data by using  
49 the field notes as a means to triangulate and deepen the insights from the interviews. All three  
50 authors engaged in thematic data analysis separately. We then discussed our thoughts and  
51 refined our analysis collaboratively. Upon our first wave of data analysis, we noticed our  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 emergent themes could align with the conceptual theory of posthumanism revolving around  
4 the principles of interdependency, embodiment, and relationality. We continued to iteratively  
5 move back and forth between theory and data until we reached a point of theoretical saturation.  
6  
7 Each round of analysis included in-depth discussions on possible theoretical interpretations. In  
8 that process posthumanism continuously and increasingly aligned with our data, resulting in  
9 the analytical narrative presented in this paper. The posthuman lens helped us to thematically  
10 unpack the three forms of access, the challenges, and in particular, the inclusionary strategies  
11 adopted by service providers in facilitating marketplace accessibility. Figure 1 represents a  
12 visual summary of this process, with the posthuman principles of 1. interdependency  
13 underpinning autonomous access; 2. embodiment underpinning embodied access; and 3.  
14 relationality underpinning social access.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 The third author, in not being part of the duo-ethnography, was able to provide a more  
29 distanced, objective analytical lens, helping to strengthen “the overall dialogue and the co-  
30 constitution of interpretation” (McAlexander *et al.*, 2014, p. 863). As such, we benefitted from  
31 both close and distant interpretations of the data. Whilst distant interpretations have long been  
32 considered important in field-based research, recent research has called for more research done  
33 by those personally close to the research (Jones and Bartunek, 2021). Thus, by combining the  
34 interpretations of all three authors who represented very close (author 2 as registered blind),  
35 close (author 1 sighted but participated in tours) and distant (author 3) interpretations, we were  
36 able to unpick the data from various angles and develop deeper, more nuanced insights. Next,  
37 we outline our findings.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## 52 Findings

53  
54 Our analysis reveals that to facilitate marketplace accessibility, service providers of VI  
55 access programmes foster three interrelated forms of access for their customers: *autonomous*,  
56 *embodied*, and *social*, each of which resonates with the posthuman focus on interdependence,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 embodiment, and relationality - however, they are not mutually exclusive. Informed by  
4 interview and ethnographic data, Figure 1 visually summarizes the full process. We introduce  
5 Figure 1 upfront to provide the reader with an overview of our findings before outlining them  
6 in detail. Autonomous access refers to facilitating an independent marketplace experience at  
7 the customers' own discretion. This form of access is typically challenged by organisational  
8 resource constraints. Embodied access refers to providing a safe market environment that  
9 allows customers to engage in multi-sensory experiences. Yet, it is challenged by safety  
10 considerations. Social access refers to facilitating relationship-building and creating a sense of  
11 belonging in the marketplace, but is often challenged by exposed differences between  
12 customers. To overcome these challenges service providers engage in three inclusionary  
13 strategies - *informing*, *extending*, and *sensitizing*. Inclusionary strategies offer the power to  
14 push commercial access programmes beyond regulatory rules informed by the DDA and ADA,  
15 towards meeting the actual lived needs and realities of VI customers. It is via these strategies  
16 that service providers embrace differences and celebrate connectedness among their customers,  
17 staff, and other stakeholders, in line with posthumanist principles (Braidotti, 2013). In the  
18 following sections, we outline each form of marketplace accessibility, as well as their  
19 respective challenges and inclusionary strategies. Even though we find that the three forms of  
20 access prevail across the data set in each access programme, we tease out nuances, that is  
21 differences and similarities, in how the service providers in our study bring them to life.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 ----- Please insert figure 1 about here -----  
50  
51  
52  
53

#### 54 *Autonomous Access*

55  
56  
57 Autonomous access refers to facilitating an independent marketplace experience at the  
58 customers' own discretion. In facilitating autonomous access, service providers build on  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 posthuman thought by acknowledging and celebrating customer's interdependencies as a  
4 gateway towards independence and autonomy rather than dependence (Dolezal, 2017;  
5 Braidotti, 2013). Our findings reveal that service providers of VI access programmes work to  
6 deliver autonomous access by providing opportunities for, and encouraging, independent  
7 decision-making and offering choices concerning when, and how, to engage with the market  
8 offering. Choices offered vary in our data set. Although, a few service providers offer  
9 provisions and equipment for self-led tours (Museum E, F), we find that most commonly VI  
10 customers choose between participating in a scheduled group tour or booking a private tour  
11 (Museum A, C, E, G, H) as illustrated here:

22  
23  
24  
25  
26 “[W]e’ve been running touch tour programmes now 30+ years, so it’s quite well-  
27 established. We have a monthly programme which is bookable, and that focusses on all  
28 of our special exhibitions and our permanent collection. VI people can then participate  
29 in any lecture, workshop, activity and so on... We also arrange when visitors want to  
30 come in at their time and choosing, then we’d try to make the necessary arrangements.”

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 (Interview with the Equality and Access Advisor, Museum A)

38  
39  
40  
41  
42 The Equality and Access advisor of Museum A takes measures to design a service that involves  
43 the entire art collection and ensures that VI customers can “participate in any lecture,  
44 workshop, activity [...] at their time and choosing”. He shapes the service in a way that enables  
45 VI customers to increasingly make independent decisions regarding when to visit the museum  
46 and what to see, enhancing feelings of self-worth (Baker *et al.*, 2002). This resonates with  
47 Baker (2006, p. 47) who uncovers that marketplace interaction “can enhance” or aid in building  
48 consumer identity. She continues, “being-in-the-marketplace is part of the essential ground for  
49 being in the contemporary world” in turn enabling customers to feel societally normal. Service  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 providers that dedicatedly work towards offering opportunities for their VI customers to  
4  
5 independently engage with their services and to make autonomous decisions about when and  
6  
7 how to access the service send the message that disabled customers are welcome and belong.  
8  
9

10 Beyond providing opportunities for autonomous decision-making in the marketplace,  
11  
12 service providers realize that it is equally important to encourage their customers to take up  
13  
14 these opportunities:  
15

16  
17  
18  
19 “When I first make contact with someone, I ask if I can speak to them, rather than just  
20  
21 doing it over email. I’ll say, ‘What’s your number?’ so that I can ring and talk to them,  
22  
23 and they can get to know me before they come. So I can say, ‘Listen, you might have a  
24  
25 nice time. You may or may not get something from it, but why don’t you try it?’ Then  
26  
27 you’ll get people that are like, ‘Oh my God, I didn’t even want to phone you up’, ‘I  
28  
29 thought that it was not a place for me to come.’ I’m like, ‘Listen, we want you to come  
30  
31 and engage... because that’s how we make stuff better for the future.’ So for us, it’s not  
32  
33 just about that tour; it’s about getting those people within those groups to be more  
34  
35 confident to come and engage with services.” (Interview with the Visitor Service  
36  
37 Officer, Museum B)  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Museum B offers a space where VI customers can build confidence. Confidence-building,  
46  
47 which is further encouraged by proactively offering information about to how get to the  
48  
49 museum as well as information about the setup of the service and space itself (Museum D, B),  
50  
51 can powerfully facilitate an independent marketplace experience for VI customers and for  
52  
53 disabled customers in general. Higgins (2020) found that many disabled customers self-exclude  
54  
55 from the marketplace when service provision is unwelcoming and unable to cope with their  
56  
57 disability. Our findings support Higgins (2020) by showing that when service providers  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 prioritize their VI customers' abilities and adopt a mind-set of welcoming and confidence  
4 building, they help remove customer fears and anxieties. This in turn communicates to disabled  
5 customers that the marketplace is indeed 'a place for [them]'.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 12 *Challenges to Autonomous Access* 13

14  
15 Although the above practices facilitate autonomous access, at times service providers  
16 need to impose decisions upon VI customers. This is due to the amount of budget, time and  
17 staff resources required to enable autonomous access. Across our data set, service providers  
18 restrict autonomous access by limiting the number of touch tours available per month, and  
19 limiting the number of artworks included per tour:  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 "[L]et's face it, we've looked at four artworks today and there are probably 25 artworks  
31 that I would love to have shown you, but it took us an hour and a quarter to visit 4  
32 artworks." (Interview with the Curator of Public Programme, Museum C)  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 "The restriction of whether somebody [a trained tour guide] is going to be available to  
40 do it or not. As I say, I have to rely on another department's staffing levels, as to whether  
41 a person can be available to do that, at a particular time." (Interview with the Visitor  
42 Service Coordinator, Museum D)  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 The vignettes highlight how touch tours can be time-and labour-intensive. This is due to the  
51 time needed to provide audio descriptions and touch experiences, as well as the time needed to  
52 move safely between different artworks, in particular, if it is a group experience. The time-  
53 intensity of VI access tours is a key reason why service providers continuously impose  
54 decisions on their customers, restricting their choice, and thus limiting their independence.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Autonomous access is also limited by offering touch tours only in selected areas of the museum  
4 due to limited budget and trained staff (Museum D, F). Current research has exposed the  
5 expectation to adapt and cope with inaccessibility as being the responsibility of the disabled  
6 customer (Pavia and Mason, 2012, 2014). Here, we see that although access is offered, it comes  
7 at the cost of restricted self-determination. Thus, disabled customers are emplaced in a  
8 precarious position where they are either responsabilized to cope with inaccessibility or de-  
9 autonomized when faced with accessibility. Nonetheless, the service providers in this study are  
10 aware of and empathetic to this shortcoming, which is an important step in challenging  
11 marketplace exclusion (Kaufman-Scarborough, 2016):  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24  
25  
26 “My wish is that a VI person can come in off the streets and ask for a guided tour there  
27 and then... That’s my aim, to have that almost seamless service and for VI people to be  
28 able to use the museum as anybody else would.” (Interview with the Equality and  
29 Access Advisor, Museum A)  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Nonetheless, until such service is available, service providers typically address challenges of  
39 restricted autonomy and independence by engaging in an inclusionary strategy that we label  
40 *informing*.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 *Inclusionary Strategy: Informing*

