Consuming history in a political context: Motivations of Turkish visitors of the Gallipoli Battlefields

Ulvi Cenap Topçu
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, ulvicenap@gmail.com

Recommended Citation

Corresponding Author

Ulvi Cenap Topçu, Faculty of Political Sciences, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey

Revisions

Consuming History in a Political Context: Motivations of Turkish Visitors of the Gallipoli Battlefields

Ulvi Cenap Topçu

Faculty of Political Sciences
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey
ulvicenap@gmail.com

Abstract

Certain unconventional tourism activities such as visiting battlefields, old prisons, or crash sites encompass *dark tourism* and have become the focus of scholarly pursuit. The term was established in relation to the Gallipoli Battlefields; which has been examined mostly in the context of its importance to Australian and New Zealander national identities. As represented by numerous memorials and well-established historical narration, the Battle in Gallipoli is credited as one of the most important representations of Turkish nationality. This research aims to investigate the motivations of Turkish visitors to Gallipoli in terms of consumption experiences and to clarify empirically motivations of Turkish visitors to Gallipoli. An explorative questionnaire was directed to respondents via e-mail, and analyses were conducted with 236 valid forms. Data supports that rather than personal motivation, visiting Gallipoli reflects politically constructed meanings for Turkish visitors. Gallipoli narration is therefore eligibly expounded as national rhetoric and motivations for visiting the site are compatible with group consumption behavior.

Keywords: dark tourism, battlefield tourism, group consumption, political narration, consumer experience

Introduction

Visitors' interests in tombs of pharaohs, the Waterloo battlefield, the several tombs of the poet Yunus Emre in several towns in Turkey, and many other places are being examined to make explicit of a particular tourism type, often named *dark tourism*. Dark tourism is defined as travelling to sites associated with "death, disaster, and depravity" by Lennon and Foley (1999, p. 46). These destinations are rarely perceived by the visitor as death-related places as per a unique rationale. Because these places are observed from different perspectives, the motivations of *dark visitors* are widely disputed and the classifications span the following range: tourism or a cultural activity; an expression of interest in or fear towards death; a personally significant individual experience; a social cohesion tool; and so on. The phenomenon invites scholars to abandon the tendency to form a universal interpretation, whereas commonalities, such as a relationship with death, identity, or spiritualism evokes common explanations.

Many people spend time and money visiting historical battlefields like Gallipoli. Motivations of long-time visitors of the Gallipoli battle zone of the first World War have been examined and reflect an interest in battlefield tourism among different scholars (Cheal & Griffin, 2013; Çakar,

2020; Hall & Basarin, 2009; Hannaford & Newton, 2008; Hyde & Harman, 2011; Slade, 2003; Yeşildağ & Atay, 2011). Though, Yeşildağ and Atay (2011) state not much research has been conducted to understand the motivations of Turkish visitors to Gallipoli. Slade (2003) questions the pertinence of the dark tourism explanations in the literature when dealing with Gallipoli visits. Australians and New Zealanders, who feel that their identity roots in Gallipoli soil, have been referred to as *secular pilgrims* by Hannaford and Newton (2008). This explanation seems to be accurate within the context as pilgrimage itself is related to the "organization of group activities and social life" (Turner, 1973, p. 192) as in constructing an identity to answer the question of *Who am I?*. Also for the Turkish people, Gallipoli possesses longstanding value which is politically constructed and is often referred to as the *foreword* of the war of independence and a symbol of the integrity of the Turkish nation (Ziino, 2012). Does that mean the Turkish visitors find their roots in Gallipoli? And if so, does it manifest itself in the same way? Based on this line of inquiry, this study aims to scrutinize motivations of the Turkish visitors to Gallipoli and to investigate further aspects in terms of consumption.

The Çanakkale Battles

In the First World War, the allied forces opened a front in Çanakkale to pass through the Dardanelles to eliminate Ottoman Empire by capturing Istanbul, thereby opening a route to Russia to come to its aid and to attack Germany from the east. For Ottomans, the front had critical consequences, as a failure could mean an early defeat (Esenkaya, 2008). Allies started by bombarding the peninsula from the Aegean Sea in February 1915, trying to reduce land defenses to pass through the strait. After the failure in the strait on March 18th, amphibious landings started in April in an attempt to occupy Gallipoli Peninsula. Landing forces included the British, the French, and the ANZAC's (the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps). The casualties were staggering for both sides; five hundred thousand soldiers were either killed or wounded (Adams, 2015; Türkmen et al., 2007). The dubious rationale for the battle and the grief felt for lost comrades and family members played an important role in creating identities for both Australians and New Zealanders. Their grandchildren continue to visit Gallipoli, and it has turned into a *secular pilgrimage* whereby they honor their past (Hannaford & Newton, 2008; Hyde & Harman, 2011). Yet on the Turkish side, through the epic narration of the event over time in the form of poems, ceremonies, and public investment, the battle has become a symbol of national unity, not only by inviting Turkish citizens to the peninsula but also by conveying the spirit derived from it (Baykut, 2016).

Before the war was over, the governing Ittihat and Terakki (Union and Progress) Party put forth an effort to glorify Çanakkale *epos* to mobilize people behind the banner of a decadent empire. Hence, publications such as *Harb Mecmuası* (the War Journal) were issued to reflect the heroism displayed in Gallipoli, to dignify the polity, and to mask various military defeats and growing unrest in the country (Esenkaya, 2003; Ulu, 2012). Despite the defeat in the Great War, the Çanakkale victory was still important because it represents a costly but mighty success. During the capitulation of the Ottoman Empire, nationalists opposed and rebelled in Anatolia. Mustafa Kemal, leader of the rebellion, gained strength and the people's trust through his remarkable success and fame gained from Gallipoli, thus he led the foundation of Republic of Turkey in Anatolia (Esenkaya, 2008). The Çanakkale discourse continued to provide a ground for politics because of the convenient public interest surrounding it (Baykut, 2016). Cemeteries, sites of martyrdom, and monuments were erected continuously in the last century (Türkmen et al., 2007),

because keeping the memory of the battles alive was always essential in a social context. The first cemeteries in Gallipoli were built just before the end of the War. In the following years, monuments and cemeteries were built and commemoration events were organized. Both Australian and Turkish authorities showed their willingness to cherish the memory of the Çanakkale Battles (Ziino, 2006). A memorial site in Seddülbahir was built in 1939 for the first martyrs of the first bombardment. A huge monument for Turkish martyrs, The Çanakkale Martyrs Memorial, was dedicated at the edge of the peninsula in 1960 (Türkmen et al., 2007). The number of visitors in Gallipoli increased in 1950s, and the site became even more popular in 1970s due to memorial services. In 1973, the area was announced as a national park (Yeşildağ & Atay, 2011). In 1983, the Ministry of Culture of Turkey authorized the historical preservation of the area; and in 1997, the area entered the United Nation's Protected Areas List. In 2014, the official status of the area was changed from national park to historical site to provide even more opportunity for utilization of the area (Baykut, 2016). The university in the province was named after the sea victory on March 18th (Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University) and every year, official ceremonies are held on March 18th in Çanakkale and all over Turkey. Furthermore, on April 25th, at dawn in the ANZAC Cove, the landing site, and in Australia and New Zealand, the battle is commemorated.

