Advancing Inclusive Sacred Tourism for People with Disabilities Through Accessibility, Cultural Participation, and Community Governance at Taman Mumbul, Bali

Gede Yoga Kharisma Pradana[1*], Gede Eka Wahyu[2], I Dewa Gede Kresna Wirawan[3], Ni Made Ruastiti[4]

[1]Applied Tourism Planning and Development (Master Program), Postgraduate, International Institute of Tourism and Business (IPBI), Denpasar, Indonesia
[2]Hotel Management (Diploma IV Program), Vocational, International Institute of Tourism and Business (IPBI), Denpasar, Indonesia
[3]Enterpreneur (Bachelor Program), Faculty of Economics and Business, PGRI Mahadewa University, Denpasar, Indonesia
[4]Dance (Bachelor Program), Faculty of Performing Arts, Indonesia Institute of the Arts Bali (ISI Bali), Denpasar, Indonesia

HOW TO CITE:
Gede Yoga Kharisma Pradana , Gede Eka Wahyu, I Dewa Gede Kresna Wirawan, Ni Made Ruastiti (2026). Advancing Inclusive Sacred Tourism for People with Disabilities Through Accessibility, Cultural Participation, and Community Governance at Taman Mumbul, Bali. International Journal of Special Education, 41(15s), 694-710

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:
Copyright: © 2026 Authors. Open access publication underthe terms and conditions of the Creative CommonsAttribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ABSTRACT:
Sacred tourism at Taman Mumbul should ideally provide people with disabilities with equitable physical, sensory, communicative, and cultural access, enabling their respectful participation in melukat under community-based governance. However, the inclusive potential of Taman Mumbul remains insufficiently assessed, as existing documents do not provide specific evidence regarding disability-responsive facilities, accessible information, and individual assistance with disabilities. This study assesses the physical, sensory, communicative, and cultural accessibility of sacred tourism at Taman Mumbul and formulates a community-based governance framework that enables people with disabilities to participate meaningfully in melukat without compromising customary authority, ritual authenticity, or sacred values. Employing a qualitative case-study design, data were collected through accessibility audits, participant observation, and semi-structured interviews, supplemented by document analysis of customary regulations, visitor guidelines, promotional materials, and photographs. The principal result indicates that while Taman Mumbul's community-based governance successfully regulates visitor participation and protects ritual sacredness, its inclusive potential remains limited because existing practices have not systematically incorporated disability-responsive physical access, the meaningful participation of people with disabilities in tourism planning and cultural engagement. The study concludes that inclusive sacred tourism requires the existing customary governance system to be expanded through disability-responsive infrastructure, accessible communication, personalised support, and participatory decision-making. This study contributes to disability-inclusive tourism and community-governance scholarship by proposing a

culturally grounded framework that integrates accessibility, communication, support, and participatory agency into customary sacred-tourism management without undermining ritual authenticity or community sovereignty.

Keywords: Sacred Tourism, Disabilities, Accessibility, Cultural, Community Governance, Bali

1. Introduction

Sacred tourism fosters cultural preservation, well-being, and development. In Bali, community co-creation and *Tri Hita Karana* strengthen local resource control and harmony (Rosalina et al., 2023). Authentic sites boost existential well-being and quality of life (Han et al., 2024). Religious festivals generate spiritual benefits and personal growth (Gedecho & Kim, 2024). With government support and infrastructure, spiritual tourism drives employment and regional development (Jena et al., 2026), while Indonesian community-based heritage tourism preserves identity, welfare, and social ties (Syafrini et al., 2026).

Accessibility enables dignified, independent participation. In religion, inclusion requires genuine belonging and recognition (Maciejewska, 2023). Greek museums present barriers like inaccessible info and co-creation limits for intellectual disabilities (Chaidemenaki & Kolokytha, 2025). Travel barriers increase dependence, yet accessible mobility boosts independence and participation (Neven & Ectors, 2023). For spinal cord injuries, travel improves integration, health, and reduces isolation (Hua et al., 2024). Finally, accessible facilities, reliable info, supportive staff, and disabled co-design are vital for dignity and agency (Devis-Rozental et al., 2026).

Cultural participation bolsters belonging and heritage connection. Sáez-Velasco et al. (2025) link social participation to inclusion, well-being, diversity, and anti-isolation. Leahy & Ferri (2024) find that arts build cultural capital, agency, and challenge devaluation. Kanari & Souliotou (2023) promote creativity. Woodruff (2023) identifies understanding, interaction, collaboration, communication, and accessibility. Chaidemenaki & Kolokytha (2025) confirm that inaccessible exhibitions restrict engagement, requiring representation.

Community governance enables equitable tourism. Rosalina et al. (2023) show customary institutions retain control and conserve via *Tri Hita Karana*. Quang et al. (2024) expose benefit-sharing inequality, demanding Indigenous participation. Tan et al. (2024) note elite capture, exclusion, and burdens on women, supporting flexible approaches. Suhartana et al. (2025) integrate socio-cultural-ecological-economic factors via social capital. Duong et al. (2026) require transparent governance, advisory structures, capacity-building, and sensitive communication for equitable ecotourism.

Bali integrates community governance (Rosalina et al., 2023; Suhartana et al., 2025). It combines interpersonal cooperation (Tomej & Duedahl, 2023). That destination has accessible digital information (Domínguez Vila et al., 2024). It has a digital source for inclusive sacred tourism, while authenticity boosts spiritual well-being/QoL (Han et al., 2024). Yet barriers span the entire journey, transport increases dependence (Neven & Ectors, 2023), fragmented web disability-info persists (Domínguez Vila et al., 2025), agency constraints emerge narratively (Tomej & Duedahl, 2023, co-creation are deficient for intellectual disabilities (Chaidemenaki & Kolokytha, 2025, 35 orgs). It visually dominated interpretation hinders equitable engagement (Qiao et al., 2023). Thus, Bali must simultaneously improve physical access, informational clarity, multisensory interpretation, respectful social assistance, and meaningful cultural participation.

Existing Bali community governance prioritises ritual preservation, identity, and safe access via *Tri Hita Karana, ngayah,* and *banjar adat* (Rosalina et al., 2023; Suhartana et al., 2025), yet omits

disability-responsive services. Technical web access improved, but disability info remains heterogeneous (Domínguez Vila et al., 2024; Chaidemenaki & Kolokytha, 2025); and participants show interpersonal dynamics restrict agency, demanding co-design with PwD (Tomej & Duedahl, 2023). Consequently, PwD face unsafe access in Indonesian worship (Riwanto et al., 2023). Polish visual impairments show presence ≠ inclusion without belonging (Maciejewska, 2023). A scoping review cites stereotypes/limited representation (McMahon-Panther & Bornman, 2025). Inaccessible visual interpretation hinders engagement (Qiao et al., 2023). Meaningful melukat participation thus requires safe physical access, multisensory ritual information, respectful assistance, social recognition and active involvement, not passive observation.

