

## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control



Rizqal Ramadhan Syarif<sup>1</sup>, Sari Lenggogeni<sup>2</sup>, Verinita<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Master of Management Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Andalas University, Padang-Indonesia

<sup>2,3</sup>Lecturer in the Master of Management Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Andalas University, Padang-Indonesia

**ABSTRACT:** In tourism studies, people who travel are called tourists. Tourists consist of various groups, one of which is groups with special needs. This group of tourists requires holistic facilities, infrastructure and facilities to accommodate their needs. The relationship between travel barriers for people with disabilities and travel intentions is conditioned by intrinsic, environmental and interactional constraints, which are supported by learned helplessness theory. In the context of hospitality and tourism TPB (Theory of Planned Behavior) is used to explain various behaviors and intentions. This research aims to analyze the barrier factors that influence the interest of tourists with disabilities in visiting tourism destinations in terms of the TPB. The type of research used is explanatory research. This research method is an Explanatory Survey with quantitative methods. The population in this study were people with disabilities who live in West Sumatra Province with a sample size of 240 people. The sampling technique uses a non-probability sampling method with purposive sampling technique. Data analysis uses Structural Equation Modeling - Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS). The results of this research are that Intrinsic Constraints have a positive and significant effect on Learned Helplessness. Interactional Constraints have a positive and significant effect on Learned Helplessness. Environmental Constraints have a positive and significant effect on Learned Helplessness. Subjective Norms have a positive and significant effect on Travel Intention. Attitude has a positive and significant effect on Travel Intention. Perceived Behavioral Control has a positive and significant effect on Travel Intention. Learned Helplessness has a positive and significant effect on Travel Intention.

**KEYWORDS:** Intrinsic Constraints, Interactional Constraints, Environmental Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude, Perceived Behavioral Control, Learned Helplessness, Travel Intention.

### I. INTRODUCTION

In tourism studies, people who travel are called tourists. Tourists consist of various groups, one of which is groups with special needs. This group of tourists requires holistic facilities, infrastructure and facilities to accommodate their needs (Darcy et al., 2020). People with disabilities are one of the tourists with special needs, along with children, pregnant women and the elderly. No different from tourists in general, they also have the motivation to go on tour and have equal status and rights in various aspects of life, including in the tourism sector (Sarmah et al., 2022)

According to the World Health Organization (WHO), tourism can contribute to health and well-being by promoting physical activity, reducing stress, and providing opportunities for social interaction. In addition, tourism can improve personal development and quality of life by providing opportunities for individuals to learn new knowledge, improve intercultural communication, broaden horizons, increase the capacity to understand other worlds, and to acquire or maintain social relationship skills.

From a societal perspective, tourism can also provide many benefits including reducing the costs of social adaptation, social integration, and achieving social equality. Because of these benefits, UNESCAP and the UN have championed the right to tourism along with other basic human rights (Marmion & Hindley, 2020). Over the past 30 years, research on disability and

## **Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control**

tourism has developed rapidly. Since the first attempts to evaluate the participation of people with disabilities in recreation and tourism (Tomej & Duedahl, 2023). In tourism practice, progress in operating accessibility remains very slow, including in developed countries. There are more than one billion people on earth living with permanent or temporary disabilities who continue to face exclusion in various aspects of social life (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2018).

According to WHO 2021, it is estimated that there are around 1.3 billion people with disabilities in the world, which is equivalent to around 16% of the world's population. Meanwhile in Indonesia, data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) for 2022 states that the total number of people with disabilities throughout Indonesia is around 22.5 million people. UU no. 4 of 1997 is the first law regarding people with disabilities in Indonesia. The law uses a health perspective, so it uses the word disabled to refer to people with disabilities. People with disabilities are seen as sick individuals and worthy of pity. In 2016, a new law was published that uses a social and human rights approach. Where in this law the word disabled is used to replace the word disabled.

Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2016 concerning persons with disabilities has 18 provisions. Consisting of 15 provisions ordering the formation of Implementing Regulations, two provisions ordering the formation of Presidential Regulations, and one provision ordering the formation of a Minister of Social Affairs Regulation. In Article 5 Paragraph 1 of the Law there are 22 rights of persons with disabilities, one of which is the right to tourism.

Tourism focuses largely on the people who participate rather than the people who are excluded from participation. Those who are considered "other", are ignored or forgotten from tourism. Usually they experience marginalization based on low socio-economic status, ethnicity, native descent, age, gender, sexual orientation, ability, or the complexity of these interconnected identity effects, as do people with disabilities (Darcy et al., 2020).

Disability means a person may have emotional, mental, sensory, cognitive, physical limitations, developmental disorders, or a combination of these. In tourism, this group of people is often assumed to be uninterested in travelling. When traveling, many people with disabilities feel they have to be sacrificed even though they have the same tourism desires and needs as other social groups. People with disabilities want to visit as many destinations as possible before their illness takes hold (Eusébio et al., 2023). In addition, involving people with disabilities in tourism activities also has important implications for family members or people around them. This gives caregivers in the family some time away from their duties. It can also promote an escape from normal routine, strengthen family relationships, and improve general well-being (Agovino et al., 2017)

When traveling, people with disabilities face several obstacles, including information, self-confidence, accessibility, facilities and infrastructure. Even though they are a minority tourist group, they must still be considered in developing tourism with a concept of justice for all (Agovino et al., 2017). These obstacles must be overcome immediately because they are not in accordance with one of the points of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), namely the target by 2030 where cities and settlements have green open spaces and public spaces that are accessible and inclusive for everyone. including for people with disabilities. In order to create this in tourism development, especially in the accessibility development sector, it must have a friendly concept for tourists with disabilities. Especially in the fields of accommodation, transportation and road facilities (Tomej & Duedahl, 2023).

Like society in general, with economic developments and social changes, people with disabilities also think that the status of tourism has shifted from something socially desirable to something necessary. (Darcy et al., 2020). In line with tourism industry expectations, people with disabilities express a desire to travel. However, people with disabilities do not show the same level of participation in tourism activities as people without disabilities, although there has been progress in removing barriers or obstacles in the tourism industry and its facilities. The reasons for this low participation rate remain unclear (Özcan et al., 2021).

The reasons for this low participation rate remain unclear. According to disability studies, people with disabilities face many barriers to participation. In this perspective, several tourism studies have been conducted on travel barriers to understand the reasons that prevent tourism participation for people with disabilities. Initial research on this began with Smith in 1987 who elaborated on three categories of obstacles: intrinsic, environmental, and interactional constraints (Lee et al., 2012).

The relationship between travel barriers for people with disabilities and travel intentions is conditioned by intrinsic, environmental and interactional constraints, which are supported by learned helplessness theory. Limited research has been conducted to examine the relationship between perceived constraints and learned helplessness (Wen et al., 2020) and how the role of learned helplessness acts as a mediator between intrinsic, environmental and interactional constraints on travel intentions. Sarmah et al., (2022) Conduct research on the relationship between these barriers to Learned Helplessness and intention to travel. In a tourism context, when someone is consistently ignored, they begin to feel unable to behave as they wish, resulting in a loss of self-confidence. People with disabilities learn to behave hopelessly to avoid unpleasant consequences,

## **Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control**

despite opportunities to help them, which further creates negative travel intentions. Therefore, the opportunity to provide better facilities increases tourists' intention to repurchase travel packages (Sarmah et al., 2022).