Nourishing the Çanakkale Legend

Glassberg (1996) notes that investing in education to train historians to work in museums, archives, history preservation, and public policy positions, keeps public memory alive. A common memory is one of the pillars of a society, thereby forming an organization towards common targets. In this sense, a common memorial on a battlefield signifies not only paying respects to those who sacrificed their lives for the sake of the nation, but also forming a political agenda oriented towards future expectations. These expectations may vary from forming a peaceful society to mobilizing a political campaign, because a society focused on common aims has conceivably more possibility to be effective on spending energy to meet its goals. Therefore, public experiences of togetherness, in terms of feeling, remembering, or mourning serve in favor of political unity. From this point-of-view, both ANZAC and Turkish commemorations in Gallipoli have constructed political content, leading to a distinction in terming what the *dark tourism* concept aims to implicate. According to Mionel (2019), dark tourism makes the most sense when it is aligned with symbolic content rather than *real death*. Moreover, Jaziri (2019) stresses behavioral aspects of the phenomenon by giving importance to consumption behavior behind it. Therefore, the pilgrimage interpretation (Hannaford & Newton, 2008; Hyde & Harman, 2011), and objections to the death-oriented dark tourism explanations (Cheal & Griffin, 2013; Slade, 2003) also have theoretical bases in terms of the common motivations behind the commemorations of Gallipoli.

Instrumentation of the Çanakkale Battles began a few months after the victory with commemorations (Şakul, 2016) and a government-financed journal, the Harb Mecmuası (Ulu, 2012), which aimed to unify the troubled Ottoman society and maintain support for the government while depicting a fresh Ottoman glory and a solid controlling power. For example, in the first issue, success in Çanakkale was framed within a political discourse: After swiftly honoring Sultan Mehmed the 5th as commander in chief, Enver Paşa, commander and Minister of War, was presented several times on the Gallipoli front, accompanied by glorious commanders from the Çanakkale Battles (Esenkaya, 2003). Not by being expressed in a publically financed journal, but by gaining appreciation for his success in Gallipoli, Mustafa Kemal's leadership in the Anatolian revolt was to be also framed by the Gallipoli myth, powered by the Gallipoli spirit (Esenkaya,

2008). The *Çanakkale Spirit* is still considerably popular in Turkey's politics, and summoned on many occasions, such as security alerts and football games. In political debates, remembering the unity in the Çanakkale Battles is a shortcut to bridge differences. As for contemporary discourse of the Çanakkale Battles in Turkey, Şakul (2016) remarks that it surfaced in the message sent by a police chief to his men, congratulating them for "repeating the Çanakkale epic" (p. 181) after rigidly suppressing protests. The spirit apparently has an emotional impact on people, legitimizing actions before the public.

Next to the Çanakkale Martyrs Memorial, a symbolic monument of martyrdom was erected in 2007 with glass tombstones listing the hometowns of the martyrs, proving not only from different cities of Turkey, but also from its periphery, from Gaza to Kirkuk, that many spilled their blood on the front. The range of the martyrs' hometowns glorifies greatness of the nation, supporting the narration of the unifying spirit (Baykut, 2016). This emphasis has been valid in the Turkish international affairs paradigm, prioritizing "prosperity, stability and security in a neighborhood which spans the Balkans, the Caucasus and the Caspian basin, the Black Sea, the Eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East, from the Gulf to North Africa" as a "vantage point" (Davutoğlu, 2009, p. 12). Every actor in Turkey has a Çanakkale story to tell when any sort of mobilization is required. In political campaigns, candidates use the *spirit* rhetoric, and are filmed praying before the same symbolic glass tombstones in TV ads, or starting their campaigns in the region by glorifying the epic history of Gallipoli. The spirit, therefore, serves as political common ground in Turkish politics when communicating with the nation. Nonetheless, political groups claim their own variant narration of the battle (Şakul, 2016), and not surprisingly, large numbers of buses hired by several institutions carry visitors from all over Turkey to attend a place offering a sense of community and social cohesion.

A Dark Tourism Destination: Gallipoli

Among the terms used in the literature, dark tourism, thana-tourism, or secular pilgrimage describe the motivations of visitors to sites of battle, disaster, or grief. The term *dark tourism* was put forward by Lennon and Foley (1999) and described as the experience of travelling to sites associated to death, suffering, or disasters. A term like *thana-tourism* is deemed to be variances of dark tourism, differing in feeling, place, or type (Ivanova & Light, 2018; Mionel, 2019; Strange & Kempa, 2003). Secular pilgrimage is a term used for ANZAC visitors to Gallipoli concerning their personal quest for identity (Hyde & Harman, 2011). Since the imputed importance of death, disaster, and suffering varies by time and the agent, broadness in range is implicit in the definition. Consumption of the *dark leisure*, then, validly reflects psychological, social, and instinctual aspects of mankind, susceptible to extraneous traits.

Tourism consumption is known to be *socially influenced* and *culturally framed*, yet dark tourism, as in visiting places related to death, disasters, tragedies, or buying souvenirs from an atrocity museum is not adequately explained (Light, 2017; Stone, 2005; 2006). Some dark-tourist experiences are identified as curiosity about death or being related to psychological perspectives (Seaton, 1996). Some are mentioned as "consuming death and suffering in touristic form, seemingly in the guise of education and/or entertainment" (Stone, 2006, p. 111). Vouching for the psychological accounts of serene curiosity in mortality, dark tourism represents a broad segment of the tourism market (Smith, 1998). Interest in death is exemplified with cheering for gladiator fights during the Roman era and public executions as a thrilling entertainment source (Stone &

Sharpley, 2008). This sort of tourism is associated with five categories by Seaton (1996), laying weight on thana-tourism and mankind's fixation on death. Starting from the strongest expression of death as a spectacle, such as watching an accident or visiting a public execution *show* as part of a crowd of spectators are possibly the most devastating forms of tourism by which it is easier to detect mortal curiosity. Visiting a place where death had occurred, monuments of such events or prisons follow in intensity, and finally, exhibitions of proofs, as in museum specimens, are categorized as forms and elements of dark tourism from this perspective. These categories do not give any insight into why visitors demand to purchase the experience of having contact death. Referring Berger's (1967) and Giddens' (1991) interpretations of the modern human's dealing with life in face of death, Stone and Sharpley (2008) addresses a *sort of commitment* in the social context to confront mortality. From this point of view, the *noteworthy death* the dark tourist leans towards (Tarlow, 2005) is created and interpreted by the consumer as it is required. Beyond its assumed relationship with the dead, consuming death plays a contemporary psychological role in visitors' lives. Nevertheless, this paper deals with death relevance as a given aspect as consumers of dark tourism sites have relatively different engagements with their experiences (Ivanova & Light, 2018), notably in terms of the Gallipoli experience.