48

49 To overcome or address issues of restricted autonomy and independence due to  
50 resource constraints, service providers engage in an inclusionary strategy that we refer to as  
51 ‘*informing*’. Informing, refers to the ways by which service providers engage in an extensive  
52 feedback process to meaningfully inform the decision(s) they impose upon customers. In our  
53 data set feedback sources range from access advisory boards (Museum C, D, G), to cross-  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 trainings and peer-to-peer observations with other museums (Museum B, C), to VI focus  
4  
5 groups and surveys (Museum B, E, F, G), to the VI customer in-situ (Museum A, B, C, D, F,  
6  
7 G, H). In line with Kaufman-Scarborough's (1999) belief that marketplace accessibility arises  
8  
9 at the intersection of disabled customers, service providers, and practice and policy makers,  
10  
11 informing relies on numerous feedback agents and sources and unfolds as an iterative and in-  
12  
13 situ process. Museum C's Curator of Public Programme reflects:  
14  
15

16  
17  
18  
19 "So, when I first started in this role about 10 years ago, the offer was quite simply a  
20  
21 touch tour and all we could touch were bronze and marble sculptures and, over the last  
22  
23 10 years, we've worked with our audience to ask what people want and expect. What's  
24  
25 going really well? What's boring? What's exciting? And, we have an access advisory  
26  
27 group of people with different kinds of sensory disabilities who give us guidance on  
28  
29 what would work well. We also work in collaboration with other major museums and  
30  
31 galleries, we're not working in isolation...we're learning from each other's practices."  
32  
33  
34

35 (Interview with the Curator of Public Programme, Museum C)  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Feedback sources, both internal and external of the organization, provide 'guidance on what  
41  
42 would work well', thus informing the decisions within the access programme. The sharing of  
43  
44 good and bad practice across key feedback sources is a core exemplar of how human-human  
45  
46 assemblages can create an interdependent rather than dependent marketplace environment  
47  
48 (Braidotti, 2013; Goodley *et al.*, 2014; Murray, 2020). Such interdependency highlights that  
49  
50 "dependency and independence are not opposite extremes of a unidimensional construct"  
51  
52 (Baker *et al.*, 2001, p. 221) but rather can work in symbiosis to ensure a lessening of the power  
53  
54 dynamic outlined above. By including VI customers in access panels, service providers view  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 them as co-creators and -producers of the market offering, re-instantiating control and moving  
4  
5 towards independence in the marketplace (Baker, 2006).  
6

7  
8 Most service providers in our study are trained to adapt the service while guiding the  
9  
10 tour to suit their customers' abilities and preferences in-situ, thus giving back voice and control.  
11  
12 The Curator of Public Programme of Museum C continues to explain:  
13

14  
15  
16  
17 “[W]e need to be aware of the wide range of VI that exists, not just in present ability,  
18  
19 but also in sight memory, and so where somebody is in their life and whether that person  
20  
21 was born without sight or whether that person has acquired sight loss during the course  
22  
23 of their life. [O]nce we’ve formed a relationship with each other, it might be a little  
24  
25 easier for me to say something like, ‘I’m thinking of describing some neon artworks to  
26  
27 you, is it okay if I ask you, do you have an element of sight ability that would enable  
28  
29 you to at least partially see some bright neon tubes?’ But that’s a very personal question.  
30  
31 [...] We hope that, by taking this very gentle approach, people feel that they can trust  
32  
33 us, that we respect their ability and that they want to come back for a second and  
34  
35 subsequent tour.” (Interview with the Curator of Public Programme, Museum C)  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 The Curator of Public Programme of Museum C, who often serves as a tour guide himself, uses  
43  
44 the VI customer as an in-situ feedback source to inform the content and flow of the touch tour.  
45  
46 As such he makes them active agents in the marketplace (Baker, 2006). A field note written by  
47  
48 author 2 reflecting on the touch tour at Museum A states “[o]ur guide as before in other tours  
49  
50 adapted to where I was touching the object and then started describing it based on what I was  
51  
52 doing”. It captures the co-creative nature of touch tours and how control is shifted to the VI  
53  
54 customer. Appreciating that each individual and each (dis)ability is not the same, informing  
55  
56 meets a range of diverse needs (Braidotti, 2013, Murray, 2020) through collaborative,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 participatory dialogue with disabled customers, as well as other expert sources (e.g., access  
4 panels). Together, the interdependent and affirmative nature of informing underpins  
5 posthumanism, providing a gateway towards an inclusive approach of marketplace  
6 accessibility.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

### 15 *Embodied Access*

16  
17 Embodied access refers to providing a sense of safety in the physical market  
18 environment and designing meaningful, multisensory experiences that prioritize VI customers'  
19 sensorial abilities. In facilitating embodied access, service providers build on the posthuman  
20 principle of embodiment by celebrating body diversity and evoking inherent embodied  
21 strengths (Dolezal, 2017; Goodley *et al.*, 2014). Meaningfully supporting the VI customers'  
22 navigation of the physical space by carefully considering a safe route, and providing a sense of  
23 space (i.e., narrating the environment) forms a key element of all touch tours across our data  
24 set. Our field note below captures this aspect of embodied access:  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 “The tour took us through many different rooms and levels of the building. Despite all  
39 this walking around, it was never difficult to follow our guide or felt like an obstacle  
40 course. She was good in explaining and directing. She was also not too pushy in a sense  
41 that she didn't try to guide me physically but [...] just needed someone to tell me left  
42 and right.” (Author 2, field notes from tour at Museum A)  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Providing a sense of space, which allows VI customers to move and experience the marketplace  
53 independently, without feeling patronized, contributes to embodied access whilst also  
54 facilitating autonomous access. This is because the ability to experience space with one's body  
55 without interference enables disabled customers to feel included and welcomed in the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 marketplace (Baker, 2006). The tour guide in skilfully leading author 2 through the museum  
4 space without being patronizing ('not too pushy') while also appreciating her embodied  
5 abilities and competences ('just needed someone to tell me left and right'), celebrates VI, not  
6 as a weakness, but rather as a diverse form of embodied strength (Goodley *et al.*, 2014). Thus,  
7 the tour guide re-conceptualizes disability as valuable, rather than non-normative, to society  
8 (Dolzeal, 2017).  
9

10  
11 The service providers in this study shared paying particular attention to the design of  
12 their museum experiences, working hard to ensure the experience prioritizes their customers'  
13 abled senses. While taste and smell (still) play a relatively minor role, service providers  
14 emphasize hearing and touch senses in their access programmes:  
15  
16

17  
18  
19 "When you're talking, and delivering the tour, people who are sighted are actually  
20 taking in those things, whereas, you know, partially sighted or blind people aren't. [...]  
21 [It is about] the vocabulary we were using. The emphasis on words, and the description  
22 of, you know, 'Tumbling cherubs falling from the sky' rather than, 'There are cherubs',  
23 'luscious ripe fruit' - those adjectives that add emphasis to the descriptions." (Interview  
24 with the Visitor Service Officer, Museum G)  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Creating word pictures is a technique that is crucial to facilitating embodied access (Museum  
46 A, B, C, D, F, G, H) as it allows tour guides to provide "the information that you often get  
47 through sight through verbal communication" (Interview with the Producer of Adult Learning,  
48 Museum E). This linguistic technique appreciates the intelligent minds and abled hearing  
49 senses of VI customers (Braidotti 2013), therefore allowing for body diversity and non-  
50 conformity (Dolezal, 2017). In other words, through their unique bodies and minds (Goodley  
51 *et al.*, 2014), VI customers gain intellectual access to marketplace artefacts. Similarly, service  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 providers address VI customers' sense of touch by utilizing objects of different forms, shapes,  
4 and materials when delivering tours, thus facilitating embodied access by promoting their  
5 individual perception (Dolzeal, 2017). This is achieved through the ability to touch the actual  
6 artefact (Museum A, C, D, E, F, H), or by handing out informative resources in large print,  
7 braille or tactile formats (all museums). Author 1 captures this in their field notes when  
8 observing that "Museum A clearly has an advanced focus on access. I could see several touch  
9 objects that were described in braille. There were also many large print books in different  
10 galleries we walked through". It is these environmental cues, Kaufman-Scarborough (1998)  
11 argues, that signal to customers with disabilities that they are not an afterthought, but valued  
12 and welcome. In sum, service providers in harnessing a posthuman skillset that understands,  
13 values, and celebrates the diverse abilities of bodies, as well as VI, create a sense of safety in  
14 the physical market environment, shift the marketplace experience to prioritize the customers'  
15 abled senses in meaningful ways, and thus permit the delivery of powerful embodied  
16 experiences in the marketplace.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 *Challenges to Embodied Access*

39  
40 Despite service providers' efforts to create a wide range of deeply engaging  
41 multisensory experiences within a safe space, they are mindful of their VI customers' bodily  
42 capacities. Protecting VI customers' physical welfare may compromise embodied touch access,  
43 a prevailing concern across our data set, as the following quote by the Access Manager of  
44 Museum F illustrates:  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 "You've got to think about considerations, when there's touch involved, about health  
55 and safety. Could a wheelchair user who is partially sighted still touch it? Is it too high?  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Could there be sharp edges? Things like that, so there's those kinds of considerations.”