People with disabilities (PwD), caregivers, and disability organisations are rarely systemically integrated into planning (Dickson et al., 2025; McIntosh & Flemmer, 2026). Only 20/490 Australian policies mention PwD in tourism workforces (Lu et al., 2024). It is care relationships shaping intellectual-disability travel that remain underrepresented (Gillovic et al., 2024). They affirm "nothing about us without us" mandates lived-experience co-creation (Devis-Rozental et al., 2026). Yet no integrated model bridges accessibility, cultural participation, representation, and sacred values (Riwanto et al., 2023). That access is relational, not merely infrastructural (Tomej & Duedahl, 2023). Physical entry fails to ensure cultural understanding (Chaidemenaki & Kolokytha, 2025). Whole-journey co-design surpasses tokenism (Dickson et al., 2025). Top-down power imbalances persist despite conservation priorities (Duong et al., 2026). These fragmented streams collectively substantiate the urgent need for a unified, culturally grounded sacred-tourism framework in Bali.

Exclusion from sacred tourism restricts cultural rights, well-being, and urgently demands reform. Indonesia shows unsafe worship (Riwanto et al., 2023). Christians with disabilities lack full faith participation (Carter et al., 2023). Pilgrimage authenticity affects spiritual well-being (Han et al., 2024). Travel reduces isolation and increases reintegration (Hua et al., 2024). Inaccessible built heritage excludes cultural appropriation (Giacobone et al., 2024). Thus, disability-responsive access and rights-based governance are urgent in Bali's living heritage. This research proposes a novel integrated model bridging accessibility, cultural participation, and community governance while preserving sanctity. Rights-based environments are needed (Riwanto et al., 2023). Inclusion requires PwD co-creation over institutional commitment (Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy, 2023). Co-design surpasses tokenism (Dickson et al., 2025). Equitable governance must protect religious authority (Quang et al., 2024). Bali's customary governance strengthens local harmony (Rosalina et al., 2023). Since these dimensions remain fragmented, an integrated framework is original and essential. It therefore aims to formulate and verify an inclusive sacred tourism framework that can guide local communities, destination managers, and policymakers in developing equitable, culturally sensitive, and sustainable tourism practices.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This qualitative field-based study uses constructivism to formulate an integrated, inclusive sacred tourism framework, meaningful cultural participation, community governance, and sacred-value protection in Bali. Methods include semi-structured interviews, ethnographic observation, snowball sampling, and thematic analysis. Consistent with Perangin-Angin et al. (2023); Tomej & Duedahl (2023) on relational accessibility, Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) on institutional vs lived inclusion, Dickson et al. (2025) on co-design beyond tokenism, and Suhartana et al. (2025) with Sanur social capital. A synchronic approach examines current arrangements and stakeholder experiences without historical tracing.

2.2 Research Setting

Fieldwork at Taman Mumbul, Sangeh (Badung) in Bali, Jan 2025–Jul 2026. Hubner et al. (2025) justify site selection by integrating ritual,

governance, and *melukat*. Unit of analysis extends relationally beyond infrastructure to services, info, and decision-making. Nyquist et al. (2025) show participation shaped by environment, assistive devices, staff competence, and info accuracy. Rubio-Escuderos et al. (2025) cite non-collaboration, conflict, discrimination, and inconsistent regulations as constraints. Preliminary mapping of zones is supported by Teixeira et al. (2025) for user-identified needs. Lu et al. (2025) for PwD involvement in research design. Comparative support is drawn, yet empirical evidence remains grounded in this study's own site records.

2.3 Participants and Sampling

Recruitment targeted diverse PwD, caregivers, religious leaders, destination managers, locals, tourism practitioners, and officials via purposive then snowball sampling. Methodological supports Perangin-Angin et al. (2023) (snowball, direct experiences); McFarland et al. (2024) (adaptive communication for intellectual disabilities); Quang et al. (2024) Indigenous priests for sacred governance); Dickson et al. (2025) (disability org co-design vs tokenism). Per Wutich et al. (2024), theme saturation occurs at 9 interviews, meaning saturation 24. Final sample = ten participants (one PwD, two caregivers, one customary leader, one destination manager, and twenty tourism-operator representatives) defensible for exploratory case-study analysis, yet acknowledging limited disability diversity.

2.4 Data-Collection Instruments and Techniques

Researchers are primary instruments, supported by interview guides, observation guides, field notes, and document-review protocols. Triangulation reveals interview–practice contradictions (Dado et al., 2023). Data collection combines participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) compare institutional commitments with lived experiences of access, assistance, ritual participation, representation, and sacred values. Communication accommodations use flexible, person-centred spatial aids (McFarland et al., 2024). Observations target entrances, pathways, facilities, signage, assistance, social interactions, and rituals, justified by systematic audits to identify physical barriers (Groulx et al., 2024). Document analysis covers customary regulations, SOPs, plans, and materials, exposing policy-implementation gaps (Lu et al., 2024).

2.5 Research Procedures

Seven iterative stages : (1) preliminary mapping of governance (Hubner et al., 2025). (2) permissions + purposive, snowball recruitment (Perangin-Angin et al., 2023). (3) accessible informed consent with visual language & supported decision-making. (4) iterative interviews, observations, and documents (Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy, 2023). (5) interpretation linking access, participation, governance, and sacred values. (6) synthesis into a preliminary framework. (7) community validation (PwD, caregivers, customary, managers) + revision, applying Dickson et al.'s (2025) lived experience, "nothing about us without us." Credibility remains grounded in Taman Mumbul's empirical context.

2.6 Data Analysis

Qualitative-interpretive thematic analysis. Repeated reading (Naeem et al., 2023). Deductive initial coding + inductive per Bingham (2023) (a priori + inductive, memoing). Codes → categories → broader themes. Cross-source comparison reveals divergence, treating contradictions as analytically significant (Dado et al., 2023). Interpretation via a cultural-studies lens, consistent with critical discourse (Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy, 2023). Themes synthesised into an inclusive sacred-tourism framework, verified via triangulation and stakeholder interpretive synthesis, not mechanical frequency count.

2.7 Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness via triangulation. Dado et al. (2023) combined reflexive journaling to reveal contradictions, boosting dependability. Member checking uses summaries for clarification (Erdmann & Potthoff, 2023). In accessible formats (Schafer & Phillippi, 2025. Community validation assesses representation of disability +

customary views, following Dickson et al. (2025) and Quang et al. (2024). Customary actors evaluate ritual credibility; PwD assess dignity. Audit trail ensures confirmability; reflexive notes document researcher influence. Results of verification remain incorporating agreement, correction, and disagreement transparently, not as a single objective truth.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations include accessible informed consent. McFarland et al. (2024) facilitative accompaniment. Gudelytė et al. (2024), enhancing agency and the right to withdraw. Identity protection measures involve the use of pseudonyms, secure storage, and data deletion upon withdrawal (Potthoff et al., 2023). Adherence to customary protocols regarding attire, photography, recording, and sacred zones is maintained. Sensitive material is handled only with authorisation from religious authorities, consistent with Indonesian ethnographic studies (Hamidah et al., 2026).