In the context of hospitality and tourism, TPB (Theory of Planned Behavior) is used to explain various behaviors and intentions. TPB has been used to understand tourists' intentions to participate in medical tourism (Seow et al., 2021) and working holiday tourism (Meng & Han, 2018). Based on the TPB, Nunkoo & Ramkissoon (2010) create a research model to examine the influence of attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control on intentions to travel.

The intention to go on tourism is formed in part by overcoming various obstacles that may arise at various stages in the decision-making process. For example, information seeking behavior begins after overcoming intrapersonal obstacles such as: lack of desire to travel, religious beliefs, or lack of skills in traveling and interpersonal obstacles such as, lack of friends with whom to share information. Additionally, forming an intention to travel is the result of overcoming structural obstacles such as lack of information and lack of opportunities. Those with disabilities often experience obstacles that are different in nature and severity compared to those without disabilities (Sarmah et al., 2022). This research aims to analyze the barrier factors that influence the interest of tourists with disabilities in visiting tourism destinations in terms of the TPB.

## **II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)**

Theory of planned behavior is one of the most popular and widely used models of social psychology to understand human behavior. TPB, a more refined version of the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), is used primarily to predict human behavior. The most criticized aspect of TRA in explaining human behavior is its recognition that people's actions are completely under their control (Ulker-Demirel & Ciftci, 2020).

The TPB has been used widely in the social sciences and is considered the primary theoretical approach for examining individuals' behavioral intentions and actual behavior (Yuzhanin & Fisher, 2016). TPB, which expands the Theory of Reasoned Action through the inclusion of perceived behavioral control (PBC), explains that actual behavior is influenced by behavioral intentions.

Human behavior is difficult to explain in all its complexity. This can be encountered at various levels, from physiological processes to social institutions. Social and social personality scientists have primarily focused on middle-level, well-functioning individuals, who process information that reinforces the changing effects of biological and environmental influences on their behavior. In these efforts to predict and explain human behavior, concepts referring to personal characteristics of behavior, such as social attitudes and character traits, have played an important role (Ajzen, 2020).

In the context of hospitality and tourism, the TPB has been used to predict a variety of behaviors and intentions. TPB has been used to understand tourists' intentions to participate in tourism. Based on the TPB, Nunkoo & Ramkissoon created a research model to test the influence of Attitude, Subjective Norms, and Perceived Behavioral Control on intentions towards tourism. As the amount of academic research on disability and tourism increases, there is increasing awareness that the barriers faced by people with disabilities vary depending on the type of disability and level of support needs, as well as the industry sector involved. This has led to changes in our understanding of the ontology of the body of people with disabilities. The critical tourism focus has helped us to understand the importance of providing accessible destination experiences that address not only sight, but also hearing, taste, touch, and smell (Huang et al., 2018)

People with disabilities do not show the same level of participation in tourism activities as people without disabilities, although there has been progress in removing barriers or obstacles in the tourism industry and its facilities. The reasons for this low participation rate remain unclear. According to disability studies, people with disabilities face many barriers to participation. In this perspective, several tourism studies have been conducted on travel barriers to understand the reasons that prevent the tourism participation of people with disabilities (Özcan et al., 2021).

The relationship between travel constraints for people with disabilities and travel intentions is influenced by constraints (intrinsic, interactional, and environmental), which is supported by the theory of learned helplessness. Despite the importance of constraints as an influencing factor in tourism and disability research, little research has been conducted on the travel intentions and travel expectations of tourists with disabilities and how learned helplessness mediates between constraints and travel intentions (Sarmah et al., 2022).

# **Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control**

## **Travel Intention**

Travel intention refers to the inclination and commitment towards the idea of traveling, and is influenced by attitudinal and practical factors, for example: budget limits, time availability, etc. Understanding intent is very important to understand consumer decisions in the tourism context, in that the emotional dimension is at the core of the consumer decision-making process (Londono et al., 2017).

Lee et al., (2020) emphasizes that revisit intention is one type of behavioral intention and represents a customer's intention to visit a location again in the future to experience a particular tourist destination, item, or brand. In Ajzen's TPB behavioral intentions represent specifically planned behavior by an individual, and possible actions based on his or her expectations. Visiting Intention is defined as thoughts or plans to visit. Intention means the probability that a person's expected or planned future action will be transferred to an action (McKercher & Darcy, 2018).

## **Learned Helplessness**

The theory of learned helplessness highly relevant to the intentions of people with disabilities to travel and participate in tourism. This is because although it is widely acknowledged that they have the same desire to participate in tourism activities as other people, they may experience more direct and indirect obstacles when traveling due to socially restrictive conditions in addition to their disabilities. Learned helplessness can also occur when a person has no control over his or her environment, either in belief or reality, which can lead to cognitive, emotional, and motivational deficits. (Lee et al., 2012)

Negative experiences combined with perceived stigma and feelings of helplessness can lead to non-participation. A person or a companion may also be necessary for travellers with disabilities to provide care and assistance, but may also be necessary for people with serious physical limitations. Friendship is also included in what is defined as companion participation in the tourism process (Ying et al., 2021)

## **Intrinsic Constraints**

Intrinsic constraints relates to the individual's psychological condition and includes personality factors, attitudes, religious beliefs, and mood. Freund stated that people with disabilities have an intrinsic desire to confirm themselves as independent individuals. This causes them to reject special trips for people with disabilities organized by associations, because they want to see themselves like everyone else without their disability being the center of their identity. Recreation is used in the concept of free time and generally emphasizes social aspects. Recreation has intrinsic motivation as in free time, and the activities to be carried out are freely chosen by the individual (Sarmah et al., 2022).

Intrinsic constraints refers to physical, psychological, or cognitive barriers. These barriers can be related to certain types of disabilities and other factors such as parental overprotection or lack of educational opportunities (De Pascale et al., 2023). People with disabilities who experience intrinsic barriers feel helpless and show lower intentions to participate in trips. McKercher & Darcy (2018) identified five features of intrinsic barriers, namely ignorance, attitudes, trust in information, problems related to the individual.

## **Interactional Constraints**

Travel barriers are defined as factors that hinder the formation of recreation preferences and hinder participation and enjoyment in recreation activities, or prevent people from traveling. According to Lee et al., (2012) interactional constraints are related to the behavior adopted by individuals in relation to the surrounding environment. Where the environment of human interaction between tourists and service providers is also important in improving travel for people with disabilities. Individual characteristics such as personality type and environmental sensitivity influence visitors' satisfaction with their vacation.

Darcy et al., (2017) states people with disabilities are influenced by the level of support needs from individuals who travel freely and independently to those with very high support needs who require 24-hour one-on-one support to participate in tourism experiences. Travel has evolved to a greater level of sophistication, and there is now a greater appreciation of the different challenges experienced by each type of disability and different levels of support needs, as well as across sectors of the industry. (Darcy et al., 2020).

## **Environmental Constraints**

According to Sarmah et al., (2022) environmental constraints are factors in the environment that hinder or limit individual participation in recreation and tourism activities. These obstacles can include barriers such as lack of transportation, safety issues, overcrowding, and poor quality of experience. Environmental constraints also include financial challenges, lack of

## **Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control**

time, ecological impacts, transportation difficulties, infrastructure constraints and obstacles due to regulations (Daniels et al., 2005).