4  
5 (Interview with the Access Manager, Museum F)

6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Concerns about the customers' physical wellbeing has the potential to compromise embodied  
11 access, especially if accessible services become overly simplistic and, as such, come across as  
12 infantilizing and patronizing (Kaufman-Scarborough, 1999). Such services can socially  
13 exclude VI customers and threaten their sense of “belongingness, self-esteem, control and  
14 meaningful existence” in marketplace settings (Kaufman-Scarborough, 2016, p. 160). Yet,  
15 embodied access is not only challenged by safety concerns for VI customers, but also by safety  
16 concerns for the artefacts, a second concern shared across all eight service providers. That is,  
17 service providers may limit embodied access due to the physical risks of damaging artefacts:  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 “...it's trying to find ways in which we can actually make the collection accessible, and  
32 balance the thing from a curatorial impulse wanting to preserve and protect objects, and  
33 from our side wanting to really just use them, take them apart, and test them. So, I think  
34 negotiating that is an institution-wide challenge.” (Interview with the Producer of Adult  
35 Learning, Museum E)

36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 The above vignette outlines the fine balance between accessibility and protection of both the  
45 customer and the artefact. This illustrates the centrality of embodied human-object  
46 relationships in delivering touch tours (Braidotti, 2013). Resonating with challenges occurring  
47 in autonomous access, this fine balance exemplifies a mid-point between Kaufman-  
48 Scarborough's (2016, p. 163) dimensions of universal inclusion, which refer to how “everyone,  
49 regardless of ability or disability is included” in the marketplace; and selective inclusion,  
50 whereby inclusion is “established by decision-makers in the social environment” (Kaufman-  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Scarborough 2016, p. 163). In many instances, mediating this balance does not only involve  
4 the curator and the customer, but often the entire organization and its stakeholders. For  
5 instance, in cases where artefacts are ‘only borrowed’ by a museum, the lender has a say in  
6 whether their artefacts should be protected from touch, as the Curator of Public Programme of  
7 Museum C explains. However, our data uncovers service providers can feel at odds with  
8 restricting embodied access, and, thus, to offset it, they engage in an inclusionary strategy that  
9 we call *extending*.

### 21 *Inclusionary Strategy: Extending*

22  
23  
24 To overcome issues of restricted embodied access due to safety concerns, service  
25 providers engage in a strategy that we call extending. Extending, which occurs to both  
26 customer’s bodies, and/ or to the marketplace object (i.e., the artwork), creates an interplay  
27 between human-object-animal relationships (Braidotti, 2013). This complex interplay rejects  
28 body conformity (Dolezal, 2017) and allows for rich multisensory experiences while ensuring  
29 the customer and object’s physical safety. In the context of VI access programmes, the  
30 inclusion of service dogs and sighted companions are common, as evidenced by field notes  
31 from all touch tours we participated in, and illustrated by the below:

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 “We walked through two rooms to the second exhibit he wanted to show us. This one  
46 was roped off, and we had to wear cotton gloves when we touched it. To make sure that  
47 I would not trip and to encourage [my service dog] to walk forward, [the guide] asked  
48 [author 1] to join him in stepping on the rope so that it was flat on the ground. We then  
49 knelt down [to touch the artefact].” (Author 2 field notes from tour at Museum C)  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The tour guide understands the interdependences between the VI customer, their service dog,  
4 and their companion in navigating the marketplace confidently and safely (Braidotti, 2013;  
5 Dolezal, 2017; Murray, 2020). Besides, service dogs and companions, objects, such as gloves  
6 and amplifiers, are also regularly used as extensions of the VI customer's body, allowing for  
7 embodied multisensory experiences in the marketplace while overcoming safety considerations  
8 (Museum A, C, G). Service providers of VI access programmes understand their customers'  
9 bodies as extendable and integrate a posthuman interplay between human-object-animal  
10 relationships into the delivery of touch tours. This interplay is key to designing an embodied  
11 but also an independent experience in the marketplace (Braidotti, 2013; Goodley *et al.*, 2014;  
12 Murray, 2020). However, this interplay also permits negotiation between multisensory  
13 accessibility and the service providers' responsibility to protect their customer and artefacts.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Our data uncovered service providers of VI access programmes to not only extend their  
29 customers' body, but also extend the marketplace object, in this case artefacts or artworks.  
30 Technologies, such as 3D printing (Museum C, E, H), replicas made from gum, wood, or plastic  
31 (Museum A, B, C, D, F), or tactile printing (Museum D, F, G), offer handling objects of  
32 artworks that are otherwise untouchable due to safety considerations, and allow VI customers  
33 to grasp the scale of very large artefacts (Museum B, C, D). Such human-technology  
34 assemblages (Braidotti, 2013; Goodley *et al.*, 2014; Murray, 2020) demonstrate the innovative  
35 and embodied ways by which service providers overcome safety issues and facilitate  
36 participation, engagement, and a welcoming marketplace environment (Pavia and Mason,  
37 2014). Thus, we advance Kaufman-Scarborough (1999) by highlighting that accessibility does  
38 not only involve human-human interaction, but also human-object-animal-technology  
39 interaction. Here, the service provider's innovative use of objects and technology to extend the  
40 museum and its artefacts further promotes an inclusive attitude and ethos, reminiscent again of  
41 posthumanism as discussed to date in disability studies (Goodley, 2014; Liddiard *et al.*, 2019).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *Social Access*

Social access refers to facilitating relationship-building and creating a sense of belonging in the marketplace that extends beyond service providers' efforts to eliminate interpersonal, service-related barriers, such as training service personnel not to patronize or over-help VI customers (Kaufman-Scarborough, 1999, 2001, 2016; Yu *et al.*, 2015). Social access draws from the posthuman principle of relationality by embracing human connectedness and the human desire for community and belonging (Braidotti, 2013). In touch tours, the group usually consists of VI customers, their sighted guides, friends or family members, one or more tour guides, and, at times, one or more assisting members of staff. Across our data set, we found that tour guides place emphasis on fostering socially vibrant but also warm and trusting relationships with their customers, as the following field note illustrates:

“The more experience I get doing these touch tours, the more I realize how important the relationship building aspect is when doing these tours. This time the guide asked Author 2 if she could touch her hands and lead her to the important parts of the objects. Author 2 agreed. There is a lot of proximity, even intimacy, involved in these tours. Laughter and having fun are part of this as well. The relationship that is built up between the VI person and the guide is partly what brings the objects to life.” (Author 1, field note from tour at Museum A)

Humour and a conversational dialogue are core facilitators in building rapport between tour guides and VI customers and create the proximity and embodied contact often needed in VI access tours. Proximity also highlights the participatory and co-creative nature of touch tours. Baker *et al.* (2002, p. 237) argue that “just as the service provider is expected to accommodate

1  
2  
3 the VI customer, the customer is equally obligated to assist the service provider by stating what  
4 it is that s/he requires”, highlighting that accessibility is co-created within market relationships  
5  
6 instead of carried out by responsabilized market actors.  
7  
8  
9