3. Results

The Taman Mumbul Inclusive Sacred Tourism Framework is a culturally grounded governance model that expands community-based management by integrating disability-responsive accessibility, accessible communication, personalised support, and participatory agency for PwD, yet without transferring sacred authority from customary institutions. It empowers *desa adat*, religious leaders, and local managers to accommodate disabled visitors while retaining full control over ritual procedures, sacred zoning, dress, conduct, and cultural interpretation with existing customary regulation of visitor access and local mediation of tourism, culture, and ritual continuity.

3.1.1 Customary Governance and Sacred-Value Protection

Customary governance constitutes the framework's normative bedrock. Rosalina et al. (2023) and Suhartana et al. (2025) substantiate that community oversight, shared infrastructure, cultural storytelling, and social capital effectively integrate diverse interests while preserving harmony. Quang et al. (2024) mandate substantive custodial involvement in sacred-site governance. Yet Riwanto et al. (2023) confirm persistent discriminatory barriers in Indonesian worship spaces. Dickson et al. (2025) advocate for authentic co-design over tokenism to incorporate lived experiences and whole-journey needs. Thus, accessibility is operationalised as a culturally negotiated right. Customary authorities retain ritual boundaries and sacred zoning, whereas people with disabilities collaborate directly in determining dignified, ritually congruent accommodations wherever unrestricted physical access is neither permitted nor viable.

3.1.2 Disability-Responsive Physical and Sensory Accessibility

The second component concerns the creation of a continuous and safe accessibility chain from pre-arrival to the completion of the ritual. Accessibility assessments should examine parking areas, entrances, ticketing points, pathways, changes in elevation, stairs, surfaces, waiting areas, changing spaces, toilets, ritual preparation areas, and access to Pancoran Solas at Taman Mumbul. The existing landscape combines gardens, traditional architecture, ritual spaces, and walking paths, requiring accessibility improvements to be carefully integrated into the cultural and ecological character of the destination. Community members expressed openness toward visitors with disabilities, although assistance was generally arranged informally, and people with disabilities had not been routinely involved in tourism decision-making. The following is an example of a tourist activity that aligns with the layout of the Taman Mumbul tourism area.

Figure 1. Tourist activities in the Taman Mumbul tourism area

(Doc. Yuli, 2025)

The image above shows that participation depended heavily on existing access routes and individual support, while visitors were required to follow customary rules concerning ritual procedures, traditional attire, and respectful conduct. Recommended adaptations include stable and non-slip pathways, ramps with appropriate gradients, handrails, resting areas, accessible sanitation facilities, designated drop-off points, safe transfer locations and unobstructed routes. For visitors with visual or sensory disabilities, the framework may include tactile orientation, high-contrast markers, adequate lighting, identifiable route boundaries, and warnings before wet or uneven areas. These interventions should use locally compatible materials and, where necessary, reversible designs so that accessibility improvements do not visually permanently alter sacred architecture.

The second component establishes a seamless, safe accessibility chain spanning pre-arrival to ritual completion. Neven & Ectors (2023) demonstrate that interconnected barriers in transport, pathways, and information amplify dependence and restrict participation. Evaluation at Taman Mumbul must thus evaluate parking, drop-offs, entrances, ticketing, pathways, stair gradients, surfaces, waiting areas, toilets, preparation zones, and access to *Pancoran Solas*. Perangin-Angin et al. (2023) reinforce that environmental barriers and provider assistance are jointly critical. Recommended physical retrofits include non-slip stable surfaces, appropriately graded ramps, handrails, and accessible sanitation, yet site-specific adaptation is paramount. Tatano & Revellini (2023) confirm that friction directly affects safety in historic contexts. For sensory disabilities, Qiao et al. (2023) mandate tactile markers, high-contrast cues, lighting, and multisensory warnings due to visually impaired travellers' reliance on sensory compensation over visual interpretation. Given Taman Mumbul's mixed gardens, traditional architecture, and sacred zones, spatial-zone analysis is necessary. Sáez-Pérez & Marín-Nicolás (2023) affirm heritage compatibility permits substantial barrier removal without improper material alteration; thus, locally compatible, minimally invasive, reversible interventions are prioritised to enhance safety without compromising the site's sacred architectural and ecological integrity.

3.1.3 Accessible Cultural and Ritual Communication

Inclusive access at Taman Mumbul demands that visitors comprehend melukat's meaning, sequence, ethical precepts, and physical demands. Chaidemenaki & Kolokytha (2025) confirm acute deficits in accessible cultural information, requiring easy-read materials, multimodal guided

activities, and trained personnel. Hutchinson & Eardley (2024) establish that sound-enriched audio descriptions enhance recall and enjoyment, while Adams (2025) validates that Deaf-led tours enrich both disabled and hearing visitors. Communication must convey appropriate attire, ritual materials, prayer sequences, photography restrictions, sacred zones, expected conduct, and tirta's religious meaning yet avoid commodifying melukat, as authenticity directly sustains spiritual well-being (Han et al., 2024). Pre-visit digital orientation via captioned videos, audio guidance, and screen-reader-compatible pages is imperative, given widespread accessibility-info deficits in visibility and correctness (Domínguez Vila & Darcy, 2025). Compliance behaviour facilitated in local government administration can be extended into a multimodal communication system that translates official and customary regulations into accessible verbal, visual, audio and digital formats (Rumtini et al., 2026). Consequently, a multimodal communication system simultaneously enables visitor understanding and upholds the interpretive authority of *awig-awig*, customary institutions, and local religious traditions.

3.1.4 Personalised Assistance and Supported Participation

A standardised yet flexible assistance system is required because people with disabilities do not constitute a homogeneous group and may have different mobility, sensory, communication, cognitive, emotional, and personal-support requirements. This issue was raised by Rimba, a tourist with a disability, in 2025 :

"...I was able to enter the Taman Mumbul area, but I was afraid to make my way to the ritual purification site. The path descends, involving stairs and some wet sections; without an escort, I was worried I might slip and be unable to reach the water spouts safely..".