For Seaton (1999), the categories mentioned can be traced back to the visiting of the Waterloo. But not all scholars agree that the human's relationship with the death can properly explain visits to battlefields. Slade (2003) stresses the difference of visitor motivations of Waterloo from Britain to those of the Gallipoli visitors from Australia and New Zealand. Bearing on several different nations, the battle in Waterloo seems to mean not much more than an attraction for someone who is interested in history, battles, or mortality. The narration presented in Waterloo loses its bond to British identity (Seaton, 1999). Nevertheless, each year thousands continue to visit Waterloo to witness the evident decline of a dominant force in Europe. Since national identities of both Australians and New Zealanders are strongly associated with Gallipoli (Haltof, 2004), the difference in motivations is inevitable.

Hall and Basarin (2009) stress the importance of the Gallipoli campaign in building national identities in Australia, asserting that "Most Australian towns, villages and hamlets had sons buried in Gallipoli" (para. 17). The experience of having sons fighting thousands of kilometers away had created a collective challenge, and the legendary heroism and friendship of the ANZAC troops, framed this historical experience as rhetoric for nationalism. Beyond abstract representations of bravery and sadness, MacCannell (1989) illuminates the remote representation of objects to import the myth right into daily life, as on naming places after the Gallipoli Campaign in New Zealand as reminders. Such reminders and commemorations serve social cohesion and political content (Glassberg, 1996) on either side.

Discussion of Dark Tourism Consumption

Due to the variety of the emotional and social characteristics and experiences of people, determining touristic motivations is considerably difficult (Dann, 1981). Scholars nonetheless attempt to render tourism consumption comprehensible. Namely, the pull-push dichotomy is found useful to explain tourism consumption motivations, with knowledge and belief originated concepts as the pull factors and feeling and instinct-originated concepts push factors (Gnoth, 1997). Research shows a clear resemblance in related aspects of tourist motivations. Self-constructing or self-enhancing motivations were noted for push, and showing interest in history and culture is

noted as pull factors in the studies (Oh et al., 1995; Sangpikul, 2008). Therefore, it is possible to specify consumption of structured commemorations of historical, cultural, or national phenomenon as cognitive, and mourning for a family member, seeking meaning of life or self as the emotional aspects of dark tourism. In this context, Sharpley (2012) points to duty or obligation, and emotions and life are prominent in Hyde and Harman's (2011) work. From this point-of-view, dark tourism literature offers both aspects mentioned while Çakar (2020) illuminates motivations of visitors of Gallipoli with pull-push dichotomy by this means.

According to Rui et al., (2020), dark tourism is the symbolic consumption of historic forces and nationalistic ideologies. In the consumption process, this agenda reconstructs itself via implicit communication; thus, the individual *converts* tacit knowledge obtained from another to their own use (Jaziri, 2019). Having pursued the external reality, the consumer undertakes a favorable social identity (Demirtaş, 2003) and expects acknowledgement (Cheal& Griffin, 2013; Hyde & Harman, 2011; Light, 2017). This process materializes via constructed experiences, in which the consumer is expected to keep up with the *band-wagon* behaviors. In other words, consumption may lead the individual to constantly encounter a repertoire of *learned* and *conceived* choices (Gnoth, 1997). As in the rhetorical dimension of consumption (Jaziri, 2019), the consuming of commemorations within dark tourism gives the individual opportunity to exercise a set of meanings. Concordantly, emotional aspects in the secular pilgrimage description for Gallipoli visitors from Australia, such as seeking memoir of family members, appear to accord with the physical dimension. Within this framework, bringing the experience into service for practical reasons is considered to be the praxeological dimension of consumption. Therefore, both the pull-push dichotomy and the dimensions of consumption experience promise relevance in terms of understanding motivations of Gallipoli visitors. Consumption of Gallipoli experience is multidimensional and open to be examined from different viewpoints. Thusly, in this study, Turkish Gallipoli visitors' motivations are examined in terms of political content and resemblance with ANZAC pilgrimage through the listed inquiries.

Inquiry1. Motivations of Turkish Visitors of Gallipoli

Sharpley (2009) states that dark tourists seek four main assets: (a) social meaning, (b) shared mourning, (c) status, and (d) integration, which are supplied by the Gallipoli narration with its heroic narrative and eminence. The narration of the war provides a foundation for both social meaning and mourning when one identifies as an upstanding member of the society. Despite the fact that Sharpley's classification claims of an implicit understanding towards the relation to death, battlefield tourism is conceivably richer in motivations, meanings, and experiences as compared to other forms of dark tourism (Winter, 2011). A dark tourism site is expected to encapsulate spontaneity to prevent any fake perception and ideological resources, to construct a myth by which social cohesion is forged. This leads to the reviving and (re)writing of history, the construction of an educational program, and economical aims (Stone, 2006). Thus, dark tourism is consumed via cultural patterns revealed with a range of interests and meanings motivating the consumption of the rhetoric.

Yeşildağ and Atay (2011) identified the main reasons for Turkish visitors in Gallipoli as understanding, gratitude for sacrifice, respect paid to the soldiers, and remembrance of the martyrs. Having a relative who fought or was buried in Gallipoli has the lowest mean scores in their study. They indicated that social motivations related to social meanings are crucial for Turkish visitors.

Taking into consideration the meanings attached to Gallipoli, Turkish motivations for visiting Gallipoli were examined for a range including nationalistic, historic, kin-related, death and life related, and leisure perspectives.

Inquiry2. Resemblance of ANZAC Pilgrimage and Turkish Visits to Gallipoli

National bonds and personal commitment can alter the meaning of an event. Watching horse races, a purely leisure activity, is mentioned to be a pilgrimage-like-event in Australia by Cusack and Digance (2009), and as such, an important part of the Australian identity. The individual self-constructs by obtaining symbolic content (Belk, 1988) and cultural patterns supply the symbolic content with which the consumer interacts to reflect an identity (Kassarjian, 1971). Consumption reflects individual and affiliation functioning in two ways. Dark tourism, then, can be both served and requested by the individual as an affiliation tool, and even opens itself to interpretations like an esoteric initiation ritual since group membership, pilgrimage, and product commitment function similarly. While the individual faces depictions of relics to be comprehended, experienced, and justified, within the context of economic and political processes, the *spectrum of pilgrimage* widened and can be considered a means by which one can "seek meaning, support, comfort and healing in collectivity, in places of shared spirituality or shared suffering" (Margry, 2008, p. 37). In this sense, the *Gallipoli pilgrimage* is a self-constructing quest inviting individuals to participate in reproducing patriotic and spiritual meanings of the rhetorical dimension of the experience.