10 In addition to rapport-building between tour guides and VI customers, VI access  
11 programmes provide extensive opportunities for VI customers and others to socialize (Museum  
12 A, B, C, E, G). Socializing opportunities can take the shape of more formal workshops  
13 (Museum A, C, E, G) or informal after-tour events, e.g., coffee, snacks (Museum B) that foster  
14 not only relationship building but also a sense of belonging. Resonating with the posthuman  
15 assertion that the underlying desire in all human life is to connect and build a sense of  
16 community (Braidotti, 2013), our study found that service providers also use their tours and  
17 services to create a local community that exists beyond the immediate time and place of the  
18 museum or the event.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 “[W]hat’s really nice about the tours here is that we have a core group of people who  
34 come to all the sessions, so it’s also about building that network of people who can  
35 come and already feel that they have some form of ownership in visiting the museum  
36 and coming here. So, I think it’s also about social inclusiveness.” (Interview with the  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Producer of Adult Learning, Museum E)  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Although social access is key to achieving marketplace accessibility regardless of the particular  
48 form of disability, social access becomes ever more critical within the context of VI, due to the  
49 larger societal and psychological issues VI can raise (Falchetti *et al.*, 2016). Museum E’s  
50 discussion of ‘social inclusiveness’ resonates across all our service providers, showing a shared  
51 cognizance that some VI customers may live a relatively isolated life. Most service providers  
52 show efforts to use their access programmes as an opportunity to personally get to know their  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 customers and to build long-term, trustful relationships (Museum A, B, C, E, F, H, G) which  
4  
5 is illustratively captured by a field note written by author 1 after a group tour in Museum C:  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 “Clearly the VI people knew each other and had a lot to talk about. The pictures  
11 [artworks] come second. The tour guide does an amazing job in facilitating the social  
12 aspect of the tour. As a host he is treating people as if they were old good friends that  
13 he is happy to catch up with.” (Author 1, field note from tour at Museum C)  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 As the Curator of Public Programme at Museum C further outlines, “we mustn’t forget that the  
22 museum of the future is not just about experiencing art objects, it’s about experiencing other  
23 people in a sense of place.” Overall, we find that service providers of VI access programmes  
24 pro-actively work towards social access by designing their offering in an affirmative way,  
25 ensuring that relationships of flow rather than of dependency are created between disabled  
26 customers and service providers (Braidotti, 2013), which in turn can address issues of societal  
27 isolation.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

#### 40 *Challenges to Social Access*

41  
42 At times service providers place emphasis on differences rather than commonalities  
43 between VI and sighted customers as a means of respectively managing and aligning both  
44 groups’ expectations and needs. These exposed differences can challenge social access and are  
45 not inclusive but instead stigmatizing. Exposed differences, which we found in all eight  
46 museums, are often symbolic and manifest, for example, when VI customers touch otherwise  
47 untouchable artwork, jump queues, or cross barriers that sighted customers ought not. This, as  
48 reflected upon by some service providers, can make touch tours seem more ‘exclusive’ to  
49 sighted customers (Museum B, C, F), which may leave them “irritated but also interested”  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (field notes, author 1, Museum C). This special treatment makes disability widely visible in the  
4 marketplace, which is positive in that it widens recognition of accessibility amongst the public  
5  
6 (Reeve, 2020). However, at the same time, VI customers are aware that such recognition is  
7  
8 predicated on their impairment, which can be negative for their sense of self (Baker, 2006).  
9  
10

11  
12 Service providers of two VI access programmes (Museum B, F) perpetuate such  
13 distinction through ‘signifying’ participants of touch tours with colourful badges or sashes as  
14 a means of managing the expectations of those customers who are not participating in the touch  
15  
16 tours.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 “Quite often, as soon as people see people touching the objects, they think, ‘So, I can  
25 touch the objects, even though it says, ‘Don’t touch,’’ so then they start touching the  
26  
27 objects. There’s a bit of a management job of that, so it’s a cross between some visitors  
28  
29 are telling people off for touching the objects; some visitors are taking it as a sign that  
30  
31 they can touch the objects. The original idea was [then to use] a little beige sticker with  
32  
33 ‘Touch Tour’ written on it that was about an inch round. We realized pretty quickly that  
34  
35 that didn’t cut it and then we needed something a bit flashier, clearer. [So we introduced  
36  
37 the turquoise badges]. We kind of had quite a debate about the fact that people don’t  
38  
39 necessarily want to identify themselves in such a way, but the difficulty is that we’ve  
40  
41 got minimal staff in that gallery.” (Interview with the Access Manager, Museum F)  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 The ‘debate’ outlined by the Access Manager of Museum F, highlights that service providers  
50 themselves are aware and empathetic of how the demarcation between VI and sighted  
51  
52 customers via badges and sashes emphasizes and reinforces difference in stigmatic ways, and  
53  
54 thus limits social cohesion for their VI customers. Customers with VI seek to achieve  
55  
56 uniqueness and distinction through consumption, yet not through being reduced to or by their  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 impairment (Baker, 2006). However, such demarcation has become necessary to manage both  
4 staff resource limitations, and the potentially “stigmatizing behaviour of fellow consumers”  
5  
6 (Dias de Faria and Casotti, 2019, p. 2246) (i.e. ‘some visitors are telling people off for touching  
7  
8 the objects’). Nonetheless, the service providers of this study, in being aware of this  
9  
10 demarcation, worked to resolve such unwelcomeness through an inclusionary strategy we refer  
11  
12 to as *sensitizing*.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 *Inclusionary Strategy: Sensitizing*

21  
22 To address issues of restricted social access, service providers engage in the  
23  
24 inclusionary strategy of *sensitizing*, whereby, they provide opportunities for sighted customers  
25  
26 and staff to understand, and relate to, VI customers’ needs in the marketplace. In doing so,  
27  
28 service providers enact a posthuman ethos that is open and respectful of difference, rather than  
29  
30 controlling of it (Goodley *et al.*, 2014). To help sensitize sighted customers to VI experiences,  
31  
32 one service provider has begun to make touch tours available to all.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 “So, on the one hand, it’s about trying to be inclusive [...] On the other, that can throw  
39  
40 up new challenges, so you also want to make sure [...] that we’re prioritizing the VI  
41  
42 participants on the tours as well and making sure that their needs are met. Sometimes  
43  
44 when you have too many fully sighted participants that can shift the dynamic a bit [...]  
45  
46 I think it goes back to what I was saying before about not segregating a group, in one  
47  
48 of the senses. I’m a sighted person and I learn so much through being part of these. Just  
49  
50 in terms of thinking about different senses and different sensory experiences to [art].  
51  
52 That’s an insight that I wouldn’t usually get. I think, in a way, having vision is almost  
53  
54 like having a barrier to thinking in those other ways.” (Interview with the Producer of  
55  
56 Adult Learning, Museum E)  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 By carefully opening up VI tours to the general public (i.e. not allowing too many sighted  
7 customers), Museum E knowingly sacrifices attention to, and prioritization of, VI customers'  
8 needs. In line with Baker *et al.* (2002), the Producer of Adult Learning argues that respectful  
9 service provision should not define customers in terms of single characteristics such as  
10 individual senses, or disability, more broadly. For him, inclusion involves not only offering  
11 equitable services to VI customers but bringing together VI and sighted customers and allowing  
12 them to learn from each other. A field note from author 1 reflects on Museum's E innovative  
13 approach and concludes that "there was a good vibe and lively exchange between all visitors".  
14  
15 Reeve (2020) outlines that the societal hiding of disability perpetuates ostracism. She continues  
16 that such ostracism can only be shattered when disability is unhidden and integrated in a way  
17 that allows it to become societally mundane. The alignment of VI and sighted customers in  
18 touch tours permits a renewed sense of community and sense of belonging across different  
19 bodies, persons, and places (Goodley *et al.*, 2014), and thus re-conceptualizes diversity as a  
20 strength not a weakness, and as valuable, not non-normative, to society (Dolezal, 2017).  
21 Following a similar ethos, other service providers (Museum A, C, D, F, H) allow all customers,  
22 not just tour customers, to touch selected artworks, and make those artworks part of the tour.  
23 Sensitizing enables a normalcy approach to impairment, whereby instead of being 'othered'  
24 (Reeve, 2020) the VI customer becomes 'thered' with all who partake in the tour.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 To further sensitize able-bodied society to the needs of VI customers', service providers  
48 invest in disability awareness training for members of staff beyond the immediate access team  
49 and tour guides (Museum A, B, C, D, F, G). For example, the Visitor Service Officer of  
50 Museum B outlines:  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “...we trained the staff, but it didn't mean just training the people that are on the tour  
4 themselves; it meant training security. It meant training the people in the canteen. We've  
5 put them [staff] in blindfolds, and we've walked them through [the museum], so they  
6 would understand how it is...”. (Interview with the Visitor Service Officer, Museum B)  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 This training moves service provision towards an ethos of posthuman collectivism (Braidotti  
16 2013) developing an “affirmative bond” (Braidotti, 2013, p. 144) between VI customers,  
17 sighted customers, staff, and objects; thus, building a sense of collective relationality (Murray  
18 2020). Accordingly, service providers of touch tours aim to stimulate an ethos of relationality  
19 that is open and respectful, not controlling of, difference (Dolezal, 2017).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

## 30 **Discussion**

31 The purpose of this study was to explore the strategies that service providers use to  
32 facilitate marketplace accessibility, and to understand the challenges they face when doing so.  
33 Drawing from a combination of semi-structured interviews with service providers of, and  
34 ethnographic data from, touch tours offered in museums and designed for VI customers, our  
35 analysis reveals that to facilitate marketplace accessibility, service providers foster three  
36 interrelated forms of marketplace access: autonomous, embodied, and social. Through our  
37 findings, we contribute to marketing and consumer research on marketplace accessibility as  
38 well as to posthuman theory.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 *Theoretical Contributions*