While Taman Mumbul permits open physical access, genuine inclusion remains unrealised; informants emphasise the urgent need for a standardised yet flexible support system to ensure comfortable, equitable experiences. Perangin-Angin et al. (2023) confirm that physical access alone is insufficient without responsive service and a friend in tourism. Gillovic et al. (2024) establish care as a negotiated practice, cautioning that poor assistance perpetuates dependence. Tomej & Duedahl (2023) show that interpersonal dynamics can enable or constrain agency; assistance must derive from preferences. Dickson et al. (2025) mandate whole-journey co-design with PwD to move beyond tokenism and recognise agency. Devis-Rozental et al. (2026) highlight that staff attitudes determine dignity vs dehumanisation, affirming "nothing about us without us." At Taman Mumbul, informal goodwill must be formalised into an agreed protocol covering individual needs assessment, respectful communication, sighted assistance, emergency procedures, water safety, privacy, and ritual preparation. Caregivers are included upon request, yet the person with disability remains the primary participant and decision-maker, with assistance rendered solely by consent, safety imperatives, and communicated preferences.

3.1.5 Meaningful Cultural Participation

Meaningful participation at Taman Mumbul mandates active, equitable integration into melukat rather than mere distant observation. Carter et al. (2023) and Maciejewska (2023) corroborate that physical presence does not equate to inclusion; active support, belonging, and committed engagement are imperative. Kanari & Souliotou (2023) and Adams (2025) demonstrate that visual-spatial methodologies foster active creative participation, countering passive observation. Any adaptations must be authentically co-developed with PwD and sanctioned by customary authorities, consistent with Dickson et al.'s (2025) co-design mandate over tokenism. Hence, meaningful participation necessitates negotiated accommodations that safeguard dignity and agency while rigorously upholding ritual etiquette, theological integrity, customary authority, and sacred order.

3.1.6 Participatory and Representative Decision-Making

The most transformative component mandates PwD inclusion in governance, precluding design solely by managers or customary leaders. Dickson

et al. (2025) show that tokenism fails, whereas authentic co-design integrates lived experience and whole-journey needs. Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) confirm commitments require value co-creation. Lu et al. (2025) advocate power-sharing and PwD as active partners, not subjects. Gillovic et al. (2024) highlight care's negotiated practice marginalising travel. Rosalina et al. (2023) confirm Bali's customary governance preserves harmony. Thus, an inclusive working group is proposed: PwD reps lead evaluation, while customary authorities retain ritual oversight.

3.1.7 Operational Cycle of the Framework

The framework operates as a continuous participatory cycle of assessment, co-design, implementation, verification, and evaluation. The framework may be implemented through a continuous five-stage cycle :

Assessment → Co-design → Implementation → Community verification → Evaluation and revision

Assessment should systematically document barriers across physical, informational, service, policy, and attitudinal dimensions consistent with Groulx et al.'s (2024) nature-based accessibility study. Co-design should bring together customary authorities, diverse PwD, caregivers, and disability organisations to identify culturally acceptable solutions reflecting Dickson et al.'s (2025) co-design mandate "nothing about us without us". Implementation translates commitments into infrastructure, information, assistance and training, as Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) found that commitments alone fail without direct co-creation. Community and disability verification should assess compatibility, feasibility, dignity, and safety (Sáez-Pérez & Marín-Nicolás, 2023). Periodic evaluation should inform ongoing revisions, given Domínguez Vila & Darcy's (2025) finding of persistent accessibility-info deficiencies. Thus, the framework is not a one-time intervention but a dynamic, inclusive, culturally grounded governance cycle.

3.1.8 Conceptual Meaning of the Framework

The framework fundamentally repositions people with disabilities. Lu et al. (2025) and Dickson et al. (2025) both affirm that authentic inclusion demands power-sharing and lived-experience integration, operationalising "nothing about us without us" into whole-journey accessibility and responsive policy. Concurrently, the framework eschews a standardised external model, honouring Taman Mumbul's cultural specificity. Rosalina et al. (2023) confirm customary governance preserves local control and harmony via *Tri Hita Karana*. Quang et al. (2024) demonstrate that excluding custodial authority creates inequality. Han et al. (2024) establish that preserving sacred authenticity directly enhances spiritual well-being and quality of life. Collectively, these findings substantiate that disability inclusion and sacred-value protection are mutually reinforcing. Co-designed accommodations, authorised by customary custodians, culturally adapted, and periodically evaluated, concurrently strengthen dignity, spiritual meaning, social legitimacy, and cultural sustainability in sacred tourism. Conceptually, the framework may be summarised as follows: “Inclusive sacred tourism at Taman Mumbul results from the integration of accessible environments, understandable cultural communication, personalised support, and the participatory agency of people with disabilities within customary governance that protects ritual authenticity, sacred values, and community sovereignty”.

3.2 Verification of an Inclusive Sacred Tourism Framework at Taman Mumbul

Verification is qualitative, not statistical, assessing empirical relevance, cultural legitimacy, stakeholder acceptability and operational feasibility through triangulated audits, observations, interviews, documents, and customary consultation. Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) and Dickson et al. (2025) validate co-design approaches over tokenism. Sáez-Pérez & Marín-Nicolás (2023) demonstrate feasibility with heritage preservation. Quang et al. (2024) affirm custodial perspectives for legitimacy and

equity. Han et al. (2024) confirm that sacred authenticity underpins spiritual well-being; adaptations must not dilute meaning. Hence, verification ensures relevance, acceptability, feasibility, and compatibility with ritual authenticity, sacred spatial order, and community sovereignty.

3.2.1 Empirical Verification

The first verification stage confirms that the framework directly responds to field-identified barriers. Groulx et al. (2024) systematically documented interconnected physical, informational, service, policy, and attitudinal barriers restricting equitable participation. Taman Mumbul evaluation similarly reveals barriers in visitor routes, elevation changes, uneven surfaces, ritual spaces, assistance, and cultural information. Perangin-Angin et al. (2023) and Tomej & Duedahl (2023) corroborate that environmental and relational factors crucially enable or constrain agency, affirming personalised, relational assistance. Chaidemenaki & Kolokytha (2025) confirm that physical entry alone does not ensure meaningful cultural engagement due to participation deficits. Dickson et al. (2025) mandate co-design over tokenism, grounding planning in lived experience and whole-journey needs. Collectively, these findings validate the framework's four operational components as empirically grounded in observed barriers and narrated experiences, not merely general principles.

3.2.2 Cultural and Normative Verification

The second verification stage confirms proposed accessibility measures are compatible with Taman Mumbul's customary foundations. Rosalina et al. (2023) and Suhartana et al. (2025) demonstrate that Bali's customary governance enables local resource management while preserving cultural harmony. Thus, the framework does not mandate unrestricted access to all sacred areas or standardise melukat per external expectations. Quang et al. (2024) confirm that custodial authority is essential; excluding them from governance weakens heritage conservation. Basir et al. (2025) caution that external pressures can commodify sacred practices, reinforcing the need for culturally controlled adaptation. Proposed accommodations must be evaluated against *awig-awig*, ritual procedures, sacred zoning, and pemangku authority, yet Riwanto et al. (2023) emphasise that customary protection must include disability-responsive measures to address dangerous access, inadequate facilities, and discrimination in Indonesian worship spaces. Collectively, accessibility is affirmed as a culturally negotiated right. Customary institutions determine how adaptations can be introduced without altering melukat's spiritual meaning, while PwD receive safe, dignified, culturally equivalent participation opportunities.