Hall and Basarin (2009) traced the motivations of Australians heading to Gallipoli and compiled categories: mourning, affirmation, accompanying, external influences, and battlefield attraction. Hannaford and Newton (2008) used the term *secular pilgrim* for dark tourists in Gallipoli, thereby facing an ideologically constructed and individually sought experience, meaning that cultural heritage sites or memorials for musicians, sport clubs, political entities are possible courses (Hyde & Harman, 2011). The term is used to refer a *personal journey* (Margry, 2008) as observations of Australian and New Zealanders revealed the feeling of life changing experiences which are found to be motivated by spiritual, national, family, friendship, and travel intentions in the research conducted by Hyde and Harman (2011). Cheal and Griffin (2013) documented proof for a search for meaning and shared mourning and remembrance, yet much less was observed for a curiosity about death. Mentioned research was conducted on Australian and New Zealander visitors of Gallipoli. In Yeşildağ and Atay's (2011) research on Turkish visitors, *family-relatedness* and *pilgrimage* were significantly lower, yet item design was different than Hyde and Harman's (2011) study. Therefore, this study aims to consider more resemblances and differences of Turkish motivations.

Inquiry3. Political Content Behind Motivations of Turkish Gallipoli Visits

Yeşildağ and Atay (2011) depicted that Turkish visitors primarily place importance on *understanding* the Çanakkale Battles, showing gratitude to those who sacrificed themselves, paying respects, and remembering the martyrs. The term understanding is used consciously to refer to the assertion by Glassberg (1996), which conjures up a politically-motivated framework. It also alludes to the praxeological and rhetoric dimensions of consumption (Jaziri, 2019) by serving the consumer the experience of social fraternity. Concerning that direct kinship and identity relations are not as strong as ANZAC heritors, it is possible to argue that Turkish memories are more

formally structured than those of the Australian and New Zealander visitors. Therefore, Turkish motivations are expected to be politically framed and constructed.

Inquiry4. Leisure Expectations of Turkish Gallipoli Visits

Çanakkale Province is in the north-west of Turkey where the Dardanelles divides European and Asian soil and connects Aegean and Marmara Seas. The Gallipoli Peninsula is by the north of the strait on the European continent. Despite its pleasant nature and beaches, it is not well- populated due to restrictions. The province has two popular islands, Gökçeada and Bozcaada, and remains a cultural heritage site of ancient civilizations (Yıldırım et al., 2008) offering historical assets back to Greek mythology, like the Illiad, the Odyssey and the Trojan War (Duran et al., 2014). The ancient cities of Troia and Assos, Mount Ida, and many recreational areas are accessible from the province center, Çanakkale. The area presents important and valuable tourism opportunities (Çakıcı et al., 2007). In contrast to Cheal and Griffin (2013), Hyde and Harman (2011) revealed the travel motivation for visitors of Gallipoli. Therefore, this study aims to investigate leisure interests of Turkish visitors concerning the opportunities offered around the site.

Methods

To ground the study with quantitative data, an item structure was designed by adopting the aforementioned research and their findings (Hyde & Harman, 2011; Yeşildağ & Atay, 2011), and additional questions were developed to analyze the data. The target is to understand the details of Turkish visitors' motivations to visit Gallipoli and discern the differences or similarities with the ANZAC travelers. For this purpose, a questionnaire was created and distributed online via e-mail to approximately fifteen thousand e-mail addresses retrieved from web-sites of municipalities, associations, business organizations, political party offices, and universities in İstanbul. Because the political agenda in Turkey was mostly *lively* in 2017, data collection process was more difficult than it was for other research topics. Despite a direct explanation about the aim of the questionnaire, the purpose of the survey was often questioned. It ended up with a low return rate of 1.5% and 236 respondents filled out the form.

Demographics

The last block of the questionnaire intended to reveal demographics as in Table 1. The sample consisted of 130 female (55.1%) and 104 male (44.1%) respondents. Age dispersion was $n = 32$ under 25 years old (13.6%), $n = 84$ between 25 and 34 (35.6%), $n = 69$ between 35 and 44 (29.3%), $n = 27$ between 45 and 54 (11.4%), and $n = 23$ over 55 years old (9.7%). Responses to monthly income were $n = 33$ less than 2000 Turkish Liras, $n = 110$ (14.2%) between 2000 and 3999, $n = 46$ between 4000-5999 (19.5%), and $n = 23$ more than 6000 Turkish Liras. The last question in this block was asked to reveal respondents' *kin-relatedness* ($n = 94$) and was formed by merging *having a relative fought in Gallipoli* ($n = 47$), *a family member as police officer* ($n = 36$), *in military* ($n = 8$), or *martyred* ($n = 3$). The first block of the questionnaire asked whether the respondents had visited the Gallipoli remembrance site. More than 28% responded *once* ($n = 68$) and 39.8% marked *more than once* ($n = 94$). In the following question, more than 72% of all respondents scored importance of their visit as 8, 9, or 10 out of 10.

Table 1. Demographic Data

Gender	Freq.	%	Age	Freq.	%
Male	104	44.1	below 25	32	13.6
Female	130	55.1	25-35	84	35.6
Missing	2	0.8	36-45	69	29.2
Having visited Gallipoli			46-55	27	11.4
None	74	31.4	over 55	23	9.7
Once	68	28.8	Missing	1	0.4
More than once	94	39.8	**Monthly Income (₺)**		
Missing	0	0	less than 2000	33	14.0
			2000-3999	110	46.6
Kin-relatedness			4000-5999	46	19.5
Kin-related	94	39.8	6000-7999	20	8.5
Not kin-related	126	53.4	more than 8000	23	9.7
Missing	16	6.8	Missing	4	1.7

Reviving of Gallipoli

The second block was about *reviving of Gallipoli* to current perceptions of the country and national well-being. Four items were scored over six: (Item 4) necessity of the children to visit and learn about the Çanakkale Battles ($\bar{x}$ = 5.18), (Item 3) the need to unify today as done in the time of the Çanakkale Battles ($\bar{x}$ = 4.97), (Item 1) key importance for foundation of Turkey ($\bar{x}$ = 4.94), (Item 2) future is dependent on sustaining the Çanakkale spirit ($\bar{x}$ = 4.71); total reviving mean score is $\bar{X}$ = 4.89. The data affirmed that the reflection of the battle, as a sacrifice and reminder of unity, rests within contemporary identification of the social cohesion. Comparison of gender, age, monthly income, and kin-relatedness were not found to be significant.

