Motivations in Battlefield Tourism: The Case of '1916 Easter Rising Rebellion', Dublin

Jithendran Kokkranikal, Yeon Sun Yang, Ray Powell, and Elizabeth Booth

Abstract Journeys to battlefields or war-related sites are categorised as dark tourism. Dark tourism is travelling to sites associated with death, disasters or atrocities and has emerged as a major tourist attraction. It involves visiting concentration camps, war memorials, cemeteries, scenes of mass murder, horror museums, fields of fatality, sites of natural disasters and perilous places, and has been varyingly described as 'morbid tourism', 'milking the macabre', Thana tourism 'black spots tourism' or 'sensation sights tourism' and 'the heritage of atrocity tourism'. Battlefield tourism can be defined as travelling to war-related sites to remember and commemorate the fallen focusing on spiritual and emotional experience. The battlefields and other artefacts associated with warfare have been drawing visitors for many centuries. A trip to war-related sites could take many different forms, and visitor backgrounds, attitudes and their reasons for visiting war-related sites could also vary. This paper reports findings of a study examining motivations of visitors to major battlefield destinations related to the '1916 Easter Rising Rebellion'. This study employed quantitative research methods with a questionnaire survey at two different sites and a tour associated with Easter Rising rebellion in Dublin, Ireland.

Keywords Battlefield tourism • Dark tourism • Thana tourism • Dublin • Pilgrimage • Easter rising

J. Kokkranikal (✉) • R. Powell • E. Booth
Department of Marketing, Events and Tourism—University of Greenwich, London, UK
e-mail: j.kokkranikal@greenwich.ac.uk

Y.S. Yang
University of Greenwich, London, UK

1   Motivations in Battlefield Tourism: The Case of '1916 Easter Rising Rebellion', Dublin

This paper reports findings of a study examining motivations of visitors to major battlefield destinations related to the '1916 Easter Rising Rebellion'. Battlefield tourism can be defined as travelling to war-related sites to remember and commemorate the fallen focusing on spiritual and emotional experience (Baldwin & Sharpley, 2009). Over the last century, tourism which is related to wars and conflicts has grown extensively. Many armed and political conflicts have occurred in the last century and they seem to recur as evidenced by the current global geopolitical developments (Baldwin & Sharpley, 2009). Seaton (1999) points out the large number of British tourists visited Belgium to see the sites of the battle of Waterloo after 1815. Leisure tourists came to gaze at the land of death with curiosity while some came to the battlefield to mourn and remember the dead as pilgrims. Majority of them were the relatives of the fallen and wounded. According to Seaton (1999) this was the first great battle site which lured tourists. Due to the sacrifice of young soldiers and the glory of victory, the sites of the battle of Waterloo were a sacred place for the British tourists and relatives of the dead (Seaton, 1999).

World War II (WWII) also played a key role in the growth of the battlefield tourism. After the WWII, survivors, veterans and tourists visited places where major battles and consequent death and destruction happened (Beech, 2009). Also a large number of people visited areas where the Pacific war took place and Vietnam after the Vietnamese war (Agrusa, Tanner, & Dupuis, 2006; Henderson, 2000). A large number of historical and modern war theatres continue to attract visitors, marking a steady growth of battlefield tourism as one of the major categories of global tourism (Smith, 1998). As Smith states (1998: 206), 'where there is a war, there is tourism'.

2   Battlefield Pilgrimages or Tourists?

A trip to war-related sites could have many different forms and tourists might experience it varyingly depending upon their expectations of and attitudes toward war-related sites. Additionally, they might interpret the meanings of sites visited differently. The battlefields and other artifacts associated with warfare have been drawing visitors to for many centuries (Baldwin & Sharpley, 2009). Lloyd (1998) identifies two significantly different groups, tourists and pilgrims, suggesting a dichotomy of motives in battlefield tourism. He emphasises a perception of the war which underlined respect to the sacrifice of the dead, perception of such places as sacred and the duty to remember the sacrifices of those fallen in the war. However, Mosse (1990) argues that the debate between the sacred and the profane toward the perception of the war might be the inevitable issue after WWI. He

emphasise that the pattern of tourists had changed from battlefield pilgrimage to battlefield tourism after WWI. During WWI and its aftermath, widows, orphans and families visited the battles sites where their relatives sacrificed their lives.