3.2.3 Stakeholder Verification

Stakeholder verification examined the framework through multiple standpoints to ensure negotiated, complementary authority rather than dominance of any single interest. Dickson et al. (2025) confirm that authentic co-design with advocacy organisations replaces tokenistic consultation, integrating lived, whole-journey needs. Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) substantiate that organisational commitments must be validated against actual visitor experiences through value co-creation. Gillovic et al. (2024) show caregiver inclusion is critical, yet must avoid undermining autonomy. Quang et al. (2024) and Rosalina et al. (2023) confirm that religious custodial validation is essential for governance legitimacy, ritual validity, and sacred boundaries. Consequently, families assessed participation; religious actors evaluated ritual cultural appropriateness; managers assessed feasibility; advocates assessed equality. The framework was acceptable only when it simultaneously improved PwD's ability to understand and preserved customary authority. These studies provide strong methodological support, though not direct empirical verification of Taman Mumbul.

3.2.4 Verification of the Framework Components

3.2.4.1 Physical and sensory accessibility

Physical accessibility verification ensures a complete safe chain from arrival to ritual. Groulx et al. (2024) confirm that isolated facilities are

insufficient. Proposed improvements with drop-off zones, stable pathways, ramps, handrails, accessible toilets, and water-edge assistance (Tatano & Revellini, 2023). Sensory access requires high-contrast signage, lighting, and warnings (Ma et al., 2023; Chidiac et al., 2024). Cultural feasibility mandates local materials, minimal intrusion, and customary approval. Sáez-Pérez & Marín-Nicolás (2023) confirm compatibility. The objective is site-specific barrier reduction, not standardised modernisation, supported by comparative evidence.

3.2.4.2 Accessible communication

Communication verification ensures visitors understand melukat's meaning, procedures, restrictions, and safety. Chaidemenaki & Kolokytha (2025) found severe experience deficits mandating plain language, pictograms, large-print, visual sequences, verbal assistance, and digital formats. However, Iacono (2026) cautions that Easy Read evidence is uneven, requiring end-user testing. Hutchinson & Eardley (2024) validate that sound-enriched audio descriptions equalise recall and increase enjoyment. Adams (2025) confirms that digital sign-language resources extend access beyond Deaf audiences. Domínguez Vila & Darcy (2025) expose systemic accessibility-info deficits in accuracy. Content must cover tirta, dress, offerings, prayers, boundaries, conduct, restrictions, physical demands, and water safety. Verification thus confirms multimodal communication is acceptable only when it improves comprehension across diverse needs while preserving ritual terminology, religious meaning, customary authority, and participant responsibility (Han et al., 2024).

3.2.4.3 Personalised support

Verification confirms personalised support assistance is tailored to each visitor's voluntarily disclosed mobility, sensory, cognitive, emotional, and communication needs. The framework mandates that support fosters autonomy over dependency, while companions and personnel assist only upon request or as safety requires.

3.2.4.4 Cultural participation

Verification affirms meaningful participation via equitable opportunities to comprehend, prepare, communicate with temple priests, use ritual materials, pray, and engage in authorised *melukat* stages. Equivalent procedures, authorised by ritual authorities, may substitute when direct participation is unsafe or culturally restricted. Existing adaptive capacity supports disability-responsive modifications, contingent upon religious endorsement and preservation of ritual essence.

3.2.4.5 Participatory governance

The governance component verification confirms that disability perceptions can be integrated into existing decision-making without displacing customary authority. Lu et al. (2025) and Dickson et al. (2025) establish that transformative inclusion requires power-sharing, lived-experience integration, and whole-of-journey accessibility over tokenism. Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) further validate value co-creation for improving organisational commitments. At Taman Mumbul, this supports PwD participation in evaluation. Rosalina et al. (2023) and Quang et al. (2024) confirm that customary governance retains control via *Tri Hita Karana*, and custodial authority excluding custodians generates inequality. Thus, pemangku retain sacred theological trust, while disability representatives contribute experiential expertise in access. Participatory governance is structured as complementary responsibilities supported by strong comparative evidence, though not direct long-term empirical verification at Taman Mumbul.

3.2.4.6 Revision Following Verification

Verification feedback refined the framework about accessible but culturally inappropriate measures that required modification. Culturally acceptable yet non-meaningful access was reconsidered. The revised framework prioritises solutions meeting six criteria: (1) relevance to PwD experiences; (2) safety and dignity protection; (3) compatibility with sacred values; (4) feasibility within community-based management; (5) customary authority

preservation; and (6) continuous improvement capacity.

The attached report confirms Taman Mumbul's cultural actors and guides actively negotiate tourism practices to maintain quality and authenticity through actor empowerment, regulatory optimisation, partnerships, culturally based promotion, and negotiation of incompatible practices. This adaptive capacity is strongly supported by Hanita et al. (2024); Rosalina et al. (2023); and Suriyankietkaew et al. (2025). For implementation, Dickson et al. (2025) mandate place-based policies via direct participation, disability diversity, whole-of-journey perspective over tokenism. Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) confirm value co-creation and iterative evaluation operationalise commitments via user experience. Collectively, Taman Mumbul's existing capacity for empowerment, regulatory adjustment, collaboration, negotiation, and practice revision provides a credible institutional foundation for phased implementation through pilot interventions, co-design, customary confirms, monitoring, and improvement.

3.2.4.7 Verification Outcome

Verification confirms the framework is contextually relevant, culturally congruent and operationally plausible for Taman Mumbul. Its core strength is integrating accessibility as a system encompassing governance, ritual communication, assistance, participation and deliberation. Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) and Dickson et al. (2025) demonstrate that commitments require value co-creation, lived experience, and whole-journey perspectives over tokenism. Rosalina et al. (2023) confirm customary governance enables local control and *Tri Hita Karana*-grounded management. Operational feasibility is supported by Sáez-Pérez & Marín-Nicolás (2023). However, this establishes conceptual, not long-term. Lu et al. (2025) mandate attention to heterogeneity, power-sharing, and practical relevance. Thus, infrastructure, communication, assistance, and participation mechanisms must be piloted with diverse disability groups and assessed over time. The framework should operate through recurring cycles. Accessibility assessment, collaborative co-design, ritual approval, small-scale pilot, stakeholder evaluation, and evidence-based revision, yet requiring longitudinal testing in Taman Mumbul's specific spatial context.