Information Sources

In the next question, respondents were asked *to what extent have you learned the Çanakkale Battles from the listed information sources s*uch as TV/newspaper/news, books, journals, documentaries, movies, art, internet, school, tourism leaflets, and conferences. Table 2 reveals that books ($\bar{x}$ = 4.42), documentaries ($\bar{x}$ = 4.59), and school ($\bar{x}$ = 4.23) scored higher. Also, touristic guides or leaflets were found to be valued information sources by respondents who had visited Gallipoli (F = 12.07, p < .05). The results confirmed the assumption that Turkish Gallipoli perception is formally structured, and respondents are more loyal to formal sources.

Table 2. Information Sources

Source	N	M	SD
TV/newspaper/news	236	2.70	2.065
Books	236	4.42	1.932
Magazine	197	2.60	1.983
Documentary	222	4.59	1.580
Cinema	207	3.24	1.943
Art	197	2.59	1.956
Internet	209	3.89	1.944
School	220	4.23	1.817
Guide/Leaflet	203	2.32	1.968

Factor Analysis

In the next question, 27 motivation items, adopted from the scale used by Hyde and Harman (2011) and rewritten concerning findings in Yeşildağ and Atay (2011), were presented to respondents in a 7-point Likert form. The respondents were asked *to what extent would you rate these reasons to visit Gallipoli?* to determine motivations. To simplify the factor structure (Akhtar-Danesh, 2017), quartimax rotation was used. Differing from Hyde and Harman (2011), the analysis revealed five components as named in Table 3: (a) national history motive, (b) leisure motive, (c) spiritual motive, (d) life motive, and (e) family motive. One item loading leisure motive: *Since everyone thinks it is something to be done* was deleted due to low factor loading and the model was thereby confirmed.

Table 3. Component Matrix

Factor/Statement	M	α	% of Var.	Factor Loadings				
				1	2	3	4	5
1. National History Motive	5.01	.935	33.182					
To honor our ancestors who fought in the war				0.844				
Since I am proud of my country				0.611				
To celebrate Çanakkale Victory in the actual place				0.739				
Since it is one of the main values in our motherland				0.831				
Since Çanakkale Spirit is a main pillar of Turkey				0.886				
Since Çanakkale Victory is a bond between past and the country				0.749				
To learn an important battlefield in the actual place				0.834				
To get information about an important front of the First World War				0.818				
To see important monuments and cemeteries				0.815				
To get information about a particular person				0.819				
2. Leisure Motive	1.33	.907	21.29					
To travel north of Aegean shores					0.779			
Since it is part of a tour/route					0.886			
To spend time with friends					0.924			
To meet new people					0.892			
Since everyone thinks it is something to be done					*0.553*			
To say that I saw Gallipoli					0.764			
Since my friends organized it					0.808			
3. Spiritual Motive	3.53	.858	7.14					
To see this holy land						0.733		
Since it is a spiritual journey for me						0.725		
Since it is something I always wanted to						0.656		
To know myself better						0.551		
4. Life Motive	4.47	.621	5.52					
To understand value of life							0.609	
Since it is about thousands of people losing their lives							0.728	
Since I give value to surviving struggle of people on the front							0.657	
5. Family Motive	1.14	.766	4.27					
Since it is a family duty								0.531
To remember a family member								0.624
To represent my family								0.598

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Adequacy		.886
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4116.44
	df	351
	Sig.	.000

Tests by Demographics

The model was tested by mean values of the named components and compared for demographic characteristics of the respondents. Independent samples *t*-tests and ANOVA tests presented significantly in some group relations of the motives. National history motive was found significantly higher for female respondents ($t = -2.539$, $p < .05$) and lower for respondents who did not visit Gallipoli memorials beforehand ($F = 5.47$, $p < .05$). This result may be interpreted as supporting the idea that visiting the memorials, reading monument text, and physically experiencing a tour in a preserved legendary peninsula full of martyrs and cemeteries had an effect on the respondents. They were more engaged into the narration, thus felt more nationalistic and historically interested.

Relative to the leisure motive, respondents younger than 25 years old were found to have significantly more mean scores than older respondents ($F = 4.162$, $MD = 1.21$, $p < .05$). Also, respondents who had the least monthly income were found to have significantly more leisure motive mean scores than those earning the most in the sample ($F = 4.335$, $MD = 1.41$, $p < .05$). That is, younger and lower income respondents were more eager to associate visiting the memorial with leisure. Spiritual motive was found significantly higher for female respondents ($t = -2.266$, $p < .05$) and kin-related respondents ($t = -2.051$, $p < .05$). The tests did not reveal any significant result for family motive for kin-related respondents, but female respondents were clearly more reflective of national historic, spiritual, and life motives, implying that pilgrimage concept was observed more among them.

Test for Correlation of Reviving of Gallipoli and Derived Motives

To examine component structure, correlations between components and reviving of Gallipoli were also investigated. Table 4 shows the respondents' reflections of Gallipoli feelings related to current affairs is significantly correlated to national history, spiritual, and life motives. It may be inferred that, by having an effect on today's minds, Tarlow's (2005) definition of dark tourism is observed in three components. They give importance to learning what happened in Gallipoli and to relating the Gallipoli experiences to their lives.

Concerning the factor analysis, mean comparison and reviving of Gallipoli correlation results, leisure motive, and family motive components were not found to be significant motivators. Different from Hyde and Harman's (2011) findings concerning the Australian and New Zealander sample, personal relations due to range of travel, both mental and spatial, identity, and kinship were not a basis of impacting present life. It may be argued that Turkish motivations of visiting Gallipoli are more socially framed, confirming the conclusion of Yeşildağ and Atay (2011).

Table 4. Correlations: Reviving of Gallipoli x Motives

Variable		National History Motive	Leisure Motive	Spiritual Motive	Life Motive	Family Motive
Reviving of Gallipoli	Pearson Cor.	.525**	-.085	.370**	.391**	.076
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.204	.000	.000	.264

*** significant at .01 level (2-tailed)*

Destinations and Attractions in the Province

In the next section, the respondents were asked to score the listed places out of six, based on the extent they gave importance to visiting in Çanakkale. Battle-related places like monuments and martyrdom sites were scored in the first list. Places irrelevant to the Battles like the city center, the Islands, and ancient cities of Troia and Assos were scored in a second list (see Table 5). The Çanakkale Martyrs Memorial and Martyrdom ($\bar{x} = 5.25$), trenches and battle zones ($\bar{x} = 5.37$), Seddulbahir–first martyrs monument ($\bar{x} = 5.36$), 57th Regiment Martyrdom ($\bar{x} = 5.36$) and Kilitbahir Fortress and Namazgah Emplacement ($\bar{x} = 5.26$) scored highest in the first list. The trenches and the fortress are real war remains; the rest of the highly scored places are constructed memorials for the martyrs. It is conceivable these places are more familiar to the public, especially as an epic symbol of the heroism and martyrdom of the 57th regiment, which is known to have lost every single one of its soldiers in the battle. In the second list, respondents rated Assos Ancient City ($\bar{x} = 4.75$), Troia Archeological Site ($\bar{x} = 4.839$) and Mount Ida ($\bar{x} = 4.8$) higher than other places on the same list. All three of these places are recognized as being historically and culturally important.