Structural constraints is another name for Environmental constraints. Lenggogeni & Syafrizal (2023) explained that structural constraints are factors that can hinder or limit travel plans and activities. These obstacles include various elements related to the physical, social and regulatory environment. Lee et al., (2012) describes the constraints included in Environmental constraints, namely attitudinal constraints, architectural constraints, ecological constraints, transportation and air travel constraints, international rules and regulations.

### **Subjective Norms**

According to Huang et al., (2018) Subjective norms refer to the impact of perceived social pressure on a person's behavior. In addition, tourists will consider the opinions of friends, colleagues and family when deciding to visit other places. The study conducted by found that subjective norms have an influence on behavioral intentions after the pandemic which is influenced by socio-demographic factors, which have a greater influence on intentions. tourist behavior. Subjective norm is an individual's subjective assessment of a behavior. The subjective norm factor is a collection of normative beliefs which consist of the expectations of reference groups that are directly related to the individual, for example family, friends, colleagues, co-workers or neighbors (Yuzhanin & Fisher, 2016).

### **Attitude**

According to Ajzen (2020) Attitudes toward behavior are assumed to be a function of easily accessible beliefs about the likely consequences of that behavior, referred to as behavioral beliefs. Behavioral beliefs are a person's subjective probability that performing a particular behavior will result in a particular outcome or experience. Attitude is an index of an individual's level of liking or disliking the evaluation of the behavior being discussed.

According to Yarimoglu & Gunay (2019) Attitude refers to feelings of liking or disliking a behavior. Attitude is a person's level of assessment of likes or dislikes or assessment of behavior. Attitude is an individual's opinion or thoughts regarding a particular behavior, where this is a good or bad assessment that reflects a certain behavior.

According to Vesci & Botti (2019) Attitude is defined as a learned tendency to respond consistently well or badly in relation to a particular object. This means that attitude is the first response tendency to be happy or unhappy about a particular object. Theoretically, attitude is a reflection of an individual's feelings about certain objects, whether in good or bad conditions, beneficial or detrimental. Attitudes can arise because individuals adhere to certain values which are determined by beliefs about that object.

### **Perceived Behavioral Control**

Perceived behavioral control (PBC) is based on easily accessible control beliefs (Ajzen, 2020). These beliefs are related to the existence of factors that can facilitate or hinder behavioral performance. These factors consist of: first, the skills required. Both the availability or lack of time, money, and other resources. Third, collaboration with individuals and others. PBC is defined as an individual's subjective probability that certain facilitating or inhibiting factors will be present in the situation of interest. Yarimoglu & Gunay (2019) defines Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) as internal and external perception limits on carrying out a behavior.

### **Disability concept**

The word disability comes from English, namely different abilities, which means people who have different abilities. In Indonesia, apart from people with disabilities, there are other terms used by several ministries. The Ministry of Health refers to people with disabilities as people with disabilities. The Ministry of Social Affairs uses the term disabled person. Meanwhile, the Ministry of National Education refers to people with special needs. In this research, the use of the term disabled people was chosen in accordance with what is stated in Law no. 8 of 2016.

Persons with disabilities according to this law are any person who experiences physical, intellectual, mental and/or sensory limitations for a long period of time who, in interacting with the environment, may experience obstacles and difficulties in participating fully and effectively with other citizens based on equal rights. . The Big Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI) defines people with disabilities as having long-term physical, intellectual, mental and/or sensory limitations that result in them experiencing obstacles and difficulties in interacting.

Based on Law no. 8 of 2016 article 4 concerning the types of people with disabilities who can be classified into:

## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control

1. Physical disability is a condition that causes impaired movement function. This condition can be caused by various factors, such as disease, accident, or genetic factors. For example:
  - a. Amputation is a condition where part or all of a limb is lost.
  - b. Paralysis is a condition where the ability to move body parts is lost.
  - c. Cerebral palsy is a condition of movement and posture disorders caused by brain damage.
  - d. Paraplegia is a condition of paralysis in both legs.
  - e. Small people are a condition where growth is stunted, so the height is shorter than normal people.
2. Intellectual disability is a condition that causes disruption of thinking function. This condition can be caused by various factors, such as genetic factors, disease, or environmental factors. Examples of intellectual disabilities include:
  - a. Mental retardation is a condition of delayed mental development that can occur from birth or during development.
  - b. Down syndrome is a genetic disorder that causes mental and physical retardation.
  - c. Autism is a developmental disorder that causes communication, social interaction and behavior disorders.
3. Mental disability is a condition that causes disruption of thinking, emotional and behavioral functions. This condition can be caused by various factors, such as disease, accident, or genetic factors. Examples of mental disabilities include:
  - a. Mental disorders are conditions of impaired mental function that can cause disturbances in thinking, feelings and behavior.
  - b. Psychosis is a mental disorder that causes loss of contact with reality.
  - c. Depression is a mental disorder that causes feelings of sadness, hopelessness and loss of interest.
4. Sensory disability is a condition that causes disruption of one of the functions of the five senses. Examples of sensory disabilities include:
  - a. Deafness is a condition that causes hearing loss, either partial or complete. Examples of hearing disabilities include deafness and hard of hearing.
  - b. Speech impairment is a condition that causes problems in speaking. Examples of speech disabilities include articulation disorders and fluency disorders.
5. Multiple disabilities are conditions that have two or more types of disabilities. Examples of multiple disabilities include:
  - a. Blind and deaf
  - b. Physically disabled and deaf
  - c. Mental retardation and mental disorders

### III. RESEARCH METHODS

The type of research used is explanatory research. This research method is an Explanatory Survey with quantitative methods. (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). The population in this study are people with disabilities or people with disabilities who live in West Sumatra Province. According to Hair et al., (2017) that a study is considered good if the number of samples used is 5-10 multiplied by the number of indicators. There are 48 indicators in this research, meaning the formula used to determine the sample size is  $5 \times 48 = 240$  Research Samples. The sampling technique uses a non-probability sampling method with purposive sampling technique (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). The sample criteria are as follows: at least 20 years old. Age 20 years is considered capable of understanding the statements submitted, individuals with physical, sensory and multiple disabilities, already have their own income and domiciled in West Sumatra. Data collection uses a questionnaire. Questionnaire used is a Likert scale measurement scale. This research uses online questionnaire distribution via Google Form which is distributed to individual WhatsApp or WhatsApp groups of people with disabilities in West Sumatra. Data analysis uses Structural Equation Modeling - Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS). Furthermore, the measurement of each variable can be seen in the table below:

**Table 1. Operational Definition of Variables**

Variable	Indicator	Reference
Travel intentions	1. Whenever I have the opportunity to travel, I will. 2. I will try my best to improve my ability to travel. 3. I will continue to collect information regarding future travel.	(Lee et al., 2012).
Learned	1. Visiting is not something I can enjoy	(Lee et al., 2012).
Helplessness	2. Visiting only brings pain to me 3. Visiting made me feel sad	

## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control

	4. Visiting just isn't for me	
	5. Comfortable travel is non-existent for me	
Intrinsic constraints	1. Fear of doing something alone 2. Fear of not being able to relate well to other people 3. Travel demands things that exceed my capabilities 4. Fear of causing discomfort and hassle for others 5. The condition of not being able to relate to other people well 6. Being in a situation where I need someone else's help to do something 7. Lack of knowledge on how to travel without inconvenience and hassle 8. Vague fear 9. Various regulations are faced when traveling 10. Doctor's recommendation to maintain my health.	(Lee et al., 2012).
Interactional constraints	1. Damning views from others 2. Fear of being ignored by others 3. Fear of getting hurt 4. Fear of being the object of other people's interest 5. Overprotection from the guards 6. Excessive kindness from others 7. Other people's prejudices against me 8. Lack of experience in making friends	(Lee et al., 2012).
Environmental constraints	1. Inappropriate physical conditions at tourist destinations 2. My condition requires the use of assistive devices 3. Inconvenient facilities 4. Limited physical ability to move freely 5. Transportation facilities that are not comfortable to use 6. Certain environmental conditions that need to be avoided (for example cold or hot weather).	(Lee et al., 2012).
Subjective norms	1. The most important people in my life believe that I can travel. 2. The most important people in my life support my travels. 3. The most important people in my life know about my travels. 4. The most important people in my life agree that I should travel. 5. The most important people in my life recommended me to travel.	(Meng & Choi, 2015)
Attitude	1. I really want to go on a trip. 2. In my opinion, going on tour is very fun. 3. I really enjoy going on tour. 4. In my opinion, going on a trip is a positive activity. 5. In my opinion, going on a trip is a useless activity. 6. In my opinion, going on tour is very fun.	(Fauzi et al., 2022)
Perceived Behavioral Control	1. I am sure that there is no language barrier when going on tour 2. I have enough money to go on a trip 3. I have time to travel whenever I want. 4. Lack of information does not prevent me from going on tour. 5. Health problems are not an obstacle for me to go on tour.	(Lee & Kim, 2017)

### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data analysis uses Structural Equation Modeling - Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS) which is divided into two stages, namely the measurement model (outer model) and the structural model (inner model)

## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control

### Measurement Model (Outer Model)

Testing on the measurement model (Outer Model) is divided into two parts, first, the validity test consists of convergent validity and discriminant validity. Second, it is continued with a reliability test consisting of calculating the composite reliability and Cronbach's Alpha values. In convergent validity testing, a construct is declared valid if the outer loading value is  $> 0.70$ . However, for research in the early stages of development, a measurement scale with an outer loading value of 0.50 to 0.60 is considered sufficient. Assessing the validity of the construct can also be seen from the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value. A good model is required and is declared valid if the AVE value of each construct is  $> 0.50$ . In the reliability test, a variable can be declared reliable if it has a composite reliability value and Cronbach's alpha  $> 0.70$  (Ghozali, 2021).

**Table 2. Convergent validity, AVE, Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability test results**

variable	Indicator	outer loading	AVE	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha
Travel Intention	TI1	0.874	0.731	0.891	0.816
	TI2	0.877			
	TI3	0.813			
Learned Helplessness	Help1	0.692	0.572	0.870	0.813
	Help2	0.784			
	Help3	0.779			
	Help4	0.752			
	Help5	0.772			
Intrinsic Constraints	Intc1	0.757	0.518	0.915	0.897
	Intc10	0.714			
	Intc2	0.723			
	Intc3	0.665			
	Intc4	0.746			
	Intc5	0.702			
	Intc6	0.760			
	Intc7	0.726			
	Intc8	0.669			
Intc9	0.731				
Interactional Constraints	Icon1	0.729	0.607	0.925	0.908
	Icon2	0.822			
	Icon3	0.780			
	Icon4	0.767			
	Icon5	0.757			
	Icon6	0.780			
	Icon7	0.780			
	Icon8	0.814			
Environmental Constraints	EC1	0.659	0.535	0.872	0.822
	EC2	0.580			
	EC3	0.742			
	EC4	0.790			
	EC5	0.804			
	EC6	0.784			
Subjective Norms	SN1	0.839	0.658	0.905	0.869
	SN2	0.846			
	SN3	0.863			
	SN4	0.745			



## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control

	SN5	0.753						
Attitude	Att1	0.802						
	Att2	0.822						
	Att3	0.797	0.648	0.917	0.892			
	Att4	0.762						
	Att5	0.802						
	Att6	0.843						
Perceived Behavioral Control	PBC1	0.834						
	PBC2	0.778						
	PBC3	0.770	0.598	0.881	0.831			
	PBC4	0.748						
	PBC5	0.732						

Source: Processed primary data (2024)

Based on table 2, it can be seen that all statement items are variable indicators intrinsic constraints, interactional constraints, environmental constraints, subjective norms, attitude, perceived behavioral control, learned helplessness and travel intention have an outer loading value > 0.50, meaning that all indicator statement items that measure the variables used are declared valid. Furthermore, the AVE value for each variable is > 0.50. Thus, it can be concluded that each variable in this research meets the requirements as a good model and is declared valid. Then the Composite Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha values for each variable are > 0.70. Thus it can be concluded that all variables used in this research are said to be reliable.

Testing discriminant validity In this research, one of them uses cross loading values of each indicator in the research variable. The condition is that if the correlation of a variable with its indicator has a value greater than the correlation value of the indicator with other variables, it means that the latent variables predict the size of their block better than the size of other blocks (Ghozali, 2021). The following are the results of discriminant validity testing using cross loadings:

**Table 3. Discriminant Validity Test Results Based on Cross Loadings**

Indicator	Attitude	Environmental Constraints	Learner Helplessness	Interactional Constraints	Intrinsic Constraints	Perceived Behavioral Control	Subjective Norms	Travel Intention
Att1	0.802	0.011	0.124	0.230	0.044	0.108	0.235	0.235
Att2	0.822	0.090	0.168	0.200	0.013	0.113	0.243	0.292
Att3	0.797	0.082	0.166	0.239	0.038	0.111	0.204	0.251
Att4	0.762	0.035	0.069	0.182	0.027	0.094	0.229	0.271
Att5	0.802	0.104	0.210	0.229	0.065	0.182	0.304	0.331
Att6	0.843	0.154	0.257	0.264	0.126	0.214	0.321	0.368
EC1	0.085	0.659	0.392	0.585	0.229	0.393	0.155	0.294
EC2	0.115	0.580	0.347	0.484	0.180	0.302	0.179	0.253
EC3	-0.004	0.742	0.359	0.221	0.226	0.347	0.091	0.250
EC4	0.074	0.790	0.362	0.298	0.259	0.345	0.219	0.318
EC5	0.062	0.804	0.396	0.306	0.261	0.452	0.164	0.317
EC6	0.122	0.784	0.471	0.340	0.274	0.423	0.226	0.368
Help1	0.223	0.431	0.692	0.306	0.235	0.573	0.253	0.469
Help2	0.169	0.416	0.784	0.393	0.189	0.531	0.405	0.493
Help3	0.139	0.431	0.779	0.376	0.258	0.516	0.384	0.506
Help4	0.119	0.379	0.752	0.305	0.289	0.500	0.372	0.597
Help5	0.169	0.379	0.772	0.312	0.335	0.556	0.339	0.615
ICon1	0.209	0.378	0.343	0.729	0.309	0.380	0.241	0.330
ICon2	0.203	0.347	0.321	0.822	0.290	0.381	0.299	0.359

**Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control**

ICon3	0.224	0.313	0.283	0.780	0.340	0.373	0.255	0.295
ICon4	0.213	0.314	0.245	0.767	0.231	0.380	0.170	0.253
ICon5	0.196	0.366	0.292	0.757	0.254	0.356	0.238	0.304
ICon6	0.285	0.372	0.374	0.780	0.255	0.345	0.341	0.414
ICon7	0.240	0.452	0.398	0.780	0.208	0.420	0.335	0.409
ICon8	0.175	0.544	0.441	0.814	0.247	0.495	0.306	0.425
IntC1	0.062	0.230	0.255	0.334	0.757	0.340	0.172	0.226
IntC10	0.062	0.173	0.258	0.193	0.714	0.314	0.087	0.201
IntC2	0.100	0.278	0.246	0.312	0.723	0.376	0.217	0.187
IntC3	0.133	0.278	0.252	0.269	0.665	0.356	0.152	0.205
IntC4	0.019	0.258	0.242	0.285	0.746	0.338	0.135	0.246
IntC5	0.143	0.250	0.245	0.336	0.702	0.320	0.154	0.235
IntC6	-0.015	0.258	0.259	0.165	0.760	0.327	0.101	0.123
IntC7	-0.045	0.218	0.229	0.140	0.726	0.302	0.080	0.135
IntC8	-0.088	0.191	0.190	0.151	0.669	0.241	0.029	0.035
IntC9	0.087	0.231	0.305	0.235	0.731	0.350	0.136	0.235
PBC1	0.135	0.407	0.636	0.327	0.319	0.834	0.263	0.529
PBC2	0.159	0.354	0.547	0.333	0.303	0.778	0.265	0.494
PBC3	0.055	0.369	0.470	0.369	0.438	0.770	0.216	0.462
PBC4	0.165	0.423	0.525	0.478	0.396	0.748	0.214	0.454
PBC5	0.168	0.462	0.544	0.466	0.321	0.732	0.263	0.502
SN1	0.206	0.225	0.394	0.328	0.203	0.328	0.839	0.430
SN2	0.191	0.196	0.360	0.286	0.152	0.250	0.846	0.404
SN3	0.312	0.184	0.407	0.355	0.171	0.243	0.863	0.467
SN4	0.317	0.172	0.325	0.239	0.105	0.248	0.745	0.363
SN5	0.303	0.194	0.397	0.233	0.076	0.214	0.753	0.353
TI1	0.308	0.367	0.609	0.399	0.212	0.539	0.424	0.874
TI2	0.290	0.373	0.635	0.404	0.230	0.564	0.462	0.877
TI3	0.354	0.325	0.582	0.376	0.225	0.519	0.398	0.813

Source: Primary data processed (2024)

From the table it can be seen that the correlation value of the variables intrinsic constraints, interactional constraints, environmental constraints, subjective norms, attitude, perceived behavioral control, learned helplessness and travel intention with the indicators is greater than the correlation value of the indicators with other variables. This shows that all indicator values tested in this study are declared valid, so it can be concluded that all variable indicators in this study have good discriminant validity.

Another method that can be used to assess discriminant validity uses the Fornell-Larcker Criterion value by comparing the square root value of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for each variable with the correlation between the variable and other variables in the model. The condition is that each variable must have a square root value of AVE that is greater than the correlation value between the variable and other variables, so that the decision is that the variable has a good discriminant validity value (Ghozali, 2021). The following are the results of discriminant validity testing using the Fornell-Larcker Criterion values:

## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control

**Table 4. Fornell-Larcker Criterium**

Variable	Attitude	Environmental Constraints	Learned Helplessness	Interactional Constraints	Intrinsic Constraints	Perceived Behavioral Control	Subjective Norms	Travel Intention
Attitude	0.805							
Environmental Constraints	0.106	0.731						
Learned Helplessness	0.215	0.537	0.756					
Interactional Constraints	0.280	0.510	0.446	0.779				
Intrinsic Constraints	0.070	0.329	0.348	0.339	0.720			
Perceived Behavioral Control	0.178	0.522	0.707	0.508	0.456	0.773		
Subjective Norms	0.325	0.239	0.465	0.360	0.179	0.317	0.811	
Travel Intention	0.370	0.416	0.713	0.460	0.260	0.633	0.501	0.855

**Source:** Primary data processed (2024)

From table 4, information on the square root value of AVE for each variable consisting of intrinsic constraints, interactional constraints, environmental constraints, subjective norms, attitude, perceived behavioral control, learned helplessness and travel intention is greater than the correlation between the variables and other variables. Based on the results of the Fornell-Larcker Criterium values, this research variable meets the requirements for all variables, namely having good discriminant validity, so the variables used can be said to be valid.

### Structural Model (Inner Model)

The structural assessment model uses R-square, Q-Square as well as t and significance tests. The R-squares value is used to see the ability of the independent variable to explain the dependent variable. R-Squares values of 0.75, 0.50 and 0.25 can be concluded that the model is strong, moderate and weak (Ghozali, 2021). The estimated R-square value can be seen in Table 4.15 below.

**Table 5 R Square**

Variable	R Square
learned helplessness	0.349
Travel Intention	0.608

**Source:** Primary data processed in 2023

Based on Table 5, it is known that the R-square value for the learned helplessness variable is 0.349, which means that 34.9% of intrinsic constraints, interactional constraints, environmental constraints can explain learned helplessness, while the remaining 65.1% is explained by other variables outside this research. , where the explanatory power of the model is weak because  $0.349 > 0.25$  but smaller than 0.50.

R-square value for the variable travel intentions amounted to 0.608, which means that 60.8% of subjective norms, attitudes, perceived behavioral control and learned helplessness can explain travel intentions, while the remaining 39.2% is explained by other variables outside this research, where the explanatory power of the model is moderate because  $0.608 > 0.50$  but smaller than 0.75.

The Q-Square test is also called the predictive relevance test, which is used to measure how well the path model can predict the original data values, meaning that the Q-Square test shows how good the observation values produced by the path

## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control

model are. To get values from the Q-Square test, you can use the blindfolding procedure in the SmartPLS program. If the  $Q^2$  value is greater ( $>$ ) than 0, it indicates that the exogenous construct variables have predictive relevance for the endogenous construct variables, which means the observations are good.

According to Hair et al. (2017) Q-square has 2 approaches, namely Construct cross-validated redundancy and Construct cross-validated communality. This research uses the Construct cross-validated redundancy approach to determine  $Q^2$ , because this approach includes important elements from the path model to predict omitted data points. The results of the Q-square test in this research can be seen in the following table.