4. Discussion

The findings fill the identified gap by demonstrating that exclusion in sacred tourism stems not solely from physical barriers but also from inaccessible cultural information, reliance on informal assistance, and underrepresentation of people with disabilities in decision-making. Groulx et al. (2024) confirm interlocking physical, informational, service, policy, and attitudinal barriers. Perangin-Angin et al. (2023) show that physical access alone is insufficient; responsive services, provider concern, and a trusted "friend in tourism" are essential for confidence and participation. Directly supporting the finding that formal entry to Taman Mumbul does not ensure independent access to wet, ritual-sensitive areas. Chaidemenaki & Kolokytha (2025) found that although physical museum accessibility was rated positively, interpretative deficits persisted: 31.4% found navigation completely inaccessible; 40% reported easy-read guides rarely available, 25.7% never; 60% visited with support workers without adapted mirroring conditions where caregivers must explain ritual sequences and *tirta* due to unavailable accessible information. Riwanto et al. (2023) document dangerous access, stigma, and discrimination in Indonesian worship spaces, advocating a human-rights-based paradigm over compassion-based approaches. Thus, goodwill cannot substitute for enforceable accessibility standards and trained assistance. Cerdan Chiscano & Darcy (2023) confirm that institutional accessibility commitments do not ensure inclusive experiences without PwD co-creation in service evaluation, supporting comparison of formal policies with lived experiences at Taman Mumbul. Dickson et al. (2025) mandate that "nothing about us without us" must contribute to evaluation, communication design, assistance protocols, training, complaints, monitoring, and evaluation.

Bali's plural governance requires institutional coordination, not external imposition (Atmaja et al., 2019; Rosalina et al., 2023; Suhartana et al., 2025). Quang et al. (2024) show that excluding custodians from governance generates inequality. Customary authorities must determine acceptable adaptations. Porya & Chowdhary (2026) demonstrate that boundaries can coexist with co-created visitor experiences. Accessible information should explain attire, offerings, prayers, sacred zones, conduct, and *melukat*'s spiritual meaning without commodification. Thus, integration requires four components: disability-responsive facilities, accessible communication, formalised assistance, and representative consultation, customary authorities retaining sacred zoning, and government support via regulation. Disability inclusion and sacred protection are not contradictory; safer routes, handrails, authorised alternative procedures, and visual sequences can increase participation without eliminating customary regulations. These ten studies provide conceptual support, yet contextual validity remains grounded in Taman Mumbul's field observation, interviews, customary consultation, and community-based evaluation.

The proposed framework, therefore, positions people with disabilities, caregivers, customary institutions, destination managers, and policymakers as collaborative actors in planning accessible sacred tourism. Its principal contribution lies in connecting disability inclusion with cultural participation and the protection of sacred values rather than treating accessibility solely as a matter of infrastructure. However, the study is limited by its qualitative and context-specific design, meaning that its findings may not represent all disability groups & sacred destinations in Bali.

5. Conclusion

The Inclusive Sacred Tourism Framework at Taman Mumbul integrates disability-responsive physical and sensory access, accessible cultural communication, personalised assistance, meaningful ritual participation, and the representative involvement of people with disabilities within a continuous cycle of assessment, co-design, implementation, community verification, and evaluation while preserving customary authority, ritual authenticity, sacred values, and community sovereignty.

The qualitative verification, conducted through triangulation, stakeholder consultation, and cultural assessment, confirmed that the framework is empirically relevant, culturally legitimate, operationally feasible, and acceptable for Taman Mumbul because it integrates disability-responsive infrastructure, accessible communication, personalised support, meaningful ritual participation, and representative governance within customary authority, although its long-term effectiveness still requires pilot implementation, periodic evaluation, and continuous revision.

This study concludes that an inclusive sacred tourism framework in Bali must integrate physical accessibility, understandable cultural information, structured assistance, meaningful participation, and community-based governance. The findings verify that inclusion cannot be achieved through community goodwill alone, because informal assistance and the absence of disability-responsive standards continue to restrict independent and meaningful participation.

Going forward, destinations should develop locally adapted accessibility guidelines, accessible communication systems, trained assistance mechanisms, and formal consultation involving disability organisations. Further research should verify the framework across multiple locations, include participants with diverse disabilities, and assess its practical effectiveness through pilot implementation and longitudinal evaluation. Customary institutions should retain authority over ritual integrity while incorporating disability perspectives into decisions concerning visitor services and cultural participation.

References

Adams, E. (2025). Accessing art and heritage through a visual-spatial language: In-person and digital British Sign Language museum tours. *Journal of Museum Education*, 1(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2024.2428515

Atmaja, G. M. W., Arniati, I. A. K., & Pradana, G. Y. K. (2019). Implications of the enactment of Law Number 6 of 2014 on the position of villages in Bali, Indonesia. *Asia Life Sciences,* 28(2), 295–310.

Basir, M., Marthen, M., & Ismail, A. (2025). Between the sacred and the market: The cultural politics of Mangngaro ritual tourism in Indonesia. *Asian Anthropology,* 24(4), 349–373. https://doi.org/10.1080/1683478X.2025.2582451

Bingham, A. J. (2023). From data management to actionable findings: A five-phase process of qualitative data analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 22(1), Article 16094069231183620. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231183620

Carter, E. W., Tuttle, M., Spann, E., Ling, C., & Jones, T. B. (2023). Addressing accessibility within the church: Perspectives of people with disabilities. *Journal of Religion and Health,* 62(4), 2474–2495. https: doi.org/10.1007/s10943022015086

Cerdan Chiscano, M., & Darcy, S. (2023). Making cultural and tourist attractions accessible and inclusive for people with disability through value co-creation amidst COVID-19: A critical discourse analysis. *Tourism Recreation Research,* 48(6), 856–870. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2023.2207152

Chaidemenaki, L., & Kolokytha, O. (2025). Whose culture is it anyway? Perceptions of accessibility in museums by professionals working with people with intellectual disabilities in Greece. *Museum Management and Curatorship,* 40(4), 494–511. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/09647775.2024.2357073

Chidiac, S. E., Reda, M. A., & Marjaba, G. E. (2024). Accessibility of the built environment for people with sensory disabilities—Review quality and representation of evidence. *Buildings,* 14(3), Article 707. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings14030707

Dado, M., Spence, J. R., & Elliot, J. (2023). The case of contradictions: How prolonged engagement, reflexive journaling, and observations can contradict qualitative methods. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 22(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231189372

Devis-Rozental, C., Buhalis, D., Bello, B. O., & Darcy, S. (2026). Reframing accessible tourism through the humanising framework. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* 38(4), 1257–1275. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2025-0632

Dickson, T. J., Darcy, S., & Schweinsberg, S. (2025). Co-designing accessible tourism with the disability community for embodied choice. *Tourism Geographies,* 27(7), 1377–1398. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2024.2423162

Domínguez Vila, T., & Darcy, S. (2025). Beyond technical website compliance: Identifying and assessing accessible tourism value chain information content on national tourism organisation websites. *Tourism Management Perspectives,* 55(1), Article 101332. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2024.101332

Domínguez Vila, T., Rubio-Escuderos, L., & Alén González, E. (2024). Accessible tourism: Using technology to increase social equality for people with disabilities. *Tourism Review,* 80(9), 1614–1634. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-11-2023-0812