54 First, this study contributes to marketing and consumer research by unpacking a  
55 service-provider perspective on marketplace accessibility. To date, research on marketplace  
56 accessibility has largely focused on exploring the lived experiences and coping strategies of  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 customers with physical or sensory impairments who navigate a “disabling [market]  
4 environment” (Kaufman-Scarborough 2001, p. 432), rendering the service-provider’s voice  
5 silent and often cast as unaccommodating (Higgins, 2020; Navarro *et al.*, 2014). In uncovering  
6 the process by which service providers enact responsibility, we advance the call of Goodrich  
7 and Ramsey (2012) and Higgins (2020) to illustrate how service providers can be more  
8 cognizant and proactive in stimulating marketplace accessibility.  
9

10  
11 In line with suggestions from previous research on marketplace accessibility (Baker  
12 2006; Baker *et al.* 2002, 2007; Dias de Faria *et al.* 2012; Falchetti *et al.* 2016; Kaufman-  
13 Scarborough 1998, 1999, 2001; Yu *et al.* 2015), service providers in our study remove  
14 architectural-structural as well as interpersonal service-related barriers; yet they do much more  
15 than that. Indeed, they pro-actively create opportunities for co-creation and participation in the  
16 marketplace, which, in turn, is key for disabled customers’ sense of self-worth and consumer  
17 identity construction (Baker 2006; Balabanis *et al.* 2012; Pavia and Mason 2014). By  
18 highlighting the participatory and collaborative nature of autonomous, embodied, and social  
19 access, we are shifting the debate in consumer and marketing research on marketplace  
20 accessibility from coping to co-creation. So far, the research stream on marketplace access has  
21 identified how disabled customers are often responsabilized to cope with, and adapt to,  
22 challenging marketplace settings (Baker *et al.*, 2002; Balabanis *et al.*, 2012; Beudaert *et al.*,  
23 2017; Echeverri and Salomonson, 2019; Falchetti *et al.*, 2016; Mason and Pavia, 2006; Yu *et*  
24 *al.*, 2015). Successful coping with marketplace barriers which range from switching to new  
25 products and services, to asking for and receiving help from others, to preferring retailers that  
26 meet their needs can positively affect customers’ well-being and self-image (Falchetti *et al.*,  
27 2016). That is, successful coping renders a sense of control and self-power in the marketplace  
28 and thus reduces experiences of vulnerability (Baker *et al.*, 2005; Bruce and Bannister, 2019;  
29 Dias de Faria and Casotti, 2019; Falchetti *et al.*, 2016; Yu *et al.*, 2015). By spotlighting service  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 providers' efforts to create opportunities for VI customers' co-creation and participation, we  
4  
5 outline an approach to marketplace accessibility that puts less pressure on VI customers' coping  
6  
7 skills, yet may still create opportunities for enhancing consumer wellbeing and self-esteem. In  
8  
9 other words, service providers who take the responsibility to facilitate marketplace accessibility  
10  
11 do not do so unilaterally but collaboratively and empathetically. They understand that "just as  
12  
13 [they are] expected to accommodate the VI customer, the customer is equally obligated to assist  
14  
15 the service provider by stating what it is that s/he requires" (Baker *et al.*, 2002, p. 237). Such  
16  
17 empathy and realization witness service providers working to adapt to disability, rather than  
18  
19 disability adapting to the marketplace.  
20  
21  
22  
23

24         Second, we uncover an approach to marketplace accessibility that is designed to  
25  
26 encourage disabled customers to feel "independent and competent [rather than] disempowered  
27  
28 and incapable" (Yu *et al.* 2015, p. 122) and that fosters "participation, a welcoming, or an  
29  
30 opportunity to engage" in the marketplace (Kaufman-Scarborough 2016, p. 160) while taking  
31  
32 into account the challenges that service providers encounter in that process. Our analysis  
33  
34 suggests that the three interrelated forms of access - autonomous, embodied, and social access  
35  
36 - resonate with the posthuman focus on interdependence, embodiment, and relationality.  
37  
38 Within each form of access, we unpack what we call inclusionary strategies (i.e. informing,  
39  
40 extending, and sensitizing) and show that it is via these strategies that service providers can  
41  
42 proactively address their inherent challenges (i.e., organizational resource constraints, safety  
43  
44 concerns, exposed differences). By engaging in these strategies, service providers move their  
45  
46 market offering further towards embracing embodied diversity, and celebrate connectedness  
47  
48 among their customers, staff, technology, and service animals in line with posthuman thinking  
49  
50 (Braidotti, 2013). Thus, we believe our inclusionary strategies yield the power to push the  
51  
52 boundaries of marketplace accessibility and transform commercial access programmes towards  
53  
54 being more inclusive.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Our identification of these inclusionary strategies contributes nuance to Kaufman-  
4 Scarborough's (2016) understanding of and distinction between two types of inclusionary  
5 approaches practiced by marketing practitioners—selective/partial inclusion and universal/full  
6 inclusion, and thus informs the regulation versus reality debate prevailing in research on  
7 marketplace accessibility (Beudaert, 2020; Higgins, 2020). Whereas universal inclusion refers  
8 to how “everyone, regardless of ability or disability is included” in the service encounter, and  
9 selective inclusion is “established by decision-makers in the social environment” (Kaufman-  
10 Scarborough, 2016, p. 163), we argue that inclusionary strategies constitute the mechanism that  
11 balances the two approaches. In other words, inclusionary strategies can be read as the midpoint  
12 between universal and selected inclusion. By engaging in these strategies, service providers  
13 acknowledge the interconnected and interdependent relationship between various actors and  
14 assemblages in promoting marketplace access (i.e. disabled customers, service providers,  
15 material objects, organizational resources constraints, health and safety, stakeholder  
16 expectations, legal regulations), as well as the fine balance between regulation and reality when  
17 working towards marketplace accessibility. By showing how service providers need to temper  
18 both the realities and needs of disability alongside the realities and needs of  
19 companies/organisations, and by outlining the role of inclusionary strategies in counter-  
20 balancing a range of challenges including organizational resource constraints, safety concerns,  
21 and exposed differences that threaten to compromise access, this study reveals that the  
22 regulation versus reality argument is more complex than previously discussed. Indeed,  
23 companies are often criticized for working to meet legal disability regulations, which often do  
24 not fully meet the needs and requirements of disabled people (Beudaert, 2020; Higgins, 2020;  
25 Reeve, 2020). However, marketing research fails to outline and distinguish how movement  
26 beyond regulation can and should be done. In outlining and distinguishing between three forms  
27 of marketplace accessibility, including their inclusionary strategies that help service providers  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to overcome and counter-balance inherent challenges, this study begins to address this  
4  
5 criticism, yet also acknowledges that facilitating marketplace accessibility is not an easy, but a  
6  
7 highly complex and challenging process.  
8  
9

10 Third, in introducing a posthuman perspective to marketplace accessibility, we not only  
11  
12 address marketing scholars' calls for a greater emphasis on posthumanism and embodiment  
13  
14 (Beudaert, 2020) but also highlight posthumanism's empirical value in addressing issues of  
15  
16 accessibility and disability inclusion in the marketplace. Thus, we contribute to existing  
17  
18 literature on posthumanism (Braidotti, 2013) by showing how the three posthuman principles  
19  
20 of interdependency, embodiment, and relationality can inform and transform market-based  
21  
22 accessibility agendas. This is due, we argue, to: i) it's recognition of the interdependencies we  
23  
24 all face (Goodley, 2017; Shakespeare, 2004) ii) it's embracement of embodied diversity and  
25  
26 rejection of body conformity (Dolezal, 2017), and iii) it's focus on genuine human connection  
27  
28 (Braidotti, 2013; Goodley *et al.*, 2014; Dolezal, 2017). Such an approach begins to not only  
29  
30 create physical access, but to signal a welcoming and inclusive market environment that  
31  
32 renders no-one to feel excluded, unwelcome, and 'abnormal' (Baker, 2006). While our study  
33  
34 focusses on marketplace accessibility for disabled, particularly for VI customers, we believe  
35  
36 that the three interrelated forms of access (autonomous, embodied, and social) and their  
37  
38 inclusionary strategies, may yield similarly interesting insights for other groups who  
39  
40 experience embodied discrimination (Braidotti, 2013), including discrimination based on race,  
41  
42 ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and age.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 *Policy and Managerial Implications*