**Table 6. Q-Square**

	SSO	SSE	$Q^2 (=1-SSE/SSO)$
Attitude	1440,000	1440,000	
Environmental Constraints	1440,000	1440,000	
Learned Helplessness	1440,000	1440,000	0.193
Interactional Constraints	1920,000	1920,000	
Intrinsic Constraints	2400,000	2400,000	
Perceived Behavioral Control	1200,000	1200,000	
Subjective Norms	1200,000	1200,000	
Travel Intention	720,000	410,078	0.430

**Source:** Primary data processed (2024)

Based on the table above, it is known that the  $Q^2$  value of the learned helplessness and travel intention variables is greater ( $>$ ) than 0, this shows that the model has predictive relevance. The variables intrinsic constraints, interactional constraints, environmental constraints have a predictive relevance for the variable learned helplessness of 0.193. Then the subjective norms, attitude, perceived behavioral control and learned helplessness variables have a predictive relevance for the travel intention variable of 0.430.

In this research, the original sample value is used to show a positive (+) or negative (-) correlation. Next, to test the hypothesis results, use a one-tailed hypothesis test (1-way hypothesis) with the condition that the hypothesis is declared accepted if the t-statistic value is greater than the t table value (1.65) for a degree of significance of 0.05 (Hair et al., 2017). The results of hypothesis testing in this research can be described as follows:

**Table 7. Hypothesis testing results**

		Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics ( O/STDEV )	P Values
H1	Intrinsic Constraints -> Learned Helplessness	0.155	0.162	0.060	2,581	0.010
H2	Interactional Constraints -> Learned Helplessness	0.197	0.203	0.072	2,735	0.006
H3	Environmental Constraints -> Learned Helplessness	0.385	0.385	0.057	6,792	0,000
H4	Subjective Norms -> Travel Intention	0.168	0.165	0.059	2,848	0.005
H5	Attitude -> Travel Intention	0.181	0.184	0.068	2,670	0.008
H6	Perceived Behavioral Control -> Travel Intention	0.253	0.248	0.069	3,678	0,000
H7	Learned Helplessness -> Travel Intention	0.417	0.422	0.080	5,209	0,000

**Source:** Primary data processed (2024)

## **Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control**

### **The Effect of Intrinsic Constraints on Learned Helplessness**

Based on the test results, it was found that the original sample value for the influence of Intrinsic Constraints on Learned Helplessness was positive at 0.155, which indicates that the direction of influence is positive. The t-statistics value is  $2.581 > 1.65$  with a p value of  $0.010 < 0.05$ . So it can be concluded that Intrinsic Constraints have a positive and significant effect on Learned Helplessness, thus H1 is accepted

If people with disabilities experience learned helplessness, they may hesitate to participate in tourism activities (Smith, 1987), even in situations where they can easily and successfully participate in tourism and its related activities. Therefore, learned helplessness can arise in everyday situations where people with or without disabilities feel or really have no control over what happens to themselves, sometimes resulting in motivational, cognitive, and emotional deficiencies. On the other hand, travel constraints can prevent someone from reaching a destination or reduce the quality of their tourist experience (Lai et al., 2013)

Pagan (2021) argue that loneliness in people with disabilities can be reduced by their participation in family and friend gatherings, as well as social, sports and cultural activities that have a positive impact on increasing their self-confidence. Tourists with disabilities with learned helplessness have high hopes for service providers to reduce their intrinsic constraints. According to the theory of learned helplessness, this is a psychological condition where a person has learned to believe that he has no control over a situation and that whatever he does is futile.

These results are in line with research conducted by Sarmah et al., (2022) who found that intrinsic constraints had a positive effect on learned helplessness. Lack of self-confidence or feelings of fear and lack of self-control for people with physical disabilities in India are the main influencing factors. Ying et al., (2021) also found results that intrinsic constraints have a significant positive effect on learned helplessness in people who travel.

### **The Effect of Interactional Constraints on Learned Helplessness**

Based on the test results, it was found that the original sample value for the influence of interactional constraints on Learned Helplessness was positive at 0.197, which indicates that the direction of the influence is positive. The t-statistics value is  $2.735 > 1.65$  with a p value of  $0.006 < 0.05$ . So it can be concluded that interactional constraints have a positive and significant effect on Learned Helplessness, thus H2 is accepted

McKercher & Darcy (2018) explains that prejudice and negative attitudes often arise due to a lack of knowledge and direct experience with different groups. When people have the opportunity to interact and get to know individuals from other groups on a personal level, they can develop greater understanding and empathy, thereby reducing prejudice and increasing positive attitudes.

The tourism experience is often felt as a challenge full of mixed emotions and feelings. This is normal because everything feels new and unfamiliar. However, as experience increases, individuals will get used to it and develop new skills. This learning process makes them able to face obstacles and challenges more efficiently. They can also manage emotions and feelings better, so that the next tourist experience becomes more enjoyable and memorable (Devile & Moura, 2021)

The results are in line with previous research conducted by Lee et al., (2012) And Sarmah et al., (2022) It is known that interactional constraints influence learned helplessness.

### **The Effect of Environmental Constraints on Learned Helplessness**

Based on the test results, it was found that the original sample value for the influence of environmental constraints on Learned Helplessness was positive at 0.385, which indicates that the direction of the influence is positive. The t-statistics value is  $6.792 > 1.65$  with a p value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . So it can be concluded that environmental constraints have a positive and significant effect on Learned Helplessness, thus H3 is accepted

Karl et al., (2021) explains that it is not an individual's disability that prevents them from having fun in an activity, but rather a non-disability-friendly environment. Problems related to road signs, public attitudes, and the availability of information are the main inhibiting factors.

People with disabilities are often unable to participate in tourism programs because tourist facilities are not yet fully accessible and barrier-free. However, as demand for inclusive tourism increases, accessibility is no longer seen as an obligation, but as a prerequisite and opportunity. The absence of mobility barriers and physical access are now important factors for the success and sustainability of the tourism industry (Agovino et al., 2017).

## **Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control**

People with physical or mobility disabilities cannot fully enjoy the various experiences and offers available at a tourist destination. McKercher & Darcy (2018) explains that the social approach to the physical, economic, social, cultural, etc. environment. It is inherently disabling and that disabled people are faced with hostile social attitudes, both overt and covert, that limit their participation.

According to Figueiredo et al., (2012) which states that tourists with disabilities can interact with other people both with and without disabilities and the natural and cultural environment to experience the benefits mentioned above, which significantly contribute to their personal development and subsequently to their social inclusion. Sarmah et al., (2022) which states that learned helplessness can be acquired regardless of an individual's personal and psychosocial profile. That is, life history and situational elements that influence personality development are key to growth and development in any environment.

The results are in line with previous research conducted by Wen et al., (2020) And Sarmah et al., (2022) It is known that environmental constraints influence learned helplessness.

### **The Effect of Subjective Norms on Travel Intention**

Based on the test results, it was found that the original sample value for the influence of subjective norms on travel intention was positive at 0.168, which indicates that the direction of influence is positive. The t-statistics value is  $2.848 > 1.65$  with a p value of  $0.005 < 0.05$ . So it can be concluded that subjective norms have a positive and significant effect on travel intention, thus H4 is accepted

Subjective norms reflects an individual's perception of whether others approve of the behavior demonstrated. If the individual understands that the behavior is not acceptable, they are less likely to avoid it. Thus, subjective norms describe perceptions that are influenced by others to behave in a certain way (Singh et al., 2021). By overcoming barriers and increasing positive subjective norms, travel intention in people with disabilities can be increased, allowing them to enjoy the benefits and positive experiences of travel.