Duong, M.-P. T., Lobry de Bruyn, L., Kristiansen, P., Marshall, G. R., & Wilkes, J. (2026). Community-based ecotourism and the challenges of local participation: Insights from an ecotourism venture in Cat Tien National Park, Vietnam. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management,* 69(5), 1376–1402. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2024.2428257

Erdmann, A., & Potthoff, S. (2023). Decision criteria for the ethically reflected choice of a member check method in qualitative research: A proposal for discussion. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 22(1), Article 16094069231177664. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/16094069231177664

Gedecho, E. K., & Kim, S. (2024). Exploring the spiritual well-being experiences of transnational religious festival attendees: A grounded theory approach. *Tourism Management Perspectives,* 53(1), Article 101289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2024.101289

Ghafur, A. H. S. (2024). Tourism policy impact on transforming religious traditions of Dayak: A case study of the Hudoq ceremony tradition of the Dayak Bahau tribe in tourism development, East Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Cogent Arts & Humanities,* 11(1), Article 2429938. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2429938

Giacobone, G. A., Mincolelli, G., & Imbesi, S. (2024). Inclusive cultural heritage in Europe: Co-designing an accessible user experience for digital architectural conservation. *Journal of Architectural Conservation,* 30(1), 19–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556207.2023.2296216

Gillovic, B., McIntosh, A. J., Cockburn-Wootten, C., & Darcy, S. (2024). Intellectual disability and care during travel. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 105(1), Article 103694. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2023.103694

Groulx, M., Wigglesworth, J., DeLorey, R., Harris, N., Harris, P., Lamb, H., & McBride, C. (2024). Not for all: Barriers to universal accessibility in nature-based tourism and recreation spaces across British Columbia, Canada. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism,* 47(1), Article 100772. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2024.100772

Gudelytė, U., Ruškus, J., & McCrea, K. T. (2024). "Help me to decide": A study of human rights-based supported decision making with persons with intellectual disabilities. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* 94(3), 297–310. https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000724

Hamidah, H., Martha, E., Supradewi, I., & Besral, B. (2026). Spiritual legitimacy as symbolic infrastructure in maternal health: A cross-cultural ethnography of the Akit Indigenous community in Indonesia. *SSM—Qualitative Research in Health,* 9(1), Article 100740. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmqr.2026.100740

Han, J. W., Kim, M. J., Chung, N., & Kim, J. S. (2024). The effect of the authenticity of the Catholic pilgrimage site on spiritual well-being and quality of life of pilgrims. *International Journal of Tourism Research,* 26(1), Article e2634. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2634

Hanita, M., Bangso, F. D., & Aprian, M. (2024). Beyond attraction: Unveiling Bali's cultural community's role in bolstering tourism resilience amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management,* 34(1), Article 100953. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jdmm.2024.100953

Hua, C., Cole, S., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Travel participation as an outlet for social integration of people with spinal cord injury: An explanatory sequential mixed methods study. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management,* 59(1), 332–342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2024.06.001

Hubner, I. B., Juliana, J., Lemy, D. M., Pramezwary, A., & Djakasaputra, A. (2025). Balancing growth and tradition: The potential of community-based wellness tourism in Ubud, Bali. *Tourism and Hospitality,* 6(4), Article 205. https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp6040205

Hutchinson, R., & Eardley, A. F. (2024). "I felt I was right there with them": The impact of sound-enriched audio description on experiencing and remembering artworks, for blind and sighted museum audiences. *Museum Management and Curatorship,* 39(6), 733–750. https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2023.2188482

Iacono, T. (2026). The evidence underlying guidelines for Easy Read to make written information accessible to people with intellectual disabilities. *Research and Practice in Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 1(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/23297018.2026.2654656

Jena, R. K., Botella Carrubi, D., & Currás-Móstoles, R. (2026). From tradition to transformation: Understanding the drivers of spiritual tourism as a catalyst for community-based development in India using a mixed-method analysis. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 1(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-12-2025-0419

Kanari, C., & Souliotou, A. Z. (2023). When children with disabilities "meet" artists with disabilities in a museum: A platform for creativity and cultural dialogue. *Journal of Museum Education,* 48(3), 293–305. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2022.2122666

Leahy, A., & Ferri, D. (2024). Cultivating cultural capital and transforming cultural fields: A study with arts and disability organisations in Europe. *The Sociological Review,* 72(6), 1240–1258. https://doi.org/10.1177/00380261231202879

Lu, S. E., Moyle, B. D., Yang, E. C. L., & Reid, S. (2024). Inclusion of people with disability in the tourism workforce: A critical discourse analysis of policies and plans. *Tourism Review,* 80(9), 1597–1613. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-12-2023-0887

Lu, S. E., Yang, E. C. L., Moyle, B., & Reid, S. (2025). Inclusive research in tourism: Are we enabling or disabling people with disability? *Tourism Geographies,* 27(7), 1399–1423. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2025.2546533

Lu, S. E., Yang, E. C. L., Moyle, B., & Reid, S. (2025). Inclusive research in tourism: Are we enabling or disabling people with disability? *Tourism Geographies,* 27(7), 1399–1423. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2025.2546533

Ma, Y., Mo, S., Chen, S., Xing, G., Tang, K., Zhao, J., & Guo, Z. (2023). Evaluating the effectiveness of accessibility features for roadway users with visual impairment: A case study for Nanjing, China. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour,* 97(1), 301–313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2023.07.021

Maciejewska, M. (2023). Between presence and commitment: A qualitative exploratory study of people with visual impairment in Polish religious communities. *Journal of Religion and Health,* 62(1), 1286–1304. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-022-01633-2

McFarland, B., Bryant, L., Wark, S., & Morales-Boyce, T. (2024). Adaptive interviewing for the inclusion of people with intellectual disability in qualitative research. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities,* 37(1), Article e13182. https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.13182

McIntosh, A., & Flemmer, C. (2026). Sharing experiences of co-design for accessible tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 116(1), Article 104110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2025.104110

McMahon-Panther, G., & Bornman, J. (2025). Persons with disabilities in the Christian Church: A scoping review on the impact of expressions of compassion and justice on their inclusion and participation. *Journal of Disability & Religion,* 29(1), 81–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/23312521.2024.2331461

Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A step-by-step process of thematic analysis to develop a conceptual model in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 22(1), Article 16094069231205789. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/16094069231205789

Neven, A., & Ectors, W. (2023). "I am dependent on others to get there": Mobility barriers and solutions for societal participation by persons with disabilities. *Travel Behaviour and Society,* 30(1), 302–311. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2022.10.009

Nyquist, T. E. H., Jahnsen, R. B., Bliksvær, T., Koncul, A., & Antonsen, K. M. (2025). Accessible tourism—Nature-based activities for all, needs for assistive devices and information among people with disabilities. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism,* 52(1), Article 100982. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2025.100982