52  
53 Our research yields public policy and managerial implications. Whereas the Americans  
54  
55 with Disabilities Act (ADA) in the US and the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) in the UK  
56  
57 have significantly widened physical access to marketplaces and society, it is the prioritization  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of architectural-structural barriers that has resulted in many companies working to meet legal  
4 disability laws and regulations, which often do not fully meet the needs of disabled people  
5  
6 (Beudaert, 2020; Higgins, 2020; Reeve, 2020). By adopting a posthuman perspective on  
7  
8 disability which is known for its affirmative and inclusive approach of being human (Braidotti,  
9  
10 2103; Goodley *et al.*, 2014), our model provides a starting point for unravelling some larger  
11  
12 systemic access barriers, such as the victimization of the disabled body or stigmatizing  
13  
14 behaviours of fellow customers, when facilitating marketplace access. Thus, our study offers a  
15  
16 preliminary roadmap for both public policy makers as well as service providers of how  
17  
18 movement beyond regulation can be realistically and pragmatically achieved. That is, we offer  
19  
20 a practical guide for policy makers and service providers on i) which types of access should  
21  
22 and can be created, ii) what challenges may be encountered, ii) how to proactively manage  
23  
24 these challenges, and, thus, iii) how to advance accessibility beyond mere regulations.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Our analysis unpacks how the three forms of marketplaces access manifest in the  
32  
33 context of access programmes designed for VI customers in museums. We argue though that  
34  
35 there are lessons learned beyond this. Various innovative practices and techniques such as  
36  
37 audio descriptions involving word pictures, 3D prints for tactile experiences and scaling down  
38  
39 effects, opportunities for co-creation and participation, and tours and events open to all (i.e.  
40  
41 blind, partially sighted or sighted) bring autonomous, embodied and social access to life (see  
42  
43 Figure 1 for an overview). We argue that these practices and techniques may indeed be  
44  
45 innovative to, and appreciated by, all customers. Increased inclusion of audio descriptions  
46  
47 would allow customers who struggle with literacy issues or dislike reading to feel more  
48  
49 included and welcomed in museum. Whilst the inclusion of touch to general tours would help  
50  
51 bring the art to life for all customers (not just those with VI), it would also render the need for  
52  
53 touch tours obsolete as the tour would instinctively cater to VI needs. Thus, although we discuss  
54  
55 the value of these practices and techniques from a VI perspective, such accessible innovation  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 can be inclusive and engaging for all customers. Such insight, thus, has positive implications  
4  
5 for both marketing practitioners and customers.  
6  
7

8 Furthermore, we focus on the context of access in and to museums due to their  
9  
10 leadership in this domain. However, autonomous, embodied and social access can be seen in  
11  
12 other corners of the marketplace. UK retailer Marks and Spencer, for example, provides  
13  
14 publicly available information on in-store access provisions which facilitates autonomous  
15  
16 access, offers information in large print which feeds into embodied access, and promotes  
17  
18 disability awareness staff training which can be conducive for social access  
19  
20 (<https://www.accessable.co.uk/marks-and-spencer>). This is commendable but can and should  
21  
22 be further developed. We hope service providers, marketers, and retailers will find our three-  
23  
24 fold understanding of access and how it manifests in museums (see Figure 1) useful to develop  
25  
26 their access programmes for their (disabled) customers. Speaking more broadly, we hope this  
27  
28 framework offers service providers, marketers, and retailers with hands-on guidance on how  
29  
30 to “expand their customer base to be inclusive” (de Ruyter et al., 2022, p. 19) of disabled  
31  
32 customers; a customer segment that is often overlooked, yet makes up of over 1 billion people  
33  
34 globally (WHO, 2021).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Lastly, we would like to widen the outlook of this study i) by calling on marketing  
41  
42 researchers to take on the task to study the grand challenges of our time, including reducing  
43  
44 inequalities and discrimination against disabled people, and ii) by calling on policy makers and  
45  
46 the business sector to partner with the academic marketing community to work towards  
47  
48 solutions. Indeed, the business sector is vital for successfully working towards the UN’s 2030  
49  
50 Agenda, yet they often lack appropriate tools to do so (Mende and Scott 2021). By identifying  
51  
52 and systemically unpacking the strategies and practices that museums use to make their market  
53  
54 offer more equitable and inclusive, this study shows that marketing scholars are well equipped  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 to develop appropriate toolkits that can help businesses to become “catalyst[s] for positive  
4 change” (Mende and Scott 2021, p. 116; Berry et al. 2021).  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 *Future Research and Limitations*

11  
12 This paper focuses on understanding marketplace accessibility from a service provider  
13 perspective and, thus, complements marketing research on access and disability to date, which  
14 is limited to a consumer-centric perspective. We believe future research would benefit from a  
15 poly-vocal approach that systematically and simultaneously includes the experiences and  
16 perspectives of numerous stakeholders, for example, customers, service providers, product  
17 designers, policy makers, or charities to help inform and advance marketplace access practices  
18 and policies. Resonating with principles of co-production (de Ruyter *et al.*, 2022) such an  
19 approach will be empathetic to the needs of all stakeholders and help uncover how services can  
20 be responsibly co-created in a manner that enables the marketplace to adapt to disability, rather  
21 than disabled customers having to adapt to the marketplace. This type of (marketing)  
22 scholarship can help advance UN SDG’s such as reducing inequalities (SDG 10), enhancing  
23 good health and wellbeing (SDG 3), and responsible consumption and production (SDG 12).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Furthermore, this study focuses on VI (instead of other sensory or bodily impairments)  
41 and on museums. Future research can use our model to explore how marketplace accessibility  
42 can be facilitated with other disabilities and marketplace contexts. Future research may wish  
43 to unpack how different disabilities and disabled customers feel included or perceive improved  
44 access based on i) their level of acceptance of their disability, ii) their level of dependence, iii)  
45 their desire for independence. Moreover, we recommend future research to consider  
46 intersectional consumer identities linked to disability. This approach can carve out further  
47 marketplace accessibility challenges linked to disability and its intersection with, for instance,  
48 class, gender, age, sexual orientation or socioeconomic background. For example, to explore  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(ways to enhance) socio-economic situations for disabled populations, marketing researchers can collaborate with organisational scholars to understand how embodied differences can be appreciated and catered for not only in consumption but also workspaces. Lastly, this study focuses on the in-situ over the online experience. Given the growing popularity of online experiences, there is a need for further exploration in this area. Future research should explore how our three forms of access translate into online spaces; thus, advancing our work by highlighting strategies towards online marketplace accessibility.

## References

- Arnold, S. and Fischer, E. (1994), "Hermeneutics and consumer research", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 21 No.1, pp. 55-70. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2489740>
- Baker, S. M. (2006), "Consumer normalcy: Understanding the value of shopping through narratives of consumers with visual impairments," *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 82 No 2, pp. 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2005.11.003>
- Baker, S. M., Gentry, J. W., and Rittenburg, T. L. (2005), "Building understanding of the domain of consumer vulnerability," *Journal of Macromarketing*, Vol 25 No 2, pp. 128–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146705280622>
- Baker, S. M., Holland, J., and Kaufman-Scarborough, C. (2007), "How consumers with disabilities perceive 'welcome' in retail servicescapes: A critical incident study," *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol 21 No 3, pp. 160–173. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876040710746525>
- Baker, S. M., Stephens, D. L. and Hill, R.P. (2001), "Marketplace experiences of consumers with visual impairments: Beyond the Americans with Disabilities Act," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, Vol 20 No 2, pp. 215–224. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.20.2.215>
- Baker, S. M., Stephens, D. L., and Hill, R. P. (2002), "How can retailers enhance accessibility: Giving consumers with visual impairments a voice in the marketplace," *Journal of Retailing*

1  
2  
3 and Consumer Services, Vol 9 No 4, pp. 227–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969->  
4  
5 [6989\(01\)00034-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0969-6989(01)00034-0)  
6

7  
8 Balabanis, G., Mitchell, V. W., Bruce, I., and Riefler, P. (2012), “A conceptual stress-coping  
9  
10 model of factors influencing marketplace engagement of visually impaired consumers,”  
11  
12 *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Vol 46 No 3, pp. 485–505. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745->  
13  
14 [6606.2012.01234.](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2012.01234.)  
15

16  
17 Barad, K. (2007), *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter*  
18  
19 *and meaning*, Duke University Press, Durham, NC.  
20

21  
22 Belk, R.W., Fischer, E., Kozinets, R.V. (2013), *Qualitative Consumer and Marketing Research*,  
23  
24 Sage Publications Ltd, London, UK.  
25

26  
27 Berry, Leonard L., David J. Reibstein, Frank Wijen, Luk Van Wassenhove, Chris Voss, Anders  
28  
29 Gustafsson, Ann Vereecke, and Ruth Bolton (2021), “Encouraging Business Scholars to  
30  
31 Address Societal Impact,” AACSB (February 8), <https://aacs.edu/insights/>  
32  
33 [2021/February/encouraging-business-scholars-to-address-societalimpact](https://aacs.edu/insights/2021/February/encouraging-business-scholars-to-address-societalimpact).  
34

35  
36 Beudaert, A. (2020), “Towards an embodied understanding of consumers with disabilities:  
37  
38 Insights from the field of disability studies,” *Consumption Markets and Culture*, Vol 23 No 4,  
39  
40 pp. 361–375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10253866.2018.1534734>  
41