ANOVA test revealed that respondents who visited the area scored significantly higher for Trenches and battle zones ($F = 6.909$, $p < .05$), Seddulbahir–the first martyrs monument ($F = 5.625$, $p < .05$), and Seddulbahir battle zone and ANZAC martyrdom ($F = 4.9$, $p < .01$). When compared with gender, age, monthly income, and kin-relatedness, no significant change was found in the first list. Independent Samples t-test revealed that female respondents significantly placed more emphasis to visiting the islands ($t = -3,75$, $p < .05$), seaside and beaches ($t = -2.377$, $p < .05$), and Geyikli Town ($t = -4.849$, $p < .05$). Also, it was found that kin-related respondents scored significantly less for seaside and beaches ($t = 3.030$, $p < .05$). When compared with age, monthly income, and having previously visited Gallipoli, no significant change was found on the second list.

Table 5. Destinations and Attractions in and Around Gallipoli

Related to the Battles	N	M	SD	Not Related to the Battles	N	M	SD
The Çanakkale Martyrs Memorial and Martyrdom	236	5.25	1.493	Çanakkale City Center	236	4.01	1.954
ANZAC Monuments and Martyrdoms	236	4.26	2.022	The Islands (Bozcaada/Gökçeada)	236	4.37	1.977
ANZAC Bay, landing area	228	4.79	1.606	Seaside and beaches	220	3.33	1.966
Trenches and battle zones	228	5.37	1.144	Geyikli Town	219	3.52	1.880
Seddulbahir, first martyrs monument	226	5.36	1.204	Assos Ancient City	224	4.75	1.665
Seddulbahir, battle zone and ANZAC martyrdom	228	4.99	1.503	Troia Archeological Site	226	4.83	1.598
Sea Battle Museum and Nusrat Minelayer	231	5.19	1.306	Mount Ida	227	4.80	1.583
57th Regiment Martyrdom	228	5.36	1.267	Ayazma Recreation Area	216	3.76	1.983
Kilitbahir Fortress and Namazgah Emplacement	226	5.26	1.329				
Corporal Seyit Memorial	225	5.17	1.445				
Çanakkale Legend Promotion Center	228	4.65	1.790				
Bigalı Village and Mustafa Kemal's Headquarters	236	4.75	1.877				

Discussion and Conclusions

Conclusions

Determining the motivations of Turkish visitors to Gallipoli is the main concern of this study. Factor analysis (see Table 3) revealed that for the Turkish society, the fundamental reason for visiting Gallipoli is a pure interest in the history of the nation, while paying respect to those who sacrificed themselves for the sake of the nation. Moreover, the relationship with death as being interested in the value of life or the soldiers' struggle to survive, the *life motive* in this study, was found relatively less important, indicating that the death element in Gallipoli, from Turkish visitors' perspective, is not a primary motivation, although it exists. Leisure and spiritual motives were found to be significant and family motive was not as strong as other motivations and findings of Hyde and Harman (2011). In contrast to Australians, Turkish visitors are hardly observed looking for late relatives in martyrdoms. Thus, the first implication in this study is that Turkish motivations to Gallipoli visits is collectively stimulated and grounded on a rhetoric base of nationalism (*Inquiry1*). Further analysis of female respondents showed slight differences; namely, they assigned more importance to both national history and spiritual motives, so that the collective sense of the Gallipoli experience is higher for them. Likewise, kin-related respondents showed more interest in the spiritual aspects of Gallipoli experience. It is inferred that the emotional aspects of the visits were more explicit for the kin-related visits, and both emotional and cognitive aspects were revealed for the female respondents.

Concerning emotional connections to Gallipoli, spiritual and family motives were not as explicit as the ANZAC samples in Hyde and Harman (2011), signifying that Turkish motivations to Gallipoli differ from secular pilgrimage concept (*Inquiry2*). In terms of item structure (see Table 3), national and historical interests were combined and clearly dominated the Turkish sample, whereas family motive was not as strong. This may be explained by the collectivist nature of Turkish society, in the sense of regarding the whole group instead of near kinship in a collectivist culture (Kartarı, 2006). Besides, Gallipoli memorials do not seem to prioritize the sentiment of addressing a family member; instead, the focus is on national unity. Eventually, what is brought up to today by Gallipoli is not relevant to family motive (see Table 4). It is also clear that the Turkish journey to Gallipoli is not as long or *authentic* as in the ANZAC pilgrimage. Turkish respondents do not demonstrate the same reasons to think of Gallipoli travel, a voyage often considered once in a life time event. Therefore, the conclusion emerges that secular pilgrimage and Turkish visitors' Gallipoli experience differ significantly, except for the female and kin-related respondents' tendency towards the emotional aspects of the Gallipoli experience. Turkish respondents, in general, are collectively attracted to the site but not essentially pushed by inner-directed emotions. However, the Turkish motivations are alike in the context of secular pilgrimage in terms of death, as not being primarily based on a death curiosity.

Validity from a wider group affiliation is supported in the study for the Turkish sample with clearly dominant national history motive instead of strong family mourning impetus or individual identification aims. When useful for affirmation and helping to support a myth for solidarity, individuals follow group norms (Mangnale et al., 2011) in which myths are turned "into tangible consumer experience creators" (Yavuz et al., 2016, p. 63). Pursuing a structured Gallipoli narration shows that the Turkish attention to Gallipoli is a form of *group consumption behavior*, thus supporting Jaziri's (2019) rhetorical approach, and revealing the political content supplied and

demanded (*Inquiry3*). Comparing how defined motives relate to reviving of Gallipoli (see Table 4), information sources (see Table 2) and what is considered a must-see on the peninsula (see Table 5) concretize the mostly formally structured nationalistic and spiritual aspects of the Gallipoli experience. Focused on the extent to which information sources are given credit, collective inclination becomes more explicit. The respondents scored formal sources like education and books higher. Although Mehmet Akif's epic poem *Çanakkale Şehitlerine* (*To the Martyrs of Çanakkale*) is presumably appreciated by all, art is ranked considerably low, possibly because of a political rather than an emotional or artistic framework. Another indicator of political content is the nationalistic framing of the experience. Respondents gave more credit to experiencing martyrdoms and memorials which are framed as abstract representations of the heroic narration of Gallipoli. This is even clearer for respondents who had already visited Gallipoli, as they scored the importance of monuments higher. Therefore, it is understood that for Turkish visitors, Gallipoli conveys a framed political content. The content entails pride in the struggle of sovereignty and gratefulness in which the individual experiences a sense of community. Approbation supplied by the content is both convenient for the individual and, for example, a petrol station company in a social responsibility project (Polonsky et al., 2013). Thus the Gallipoli experience functions by promoting feelings, meanings, and concision in both praxeological and rhetorical sense (Jaziri, 2019), revealing the political content of experiencing social cohesion, unity, and confidence as well as strength, competence, and magnificence on national degree.