Subjective norms can increase awareness about accessibility, provide information and support, and encourage inclusivity in communities and the tourism industry can help increase travel intention among people with disabilities. These results are in line with research conducted by

Fauzi et al., (2022) states that Subjective norms influence the intention to visit a place. This is in line with the results of research by tourists in Turkey where subjective norms have a significant role in determining individual intentions and can influence the decision-making process (Yarimoglu & Gunay, 2019)

### **The Effect of Attitude on Travel Intention**

Based on the test results, it was found that the original sample value for the influence of attitude on travel intention was positive at 0.181, which indicates that the direction of influence is positive. The t-statistics value is  $2.670 > 1.65$  with a p value of  $0.008 < 0.05$ . So it can be concluded that attitude has a positive and significant effect on travel intention, thus H5 is accepted

Attitude includes the desire and unwillingness to do something, approach or avoid situations, objects, people, groups, and other recognizable aspects of the environment, including abstract ideas and social policies. Various efforts are needed to increase travel intention in people with disabilities. By changing attitudes and overcoming obstacles, people with disabilities can be encouraged to travel more often and enjoy the positive benefits.

Previous research in line was conducted Torabi et al., (2022) towards tourists in Iran that attitude, both directly and indirectly, has a significant influence on tourists' intention to use tourism applications. Study Ru et al., (2019) strengthening the significant role of tourists' attitudes in China towards travel intention in visiting hotels.

### **The Effect of Perceived Behavioral Control on Travel Intention**

Based on the test results, it was found that the original sample value for the influence of perceived behavioral control on travel intention was positive at 0.253, which indicates that the direction of influence is positive. The t-statistics value is  $3.678 > 1.65$  with a p value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . So it can be concluded that perceived behavioral control has a positive and significant effect on travel intention, thus H6 is accepted

Perceived behavioral control can include a number of factors, such as time availability, finances, social support, and other factors that make it easy or difficult to travel (Lee & Kim, 2017). Specifically, people with mobility limitations agreed that recreational travel was interesting and enjoyable, but their intrinsic motivation did not translate into actual participation or future travel intentions, in part due to perceived accessibility limitations.

## **Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control**

Perceived behavioral control is defined as the level of difficulty or fluency a person feels in carrying out a behavior (Choo et al., 2016). The better the perceived support, the higher the perception of control over required resources. Thus, the higher the perceived behavioral control, the greater the possibility of forming a travel intention or intention to travel. Therefore, perceived behavioral control plays an important role in predicting travel intention for individuals with disabilities.

There are several external factors that may not be under a person's control, such as opportunity, resources, time, knowledge, and skills. The better a person can control external factors when engaging in certain behaviors, the more likely they will engage in those behaviors (Peng et al., 2014). For individuals who experience disabilities, there are several additional obstacles that can influence their perception of control over the resources needed to carry out travel activities. Obstacles such as accessibility of public facilities, lack of available information, or low social support can reduce their perception of control. The greater the perceived obstacle, the lower the perception of control they feel.

The results of this research are in line with the research conducted Wang et al., (2018) on tourists Cind and Huang et al., (2018) in Taiwanese tourists, which states that Perceived behavioral control has a significant influence on revisit intention. Therefore, it is assumed that perceived behavioral control can influence travel intention to visit tourist attractions.

### **The Effect of Learned Helplessness on Travel Intention**

Based on the test results, it was found that the original sample value for the influence of learned helplessness on travel intention was positive at 0.417, which indicates that the direction of the influence is positive. The t-statistics value is  $5.209 > 1.65$  with a p value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . So it can be concluded that learned helplessness has a positive and significant effect on travel intention, thus H7 is accepted

The results of this research show that it is important to help people with disabilities overcome learned helplessness in order to increase their travel intention. By overcoming learned helplessness and increasing travel intention, people with disabilities can enjoy the benefits of tourism. Learned helplessness can arise in everyday situations where individuals, both disabled and non-disabled, feel or really have no control over what happens to them. This can lead to decreased motivation, cognition and emotions (Lee et al., 2012).

The theory of learned helplessness is very relevant to the intentions and participation of people with disabilities in tourism. This is because although they have the same desire to participate in tourism activities as non-disabled people, they often face more direct and indirect obstacles during travel. These obstacles arise due to socially constructed conditions of disability, in addition to their own physical limitations (Ying et al., 2021). Research by Lee et al., (2012) also found that learned helplessness had an effect on travel intention

## **V. CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the discussion of the research results, it can be concluded that intrinsic constraints have a positive and significant effect on learned helplessness. Interactional constraints have a positive and significant effect on learned helplessness. Environmental Constraints have a positive and significant effect on learned helplessness. Subjective norms have a positive and significant effect on travel intention. Attitude has a positive and significant effect on travel intention. Perceived behavioral control has a positive and significant effect on travel intention. Learned helplessness has a positive and significant effect on travel intention. Based on the conclusions of this research, there are several suggestions that can be considered as follows in further research to add other variables that are felt to influence travel intention which were not examined in this research, such as trust, expectation, negotiation and others. It is recommended that future research use a qualitative approach to complement or enrich this research. It is recommended that parties involved in tourism improve the accessibility of facilities, complete information regarding accessibility, carry out socialization and promotion of inclusive tourism to the community in order to increase tourism interest for people with disabilities in a sustainable manner.

## **REFERENCES**

- 1) Agovino, M., Casaccia, M., Garofalo, A., & Marchesano, K. (2017). Tourism and disability in Italy. Limits and opportunities. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 23, 58–67.
- 2) Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(4), 314–324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195>
- 3) Choo, H., Ahn, K., & Petrick, J. F. (2016). An integrated model of festival revisit intentions: theory of planned behavior and festival quality/satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 818–838.

## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control

<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2014-0448>

- 4) Daniels, M. J., Rodgers, E. B. D., & Wiggins, B. P. (2005). "Travel Tales": an interpretive analysis of constraints and negotiations to pleasure travel as experienced by persons with physical disabilities. *Tourism Management*, 26(6), 919–930. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.06.010>
- 5) Darcy, S., Lock, D., & Taylor, T. (2017). Enabling Inclusive Sport Participation: Effects of Disability and Support Needs on Constraints to Sport Participation. *Leisure Sciences*, 39(1), 20–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2016.1151842>
- 6) Darcy, S., McKercher, B., & Schweinsberg, S. (2020). From tourism and disability to accessible tourism: a perspective article. *Tourism Review*, 75(1), 140–144.
- 7) De Pascale, A., Meleddu, M., Abbate, T., & Pellicano, M. (2023). Is There a Gender Gap in the Propensity to Travel of People With Disabilities? *Journal of Travel Research: A Quarterly Publication of the Travel and Tourism Research Association.*, 62(3), 517–539.
- 8) Devile, E. L., & Moura, A. A. (2021). Travel by People With Physical Disabilities: Constraints and Influences in the Decision-Making Process. *ICT Tools and Applications for Accessible Tourism*, 55–73.
- 9) Eusébio, C., Alves, J. P., Carneiro, M. J., & Teixeira, L. (2023). Needs, motivations, constraints and benefits of people with disabilities participating in tourism activities: the view of formal caregivers. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2023.2190141>
- 10) Fauzi, M. A., Hanafiah, M. H., & Kunjuraman, V. (2022). Tourists' intention to visit green hotels: building on the theory of planned behaviour and the value-belief-norm theory. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-01-2022-0008>
- 11) Figueiredo, E., Eusébio, C., & Kastenholz, E. (2012). How Diverse are Tourists with Disabilities? A Pilot Study on Accessible Leisure Tourism Experiences in Portugal. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(6). <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr>
- 12) Ghozali, I. (2021). *Partial Least Squares Konsep, Teknik Dan Aplikasi Menggunakan Program SmartPLS 3.2.9 Untuk Penelitian Empiris*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro Semarang.
- 13) Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (Second). Sage Publications.
- 14) Huang, Y. C., Chang, L. L., & Backman, K. F. (2018). Detecting common method bias in predicting creative tourists behavioural intention with an illustration of theory of planned behaviour. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(3), 307–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1424809>
- 15) Karl, M., Sie, L., & Ritchie, B. W. (2021). Expanding Travel Constraint Negotiation Theory: An Exploration of Cognitive and Behavioral Constraint Negotiation Relationships. *Journal of Travel Research*, 61(4), 762–785. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875211011547>
- 16) Lai, C., Li, X. (Robert), & Harrill, R. (2013). Chinese outbound tourists' perceived constraints to visiting the United States. *Tourism Management*, 37, 136–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.01.014>
- 17) Lee, B. K., Sheela, A., & Kim, H. J. (2012). Influences of travel constraints on the people with disabilities' intention to travel: An application of Seligman's helplessness theory. *Tourism Management*, 33(3), 569–579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.06.011>
- 18) Lee, S. J., & Kim, H. L. (2017). Roles of perceived behavioral control and self-efficacy to volunteer tourists' intended participation via theory of planned behavior. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(4), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2171>
- 19) Lee, S., Jeong, E., & Qu, K. (2020). Exploring theme park visitors' experience on satisfaction and revisit intention: A utilization of experience economy model. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 21(4), 474–497.
- 20) Lenggogeni, S., & Syafrizal. (2023). The post-COVID-19 road-based tourism market: Negotiation of travel constraints. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 22, 100908. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2023.100908>
- 21) Londono, J. C., Davies, K., & Elms, J. (2017). Extending the Theory of Planned Behavior to examine the role of anticipated negative emotions on channel intention: The case of an embarrassing product. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 36, 8–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.12.002>
- 22) Marmion, M., & Hindley, A. (2020). Tourism and Health: Understanding the Relationship. *Good Health and Well-Being, January*, 738–746. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95681-7\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95681-7_16)
- 23) McKercher, B., & Darcy, S. (2018). Re-conceptualizing barriers to travel by people with disabilities. *Tourism*



## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control

*Management Perspectives*, 26, 59–66.

- 24) Meng, B., & Choi, K. (2015). Extending the theory of planned behaviour: testing the effects of authentic perception and environmental concerns on the slow-tourist decision-making process. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(6), 528–544. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1020773>
- 25) Meng, B., & Han, H. (2018). Working-holiday tourism attributes and satisfaction in forming word-of-mouth and revisit intentions: Impact of quantity and quality of intergroup contact. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 9, 347–357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2018.03.009>
- 26) Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2010). Gendered theory of planned behaviour and residents' support for tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(6), 525–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500903173967>
- 27) Özcan, E., Topcu, Z. G., & Arasl, H. (2021). Determinants of Travel Participation and Experiences of Wheelchair Users Traveling to the Bodrum Region: A Qualitative Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(5), 2218.
- 28) Pagan, R. (2021). Leisure Activities and Loneliness Among People with Disabilities. *Handbook of Sustainable Development and Leisure Services*, 67–83.
- 29) Peng, N., Chen, A., & Hung, K. P. (2014). Including pets when undertaking tourism activities: Incorporating pet attachment into the TPB model. *Tourism Analysis*, 19(1), 69–84. <https://doi.org/10.3727/108354214X13927625340235>
- 30) Ru, X., Qin, H., & Wang, S. (2019). Young people's behaviour intentions towards reducing PM2.5 in China: Extending the theory of planned behaviour. *Resources, Conservation & Recycling*, 141, 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.10.019>
- 31) Sarmah, B., Kamboj, S., & Chatterjee, R. (2022). Linking the intrinsic and environmental constraints with PwD tourists' behavioral intentions toward a travel destination: mediating role of learned helplessness. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-02-2021-0053>
- 32) Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research Methods for Business : A Skill-Building Approach* (Seventh ed). John Wiley & Sons.
- 33) Seow, A. N., Choong, Y. O., Moorthy, K., & Choong, C. K. (2021). Predicting medical tourism behavioural intention using social cognition models. *Tourism Review*, 76(2), 374–391. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-06-2019-0267>
- 34) Singh, R., Ismail, A., PS, S., & Singh, D. (2021). Compliance of accessibility in tourism websites: a pledge towards disability. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 4(3), 263–281. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-05-2020-0092>
- 35) Smith, R. W. (1987). Leisure of disable tourists. Barriers to participation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(3), 376–389. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(87\)90109-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(87)90109-5)
- 36) Tomej, K., & Duedahl, E. (2023). Engendering collaborative accessibility through tourism: From barriers to bridges. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 99, 103528. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2023.103528>
- 37) Torabi, Z. A., Shalbafian, A. A., Allam, Z., Ghaderi, Z., Murgante, B., & Khavarian-Garmsir, A. R. (2022). Enhancing Memorable Experiences, Tourist Satisfaction, and Revisit Intention through Smart Tourism Technologies. *Sustainability*, 14(5), 2721. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14052721>
- 38) Ulker-Demirel, E., & Ciftci, G. (2020). A systematic literature review of the theory of planned behavior in tourism, leisure and hospitality management research. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 43, 209–219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.04.003>
- 39) Vesci, M., & Botti, A. (2019). Festival quality, theory of planned behavior and revisiting intention: Evidence from local and small Italian culinary festivals. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 38, 5–15.
- 40) Wang, J., Wang, S., Wang, Y., Li, J., & Zhao, D. (2018). Extending the theory of planned behavior to understand consumers' intentions to visit green hotels in the Chinese context. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(8), 2810–2825. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-04-2017-0223>
- 41) Wen, J., Huang, S. (sam), & Goh, E. (2020). Effects of perceived constraints and negotiation on learned helplessness: A study of Chinese senior outbound tourists. *Tourism Management*, 78, 104059. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104059>
- 42) Yarimoglu, E., & Gunay, T. (2019). The extended theory of planned behavior in Turkish customers' intentions to visit green hotels. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 29(3), 1097–1108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2419>
- 43) Ying, T., Tang, J., Wen, J., Ye, S., Zhou, Y., & Li, F. S. (2021). Traveling with pets: Constraints, negotiation, and learned helplessness. *Tourism Management*, 82, 104183.

## Analysis of Travel Intentions in Tourists with Disabilities: Study of Constraints, Subjective Norms, Attitude and Perceived Behavioral Control

- 44) Yuzhanin, S., & Fisher, D. (2016). The efficacy of the theory of planned behavior for predicting intentions to choose a travel destination: a review. *Tourism Review*, 71(2), 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-11-2015-0055>



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.