42  
43 Beudaert, A. Ozcaglar-Toulouse, N., Ture M. (2016), “Becoming sensory disabled: exploring  
44  
45 self-transformation through rites of passage,” *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 69 No 1, pp.  
46  
47 57-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.07.020>  
48

49  
50 Beudaert, A., Gorge, H., and Herbert, M. (2017), “An exploration of servicescapes’ exclusion and  
51  
52 coping strategies of consumers with “hidden” auditory disorders,” *Journal of Services*  
53  
54 *Marketing*, Vol 31 No 4–5, pp. 326–338. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-06-2016-0247>  
55

56  
57 Braidotti, R. (2013), *The Posthuman*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

58  
59 Bruce, H. L., Banister, E. (2019), “Army wives’ consumer vulnerability and communities of  
60

- 1  
2  
3 coping,” *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 No 11, pp. 2849-2871.  
4  
5 <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0148>  
6  
7  
8 de Ruyter, K., Keeling, D. I., Plangger, K., Montecchi, M., Scott, M. L., & Dahl, D. W. (2022),  
9  
10 “Reimagining marketing strategy: driving the debate on grand challenges,” *Journal of the*  
11  
12 *Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 50 No 1, 13-21.  
13  
14  
15 Disability Arts International, (2018), [https://www.disabilityartsinternational.org/resources/two-](https://www.disabilityartsinternational.org/resources/two-approaches-to-developing-access-in-galleries-museums/)  
16  
17 [approaches-to-developing-access-in-galleries-museums/](https://www.disabilityartsinternational.org/resources/two-approaches-to-developing-access-in-galleries-museums/)  
18  
19  
20 Dias de Faria, M., Ferreira da Silva, J., and Brantes Ferreira, J. (2012), “The visually impaired  
21  
22 and consumption in restaurants,” *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality*  
23  
24 *Management*, Vol 24 No 5, pp. 721–734. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596111211237264>  
25  
26  
27 Dias de Faria, M. and Moreira Casotti, L. (2019), “‘Welcome to holland!’ People with down  
28  
29 syndrome as vulnerable consumers,” *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol 53 No 11, pp. 2245–  
30  
31 2267. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2017-0164>  
32  
33  
34 Dolezal, L. (2017), “Representing posthuman embodiment: Considering disability and the case of  
35  
36 Aimee Mullins,” *Women’s Studies*, Vol 46 No 1, pp. 60–75.  
37  
38 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00497878.2017.1252569>  
39  
40  
41 Echeverri, P. and Salomonson, N. (2019), “Consumer vulnerability during mobility service  
42  
43 interactions: Causes, forms and coping,” *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol 35 No 3–4,  
44  
45 364–389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2019.1568281>  
46  
47  
48 Falchetti, C., Ponchio, M. C., and Botelho, N. L. P. (2016), “Understanding the vulnerability of  
49  
50 blind consumers: Adaptation in the marketplace, personal traits and coping strategies,” *Journal*  
51  
52 *of Marketing Management*, Vol 32 No 3–4, pp. 313–334.  
53  
54 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2015.1119710>  
55  
56  
57 Fletcher, V. (2013), “Museums around the World that Enliven Our Souls: Inclusion through Rich  
58  
59 Experience”, *Curator: The Museum Journal*, Vol 56 No 3, pp. 297-305.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Goodley, D. (2017), *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*, 2nd edition. Sage  
4 Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.  
5  
6  
7 Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., and Runswick Cole, K. (2014), "Posthuman disability studies,"  
8 *Subjectivity*, Vol 7 No 4, pp. 342–361. <https://doi.org/10.1057/sub.2014.15>  
9  
10  
11  
12 Goodrich, K. and Ramsey, R. (2012), "Are consumers with disabilities receiving the services they  
13 need?" *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol 19 No 1, pp. 88–97.  
14  
15 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2011.09.004>  
16  
17  
18  
19 Higgins, L. (2020), "Psycho-emotional disability in the marketplace," *European Journal of*  
20 *Marketing*, Vol 54 No 11, pp. 2675–2695. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0191>  
21  
22  
23  
24 House of Commons Library Briefings. (2020), *The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with*  
25 *Disabilities: UK implementation*. London.  
26  
27  
28 Imrie, R. (1997), "Rethinking the relationships between disability, rehabilitation, and society,"  
29 *Disability and Rehabilitation*, Vol 19 No 7, pp. 263–271.  
30  
31 <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638289709166537>  
32  
33  
34  
35 Jones, E. B., & Bartunek, J. M. (2021). "Too close or optimally positioned? The value of  
36 personally relevant research". *Academy of Management Perspectives*, Vol 35 No 3, pp. 335-  
37  
38 346. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2018.0009>  
39  
40  
41  
42 Kaufman-Scarborough, C. (1998), "Retailers' perceptions of the Americans with Disabilities Act:  
43 Suggestions for low-cost, high-impact accommodations for disabled shoppers," *Journal of*  
44 *Consumer Marketing*, 15 Vol 2, pp. 94–110. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363769810210296>  
45  
46  
47  
48 Kaufman-Scarborough, C. (1999), "Reasonable access for mobility-disabled persons is more than  
49 widening the door," *Journal of Retailing*, Vol 75 No 4, pp. 479–508.  
50  
51 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(99\)00020-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(99)00020-2)  
52  
53  
54  
55 Kaufman-Scarborough, C. (2001) "Sharing the experience of mobility-disabled consumers,"  
56 *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol 30, No 4, pp. 430–464.  
57  
58  
59  
60

<https://doi.org/10.1177/089124101030004004>

Kaufman-Scarborough, C. (2016), “Social exclusion: A perspective on consumers with disabilities,” K. Hamilton, S. Dunnett and M. Piacentini (eds.), *Consumer Vulnerability*, Routledge, Abingdon, UK, pp. 171–184.

Liddiard, K., Whitney, S., Evans, K., Watts, L., Vogelmann, E., Spurr, R., et al. (2019), “Working the edges of posthuman disability studies: Theorising with disabled young people with life-limiting impairments,” *Sociology of Health and Illness*, Vol 41 No 8, pp. 1473–1487.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.12962>

Mende, M. and Scott, M. L. (2021), “May the force be with you: expanding the scope for marketing research as a force for good in a sustainable world,” *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, Vol 40 No 2, 116-125.

Mason, M. and Pavia, T. (2006), “When the family system includes disability: Adaptation in the marketplace, roles and identity,” *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol 22 No 9–10, pp. 1009–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1362/026725706778935637>

McAlexander, J. H. Dufault, B. L. Martin, D. M. Schouten, J. W. (2014). “The Marketization of Religion: Field, Capital, and Consumer Identity”. *Journal of Consumer Research* Vol 41 No 3, pp. 858–875. <https://doi.org/10.1086/677894>

Murray, S. (2020), *Disability and the Posthuman: Bodies, Technology and Cultural Futures*, Vol 10, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool.

Navarro, S., Andreu, L., and Cervera, A. (2014), “Value co-creation among hotels and disabled customers: An exploratory study,” *Journal of Business Research*, Vol 67 No 5, pp. 813–818.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.11.050>

Navarro, S., Taulet, A. C., and Simó, L. A. (2015), “Key factors in value co-creation for disabled customers and hotel services. An exploratory study of hotel managers,” *Journal of Tourism Analysis / Revista de Análisis Turístico*, Vol 20, pp. 15–21. 10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.11.050

- 1  
2  
3 NHS, (2022). <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/vision-loss/>  
4  
5  
6 Pavia, T. M. and Mason, M. J. (2012), "Inclusion, exclusion and identity in the consumption of  
7  
8 families living with childhood disability," *Consumption Markets and Culture*, Vol 15 No 1,  
9  
10 pp. 87–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10253866.2011.637753>  
11  
12 Pavia, T. M. and Mason, M. J. (2014), "Vulnerability and physical, cognitive, and behavioral  
13  
14 impairment: Model extensions and open questions," *Journal of Macromarketing*, Vol 34 No 4,  
15  
16 pp. 471–485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0276146714527766>  
17  
18  
19 Purple Pound (2022), Purple Pound blog. <https://wearepurple.org.uk/going-global/>. Accessed 5  
20  
21 December 2021  
22  
23  
24 Reeve, D. (2020), "Psycho-Emotional Disablism: The Missing Link", Watson, N., Roulstone, A.,  
25  
26 Thomas, C.A., Vehmas, S. (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Disability Studies*, Second Edition,  
27  
28 Routledge, London, UK, pp. 94-108.  
29  
30  
31 Rosile, G. A., Boje, D. M., Herder, R. A., & Sanchez, M. (2021), "The Coalition of Immokalee  
32  
33 Workers uses ensemble storytelling processes to overcome enslavement in corporate supply  
34  
35 chains", *Business & Society*, Vol 60 No 2, pp. 376-414.  
36  
37  
38 Rubin, H.J., Rubin, I.S. (1997), *Qualitative Interviewing: the Art of Hearing Data*, Sage,  
39  
40 Thousand Oaks: CA.  
41  
42 Sandell, R. (2003), "Social inclusion, the museum and the dynamics of sectoral change", *Museum  
43  
44 and Society*, Vol 1 no 1, pp. 45-62.  
45  
46  
47 Saren, M., Parsons, E., and Goulding, C. (2019), "Dimensions of marketplace exclusion:  
48  
49 Representations, resistances and responses," *Consumption Markets and Culture*, Vol 22 No 5–  
50  
51 6, pp. 475–485. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10253866.2018.1562684>  
52  
53  
54 Shakespeare, T. (2004), "Social models of disability and other life strategies," *Scandinavian  
55  
56 Journal of Disability Research*, Vol 6 No 1, pp. 8–21.  
57  
58 <http://doi.org/10.1080/15017410409512636>  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Spiggle, S. (1994), "Analysis and Interpretation of Qualitative Data in Consumer Research,"  
4  
5 *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 21 No 3, pp. 491-503.