ANZAC pilgrims were found to be interested in also participating in leisure activities during their visits (Hyde& Harman, 2011). For the Turkish sample, similar expectations are found validly effective and named leisure motive, yet it is not relevant with what they reflected to their lives from Gallipoli (*Inquiry4*). This result accords with the literature in terms of heritage tourism, as such experiences are related to leisure expectations as well (Diker, 2016). Considering the province offers several attractions, young and lower-earning individuals especially give more credit to leisure activities combined with their tour. Also, pure leisure destinations such as the islands and beaches in Çanakkale are found to be more attractive to the female and less for kin-related respondents. Female and kin-related respondents were highly-cited to have emotional motives to the experience more. Even though cognitive elements may be inferred for female respondents, kin-relatedness is observed to induce more emotional attachment.

Theoretical Implications

In dark tourism literature, death curiosity is one of the main issues scholars emphasize. Remembering past events and experiences is explained regarding actions dependent on their relation to death. However, facing death does not adequately clarify constructed meanings of dark tourism experiences today. The relationship with the event, place, or people involved may be regarded as not only an honoring act, but may also impact the visitors' lives. As Ivanova and Light (2018) demonstrated, relation to death is not always functional in terms of dark tourism, Iliev (2020) questions the primacy of death relatedness and suggests "a clearer distinction of the 'dark tourists' based on experience" (p. 17). Concerning battlefield tourism and Gallipoli, paying respects to those who fought for the country and pilgrimage concepts still serve as a better explanation of how the experience affects its consumers (Hannaford & Newton, 2008; Lagos et al., 2015). Individuals also consume the experience of praxeological and rhetoric dimensions of *dark sites*. As in Gallipoli context, the experience enables social cohesion in nationalistic form.

Nonetheless, this study indicates applicability of consumer experience approach in dark tourism by political content of *Turkish dark tourism in Gallipoli*.

Practical Implications

There are few studies on Turkish visitors' motivations to visit Gallipoli, yet they are not examined in detail. In this study, Turkish motivations are inferred as having political content materializing in group affiliation as *group consumption behavior*. Interests of Gallipoli visitors and practical implications categorized by gender, age, and income dispersions are presented in the study. It is also revealed how cultural backgrounds similarly affect attentions related to consumer experiences. Therefore, tourism practitioners should arrange their offers on presented diversity of interests and visitors.

Limitations and Future Research

Substantiality and fragility of the topic for the Turkish society entailed a limitation in data gathering causing a relatively low return rate. A larger sample and a process integrating tourism applications in the design of the research is expected to provide more explicit results in future research. Nevertheless, research on dark tourism and relevant conceptualizations are not yet entirely established and open to conceptual explanations (Mionel, 2019). Since dark tourism consumption (in this context, consumption of the Gallipoli experience) is multidimensional and open to examination from different viewpoints, we suggest scholars focus on demographics and a detailed scope, namely discussing the psychological death relation by experience and as antecedents of motivations in the future.

References

Adams, R. (2015). The Gallipoli campaign: Learning from a mismatch of strategic ends and means. *Joint Force Quarterly*, *79,* 96-101.

Akhtar-Danesh, N. (2017). A comparison between major factor extraction and factor rotation techniques in Q-methodology. *Open Journal of Applied Sciences, 07*(4), 147-156.

Baykut, S. (2016). The re-contextualization of the Battle of Gallipoli through commemorations. *Intercultural Understanding, 6,* 7-15.

Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research, 15,* 139-168.

Berger, P. (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion*. Doubleday.

Cheal, F., & Griffin, T. (2013). Pilgrims and patriots: Australian tourist experiences at Gallipoli. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research, 7*(3), 227 - 241.

Cusack, C. M., & Digance, J. (2009). The Melbourne Cup: Australian identity and secular pilgrimage. *Sport in Society, 12*(7), 876-889.

Çakar, K. (2020). Investigation of the motivations and experiences of tourists visiting the Gallipoli Peninsula as a dark tourism destination. *European Journal of Tourism Research, 24,* 1-30.

Çakıcı, A. C., Mercan, Ş. O., & Harman, S. (2007). Sayılarla Çanakkale turizminin değerlendirilmesi [Quantitative evaluation of Çanakkale tourism]. *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi, 1*(2), 113-135.

Dann, G. M. (1981). Tourist motivation: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research, 8*(2), 187-219.

Davutoğlu, A. (2009). Turkish foreign policy and the EU in 2010. *Turkish Policy Quarterly, 8*(3), 11-17.

Demirtaş, H. A. (2003). Sosyal kimlik kuramı, temel kavram ve varsayımlar [The social identity theory, essential concepts and assumptions]. *İletişim Araştırmaları, 1*(1), 123-144.

Diker, O. (2016). Kültürel miras ile kültürel miras turizmi kavramları üzerine kavramsal bir çalışma [A conceptual study on the concepts of cultural heritage and cultural heritage tourism]. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 4*(30), 365-374.

Duran, E., Hamarat, B., & Özkul, E. (2014). A sustainable festival management model: The case of International Troia Festival. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research, 8*(2), 173-193.

Esenkaya, A. (2003). Askeri propaganda açısından Harp Mecmuası ve bu mecmuanın Çanakkale Muharebesini tasvirdeki rolü [The Harb Mecmuası in terms of military propaganda and the journal's role in depiction of the Çanakkale Battle]. In Genelkurmay Askeri ve Tarih ve Stratejik Etüd Başkanlığı (Ed.), *Bildiriler: Türk-İsrail askeri tarih konferansı II* (pp. 58-66). Genelkurmay Askeri ve Tarih ve Stratejik Etüd Başkanlığı.

Esenkaya, A. (2008). Çanakkale savaşında Türk-Alman birlikteliği [Turkish-German co-operation in the Gallipoli campaign]. *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yıllığı, 6-7*, 15-42.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self identity*. Polity.

Glassberg, D. (1996). Public history and the study of memory. *The Public Historian, 18*(2), 7-23.

Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism motivation and expectation formation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*(2), 283-304.

Hall, J., & Basarin, J. (2009, 6-9 September). *The importance of satisfaction, word of mouth and recommending behavior in battlefield commemorative event tourism: Gallipoli a case study* [Conference presentation]. 3rd Advances in Tourism Marketing Conference, Bournemouth, England.

Haltof, M. (2004). Gallipoli, mateship, and the construction of Australian national identity. *Journal of Popular Film & Television, 21*(1), 27-36.

Hannaford, J., & Newton, J. (2008). Sacrifice, grief and the sacred at the contemporary 'secular' pilgrimage to Gallipoli. *Borderlands E-Journal, 7*(1). http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol7no1_2008/hannafordnewton_gallipoli.htm

Hyde, K. F., & Harman, S. (2011). Motives for a secular pilgrimage to the Gallipoli battlefields. *Tourism Management, 32*, 1343-1351.