Perangin-Angin, R., Tavakoli, R., & Kusumo, C. (2023). Inclusive tourism: The experiences and expectations of Indonesian wheelchair tourists in nature tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research,* 48(6), 955–968. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2023.2221092

Porya, A., & Chowdhary, N. (2026). Navigating commodification and preservation: Boundary-making for sustainable ethnic tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 28*(2), Article e70261. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/jtr.70261

Potthoff, S., Hempeler, C., Gather, J., Gieselmann, A., Vollmann, J., & Scholten, M. (2023). Research ethics in practice: An analysis of ethical issues encountered in qualitative health research with mental health service users and relatives. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy,* 26(1), 517–527. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-023-10169-5

Qiao, G., Song, H., Prideaux, B., & Huang, S. S. (2023). The "unseen" tourism: Travel experience of people with visual impairment. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 99(1), Article 103542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2023.103542

Quang, T. D., Dang, V. Q., Alang, T., & Nguyen, H. V. (2024). Can tourism enhance inclusitivity for Indigenous peoples? Cham perspectives on tourism benefit sharing at living heritage sites in Vietnam. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal,* 43(6), 959–984. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-08-2022-0243

Riwanto, A., Achmad, A., Wahyuni, S., Suryaningsih, S., & Putri, D. K. (2023). Access to places of worship for persons with disabilities in Indonesia: Law and policy completion. *Cogent Social Sciences,* 9(2), Article 2243753. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2243753

Rosalina, P. D., Dupre, K., Wang, Y., Putra, I. N. D., & Jin, X. (2023). Rural tourism resource management strategies: A case study of two tourism villages in Bali. *Tourism Management Perspectives,* 49(1), Article 101194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2023.101194

Rubio-Escuderos, L., Ullán de la Rosa, F. J., & García-Andreu, H. (2025). What is stopping the process? Analysis of obstacles to accessible tourism from a stakeholders' perspective. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management,* 36(1), Article 100879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2024.100879

Rumtini, Fauzan, A., Suwondo, T., Putra, I. K. S., Tama, I. W., Herlinawati, Sundari, K. N., Astuti, M. T., Rema, I. N., Setiawan, B., Mardiyono, & Pamungkas, O. Y. (2026). Compliance behavior with Indonesian language in local government administration: An analysis of the Rasch model. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.58256/f7ynsr76

Sáez-Pérez, M. P., & Marín-Nicolás, J. (2023). Design of a support tool to improve accessibility in heritage buildings—Application in case study for public use. *Buildings,* 13(10), Article 2491. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13102491

Sáez-Velasco, S., Merino-Orozco, A., Di Giusto-Valle, C., Mercado-Val, E., Pérez De Albéniz-Garrote, G., Delgado-Benito, V., & Medina-Gómez, B. (2025). Cultural participation as a pathway to social inclusion: A systematic review and youth perspectives on disability and engagement. *Societies,* 15(10), Article 288. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15100288

Schafer, R., & Phillippi, J. C. (2025). Updating and advancing member-checking methods: Use of video and asynchronous technology to optimize participant engagement. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 24(1), Article 16094069251315395. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251315395

Suhartana, I. K., Demmallino, E. B., Ali, M. S. S., & Lakare, H. (2025). The role of social capital of the Sanur Indigenous Community in the development of the heritage tourism industry on Sanur Beach in Bali, Indonesia. *Journal of Heritage Tourism,* 20(3), 414–429. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2024.2436520

Suhartana, I. K., Demmallino, E. B., Ali, M. S. S., & Lakare, H. (2025). The role of social capital of the Sanur Indigenous Community in the development of the heritage tourism industry on Sanur Beach in Bali, Indonesia. *Journal of Heritage Tourism,* 20(3), 414–429. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2024.2436520

Suriyankietkaew, S., Krittayaruangroj, K., Thinthan, S., & Lumlongrut, S. (2025). Creative tourism as a driver for sustainable development: A model for advancing SDGs through community-based tourism and environmental stewardship. *Environmental and Sustainability Indicators,* 27(1), Article 100828. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indic.2025.100828

Syafrini, D., Amelia, L., Sasmita, S., Susilawati, N., Permata, B. D., Saputri, F., Yolanda, M. N., & Sari, M. D. (2026). Transforming traditional villages into cultural heritage tourism destinations: Insights from the Minangkabau community in Indonesia. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open,* 13(1), Article 102475. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102475

Tan, N. Q., Ubukata, F., Dinh, N. C., & Ha, V. H. (2024). Rethinking community-based tourism initiatives through community development lens: A case study in Vietnam. *Community Development, 55*(5), 754–774. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2024.2344218

Tatano, V., & Revellini, R. (2023). An alternative system to improve accessibility for wheelchair users: The stepped ramp. *Applied Ergonomics,* 108(1), Article 103938. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2022.103938

Teixeira, P., Teixeira, L., Silva, S., & Eusébio, C. (2025). Technology-based approaches for accessible tourism: Using personas to understand stakeholders' characteristics and motivations. *Data and Information Management,* 9(4), Article 100095. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dim.2025.100095

Tomej, K., & Duedahl, E. (2023). Engendering collaborative accessibility through tourism: From barriers to bridges. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 99(1), Article 103528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2023.103528

Woodruff, A. (2023). Creating visitor-centered museum experiences for adults with developmental disabilities: A collaborative story. *Studies in Art Education,* 64(3), 359–378. https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2023.2220102

Wutich, A., Beresford, M., & Bernard, H. R. (2024). Sample sizes for 10 types of qualitative data analysis: An integrative review, empirical guidance, and next steps. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 23(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241296206

Yusuf, M., Aji, K. B., & Raharjana, D. T. (2025). Cultural capital and sustainable tourism in the Kei Islands: The role of tradition in island tourism development. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change,* 23(4), 319–344. https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2025.2515412

7. Acknowledgements

We wish to extend our profound gratitude to the Indonesian Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology and to the Rector of the International Institute of Tourism and Business (IPBI) for their instrumental collaboration in facilitating the fieldwork conducted at Taman Mumbul.

8. Author Declaration

We, the undersigned authors of the article entitled "Advancing Inclusive Sacred Tourism for People with Disabilities through Accessibility, Cultural Participation, and Community Governance at Taman Mumbul, Bali," hereby affirm that this manuscript is our original work, has not been previously published, and is not currently under review for publication in any other journal or medium. All sources of data, theories, and citations utilised have been duly referenced and cited in accordance with prevailing academic standards. This research was conducted in full compliance with established ethical research protocols, including the acquisition of accessible informed consent, the protection of participant identities, and respect for the customary and religious norms observed at the research site, namely Taman Mumbul, Sangeh, Badung, Bali. We further declare that no conflicts of interest have influenced the research process or the preparation of this manuscript.