6  
7 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2489688>

8  
9  
10 Thompson, C. J. (1997) "Interpreting consumers: A hermeneutical framework for deriving  
11  
12 marketing insights from the texts of consumers' consumption stories", *Journal of Marketing*  
13  
14 *Research*, Vol 34, pp. 438-455. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3151963>

15  
16  
17 WHO, (2021). [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-  
18  
19 impairment#:~:text=Globally%2C%20at%20least%202.2%20billion,uncorrected%20refracti  
20  
21 ve%20errors%20and%20cataracts.](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-impairment#:~:text=Globally%2C%20at%20least%202.2%20billion,uncorrected%20refractive%20errors%20and%20cataracts)

22  
23  
24 Yu, H., Tullio-Pow, S., and Akhtar, A. (2015), "Retail design and the visually impaired: A needs  
25  
26 assessment," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol 24 No C, pp. 121–129.  
27  
28 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2015.03.001>

FIGURE 1: Service Providers' Strategies towards Marketplace Accessibility: Learnings from Museum Touch Tours designed for VI Customers




Table 1: Sample Overview

Museum	Museum type	Organisational values	Annual visitors (2019 based on ALVA data)	Number of artefacts	Funding	Tour description	Interviewee job title/role description
A	Art, history, and performance museum	Open, tolerant, and diverse celebrations of difference.	3.9 million	2.8 million	Government funding for free general admissions plus self-generated funding (6.2% admission for special exhibitions; 32% fundraising; remaining not specified)	Individual tour; time of choice but needed to be mornings; one guide.	Equality and Access Advisor
B	Building of historic significance	Information not available	1 million	26,000+	Government funded	Group tour; set time; VI plus companion; two guides.	Visitor Service Officer
C	Art and historic artefacts museum	Champion the importance and inclusivity of making art, encourage people to explore how art is created, develop people's creative potential.	Site 1: 6+ million Site 2: 1.8 million	20+ million across both sites	Government funded for free general admission (38%) plus self-generated income (62% made up of admission to select exhibitions, gift shop, grants, fundraising)	Site 1: Individual tour; restricted time choice (mornings 10am); VI plus companion; one guide. Site 2: Group tour plus tea and coffee; set time; VI plus companions; two guides plus two supporters (carrying chairs and sight guiding).	Curator of Public Programme
D	Building of historic significance; artefacts museum	everyone to feel welcome and accepted, allow people to explore and get minds racing	2.9 million	Multiple historic buildings and 10,000+ objects	4% donations; 32% income from trading activities; 64% income from charitable activities	Individual tour; choice of time, restricted time choice (off-peak and weekdays only); VI plus companion; two subsequent guides (one per building)	Visitor Service Coordinator

E	Technology museum	Collaborative, welcoming, enterprising and forward looking.	Approx. 1 million (2018 annual review & 2019 annual charity report)	3,000+	73% donations 15% income from trading activities 12% income from charitable activities	Group tour plus workshop; set time; VI and non-VI visitors; two guides.	Producer of Adult Learning
F	Historic and cultural artefacts	To be representative of world cultures.	6+ million	8+ million	7,5% admission income 0.5 % trading income 92% donations	Individual tour; restricted time choice (off-peak weekdays only); VI plus companion; tour possible without guide; or with one guide.	Access Manager
G	Building and site of historic significance	Bold, embracing, imaginative and resourceful.	1.2 million overall, 70,000 to historic building	Over 400, and multiple historic buildings	33% Restricted grants & donations 26% Property & lease income 13% Grant-in-aid 10% service charges 8% admission & trading operations 10% other	Individual tour plus workshop and tea and biscuits; set time; VI plus companion; four guides.	Visitor Service Officer
H	Museum showcasing science and research	Diverse, experimental, bold, and surprising.	700,000 (2017)	250,000+	76% income from investments 24% Charitable income	Individual tour; restricted time choice (mornings); VI plus companion; one guide	Education Curator

## Responses to AE comments

Dear Editors,

Again, we would like to thank you for taking the time to offer your constructive and useful feedback. We are thrilled about the conditional acceptance of our manuscript. We made the minor changes to the paper that you requested (see table below for a detailed overview).

We thank you again for your time, feedback and support, and we hope that you will find our paper is now ready for acceptance. Many Thanks.

		<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	Abstract	Please just spell out 'Service Providers' in full at each instance rather than using SPs	We have done that now.
2	Abstract	In the method, please include the number of interviews that you conducted, and indicate something about their position with the museums.	We have now included both the number of interviews conducted and the interviewees' positions in the abstract.
3	Introduction	Can you revise the last sentence of the first paragraph so that it specifies the focus of your manuscript.	Thank you for this comment. We have added following sentence to the end of the first paragraph of the introduction: "This study seeks to address these issues by exploring the strategies that service providers can use to facilitate marketplace access for disabled customers."
4	Introduction	Remove the description of your method from the introduction (this should all be contained with the method section itself) and instead expand on your post-human paragraph - you need to embed your theoretical approach better within the introduction rationale.	We removed details about the method from the introduction. We kept information about the research contexts (i.e. museums and VI) though. In the review process, reviewers asked us to add this to the introduction to improve the logical flow of our argument.  We also expanded on the posthuman paragraph to better explain our rationale for choosing this theoretical lens.
5	Research Context and Method	Please use sub-headings in this section to break up the text into its requisite parts.	We changed the main heading of this section from "Research Context and Method" to "Research Method". We added three sub-headings to this section: 1. Research Context, 2. Data Collection, and 3. Data Analysis.
6	Research Context and Method	Again include the actual number of interviews conducted.	We included the number of interviews to the method section. We did one interview per museum, that is 8 interviews. This is also shown in Table 1.
7	Research Context and Method	Please provide more of a rationale for the approach to your interviews. You suggest that you covered a range of themes, was this all in one interview? You mention using semi-structured	We have added more detail to our interview approach. We now explain in more detail what we mean by 'semi-structured' interview, and why we chose this approach. We also added detail about which topics we

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

		interviews where you would expect to have a structured set of themes going into the interview. Was this the case? On what did you base these themes etc.?	discussed during the interview. Lastly, we hope it is now clear that we did 8 interviews. We interviewed each service provider once. In this interview we covered all relevant questions.
8	Research Context and Method	You mention that you 'coded the data' but you do not specify whether you are referring to the interviews of the ethnography. Please be clearer in your method about how and what you did.	This is a very good point. We are now clearer about the fact that we coded both the interview and ethnographic data thematically and iteratively.
9	Research Context and Method	Also be clear on how you integrated the findings from your different data sources - otherwise it is difficult to follow your findings. Referencing figure 1 in your analysis section will help you a lot in linking up the analysis and the findings.	<p>We are now more explicit about how we integrated the two data sources. In the data analysis section, we now state that “we integrated the interview and ethnographic data by using the field notes as means to triangulate and deepen the insights from the interviews.”</p> <p>We also now reference Figure 1 in our data analysis section. We specify how the three post-human principles informed our data analysis, and where they manifest in our findings. That is, we state “Figure 1 represents a visual summary of this process with the posthuman principles of 1. interdependency underpinning autonomous access; 2. embodiment underpinning embodied access; and 3. relationality underpinning social access.”</p>
10	Findings	Please see my comment above - it is important that the reader knows on what elements of your data you are drawing to offer your insights.	<p>To address this point,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- we mentioned again both data sources at the beginning of the findings (“Informed by interview and ethnographic data, Figure 1 visually summarizes the full process”).</li> <li>- we also added source information to each data point in the findings section. That is, we specified whether the data point derives from interview or ethnographic data. In cases where the data point derives from an interview, we added the job title of the interviewed person in addition to the Museum descriptor (e.g. Interview with the Producer of Adult Learning, Museum E). In cases where the data point derives from the ethnography, we state which author write the field note, and which Museum it is referring to.</li> </ul>
11	References	Please check your references, I noted that you had de Ruyter et al 2021, but 2022 in the references - do go through your references and check that they are all correct.	We corrected the de Ruyter et al. reference, and double checked the other references as well.

European Journal of Marketing

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46