Iliev, D. (2020). Consumption, motivation and experience in dark tourism: A conceptual and critical analysis. *Tourism Geographies*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1722215

Ivanova, P., & Light, D. (2018). 'It's not that we like death or anything': Exploring the motivations and experiences of visitors to a lighter dark tourism attraction. *Journal of Heritage Tourism, 13*(4), 356-369.

Jaziri, D. (2019). The advent of customer experiential knowledge management approach (CEKM): The integration of offline & online experiential knowledge. *Journal of Business Research, 94*, 241–256.

Kartarı, A. (2006). *Farklılıklarla Yaşamak* [Living with differences]. Ürün.

Kassarjian, H. H. (1971). Personality and consumer behavior: A review. *Journal of Marketing Research, 8*(4), 409-418.

Lagos, E., Harris, A., & Sigala, M. (2015). Emotional language for image formation and market segmentation in dark tourism destinations: Findings from tour operators' websites promoting Gallipoli. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, *10*(2), 153-170.

Lennon, J., & Foley, M. (1999). Interpretation of the unimaginable: The US Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC, and 'dark tourism'. *Journal of Travel Research*, *38*(1), 46-57.

Light, D. (2017). Progress in dark tourism and thanatourism research: An uneasy relationship with heritage tourism. *Tourism Management, 61*, 275-301.

MacCannell, D. (1989). *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. Schocken Books.

Mangnale, V. S., Potluri, R. M., & Degufu, H. (2011). A study on ethnocentric tendencies of Ethiophian customers. *Asian Journal of Business Management, 3,* 241-250.

Margry, P. J. (2008). Secular pilgrimage: A contradiction in terms? In P. J. Margry (Ed.), *Shrines and pilgrimage in the modern world: New itineraries into the sacred* (pp. 13-46). Amsterdam University.

Mionel, R. (2019). Dark tourism and thanatourism: Distinct tourism typologies or simple analytical tools? *Tourism*, *67*(4), 423-437.

Oh, H. C., Uysal, M., & Weaver, P. A. (1995). Product bundles and market segments based on travel motivations: A canonical correlation approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 14*(2), 123-137.

Polonsky, M., Hall, J., Vieceli, J., Atay, L., Akdemir, A., & Marangoz, M. (2013). Using strategic philanthropy to improve heritage tourist sites on the Gallipoli Peninsula, Turkey: Community perceptions of changing quality of life and of the sponsoring organization. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 21*(3), 376–395.

Rui C., Cheng, M., Xin, S., Hua, C., & Yao, Y. (2020). International tourists' dark tourism experiences in China: The case of the memorial of the victims of the Nanjing Massacre. *Current Issues in Tourism, 23*(12), 1493-1511.

Sangpikul, A. (2008). Travel motivations of Japanese senior travelers to Thailand. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *10*(1), 81-94.

Seaton, A. V. (1996). Guided by the dark: From thanatopsis to thanatourism. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 2*(4), 234-244.

Seaton, A. V. (1999). War and thanatourism: Waterloo 1815-1914. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *26*(1), 130-158.

Sharpley, R. (2009). Shedding light on dark tourism: An introduction. In R. Sharpley, & P. Stone (Eds.), *The darker side of travel: The theory and practice of dark tourism* (pp. 3-22). Channel View.

Sharpley, R. (2012). Towards an understanding of 'genocide tourism': An analysis of visitors' accounts of their experience of recent genocide sites. In R. Sharpley, & P. Stone (Eds.), *Contemporary tourist experience: Concepts and consequences* (pp. 95–109). Routledge.

Slade, P. (2003). Gallipoli thanatourism: The meaning of ANZAC. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(4), 779–794.

Smith, V. L. (1998). War and tourism: An American ethnography. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*(1), 202-227.

Stone, P. R. (2005). Dark tourism consumption–A call for research. *E-Review of Tourism Research*, *3*(5), 109-117.

Stone, P. R. (2006). A dark tourism spectrum: Towards a typology of death and macabre related tourist sites, attractions and exhibitions. *Tourism: An Interdisciplinary International Journal, 54*(2), 145–160.

Stone, P., & Sharpley, R. (2008).Consuming dark tourism: A thanatological perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research, 35*(2), 574–595.

Strange, C., & Kempa, M. (2003). Shades of dark tourism: Alcatraz and Robben Island. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(2), 386–405.

Şakul, K. (2016). Contemporary Turkish perceptions of the Çanakkale Campaign. In M. Gürcan, & R. Johnson (Eds.), *The Gallipoli campaign: The Turkish perspective* (pp. 181-205). Routledge.

Tarlow, P. (2005). Dark tourism–The appealing 'dark' side of tourism and more. In M. Novelli (Ed.), *Niche tourism: Contemporary issues, trends and cases* (pp. 47-58). Elsevier.

Turner, V. (1973). The center out there: Pilgrim's goal. *History of Religions, 12*(1), 191–230.

Türkmen, Z., Çalışkan, A., & İlhan F. (Eds.). (2007). *Çanakkale savaşı, anıtları ve şehitlikleri* [The Çanakkale battles, monuments and martyrdoms]. Genelkurmay Askeri ve Tarih ve Stratejik Etüd Başkanlığı.

Ulu, C. (2012). Çanakkale Muharebeleri sırasında basının propaganda aracı olarak kullanılması: Harp Mecmuası örneği [Use of press as propaganda tool during the Çanakkale Battles: The Harb Mecmuası case]. *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yıllığı, 10*(12), 61-83.

Winter, C. (2011). First World War Cemeteries: Insights from visitor books. *Tourism Geographies*, *13*(3), 462-479.

Yavuz, M. C., Sumbul, M., Ergec, N. E., & Derdiyok, I. C. (2016). Storytelling in destination brand communication: A qualitative analysis. *International Interdisciplinary Business-Economics Advancement Journal*, *1*(2), 63-72.

Yeşildağ, B., & Atay, L. (2011). Savaş alanları turizmi: Gelibolu Yarımadasına gelen ziyaretçilere yönelik bir çalışma [Battlefield tourism: A survey with the visitors of Gallipoli Battlefields]. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *14*(26), 267-280.

Yıldırım, T. B., Ak, T., & Ölmez, Z. (2008). Assessment of the natural-cultural resources in Çanakkale for nature-based tourism. *Journal of Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *10*, 871-881.

Ziino, B. (2006). Who owns Gallipoli? Australia's Gallipoli anxieties 1915–2005. *Journal of Australian Studies*, *30*(88), 1-12.

Ziino, B. (2012). 'We are talking about Gallipoli after all': Contested narratives, contested ownership and the Gallipoli Peninsula. In M. Gegner, & B. Ziino (Eds.), *The Heritage of War* (pp. 142-159). Routledge.