Traditionally, a journey for a pilgrimage means that people visit religious sites as part of religious tourism (Digance, 2003). However, the pattern of pilgrimages has changed from a religious ritual to a modern secular pilgrimage. Sites commemorating national tragedies and associated with legendary icons are now part of contemporary secular pilgrimage tourism (Collins-Kreiner, 2009; Hyde & Harman, 2011; Shuo, Ryan, & Liu, 2009). Baldwin and Sharpley (2009) describe battlefield pilgrimage as visits to graves and war memorials for remembrance and to grieve for the fallen. Battlefields can also develop into national symbols and mythical sites. A battlefield where soldiers have sacrificed their lives for the national cause is of major importance to not just their relatives, but to their compatriots also. The battles and their locations transcend the living memory and become part of the collective social memory in which the battles are re-created through a range of social procedures, memorials, warfare artefacts, souvenirs and part of the national ideology (Winter, 2009a, 2009b). Nostalgia is felt not just by the war-veterans but by casual visitors too. For many, battlefield pilgrimages are opportunities to reaffirm the sites importance for its military heritage and feel pride and loyalty through a collective social memory (Iles, 2008; Winter, 2009a) Even the second and third generation visitors are grief stricken and emotionally engaged while on a battlefield pilgrimage.

However, the post-war period saw a great number of tourists who had little or no connection to the fallen joining the battle tours run by tour operators (Lloyd, 1998). These visitors wanted their comforts, and the sacred meaning of the war was trivialised by the tourists and the commercialism they represented through the organised tours to those destinations (Lloyd, 1998; Mosse, 1990).

Battlefield tourists are likely to have varying and multiple motivations in visiting sites associated with warfare. They are also likely to be influenced by a range of motivators (Swarbrooke & Horner, 2007). Many researchers report that tourists visit sites of wars as pilgrimages to mourn and remember the relatives (Baldwin & Sharpley, 2009; Iles, 2008; Lloyd, 1998; Mosse, 1990; Scates, 2007; Winter, 2009a, 2011) or to identify themselves with the birth place of their nations (Hyde & Harman, 2011). Educational purposes are also dominant motivations for battlefield tourists (Baldwin & Sharpley, 2009; Henderson, 2000; Winter, 2009a, 2011). Though the sites of battlefields may be interpreted differently depending on the character of the sites, tourists are motivated by remembrance of the dead, educational purposes and curiosity. Ryan (2007) points out that war-related sources such as novels, television documentaries, war movies and games also may be motivators because they provide constant war-related information to tourists. Therefore, battlefield tourists or enthusiasts may also be interested in or motivated by other war-related cultural resources (Ryan, 2007; Smith, 1998). Ryan (2007) also focuses on the interpretation of the battlefields as mythic sites. If sites are recognised as symbols of defence of freedom, or are linked with patriotism or heroism, they may be classified as mythic sites (Ryan, 2007). Tourists might experience a feeling of

the mythic through their own beliefs and thoughts, which are socially contextualised.

No matter what the main motivator that pushes or pulls tourists to travel to war-related sites, tourists are influenced by multiple motivators and they have multiple purposes for visiting battlefield destinations (Swarbrooke & Horner, 2007). Henderson (2000) has noted how tourists to Vietnam often visit war-related sites for reasons of education and entertainment. Tourists may wish to experience something different during their holiday and also may want to obtain knowledge of the past with morbid curiosity. Some tourists visit war-related sites for leisure or because of their proximity to other attractions (Le & Pearce, 2011). Winter (2011) also notes how tourists visit WWI sites mainly for education and remembrance while enjoying other leisure activities such as shopping, dining and visits to other attractions.

The debate over the dichotomous nature of modern day visitations is an ongoing one (e.g., Collins-Kreiner, 2009; Lloyd, 1998, Winter, 2011). Attempts to differentiate between tourists and pilgrims blur the conceptualization of battlefield tourism, raising questions whether it is tourism or pilgrimage (Lloyd, 1998; Winter, 2011). Many researchers content that tourists mostly go on battlefield tours for educational purpose and remembrance (Baldwin & Sharpley, 2009; Henderson, 2000; Iles, 2008; Lloyd, 1998; Mosse, 1990; Scates, 2007; Winter, 2009a, 2009b). However, for many, battlefield visits involve leisure pursuits as well (Winter, 2011). The apparent de-differentiation of the two in battlefield tourism can be explained as a feature of the post-modernity (Collins-Kreiner, 2009). The boundaries are thus blurred and consequently, the meanings are modified. Iles (2008) argues that visitors who have no connection with past wars and the fallen may often realise themselves to be emotionally engaged to battlefield destinations. Winter (2011) notes that only a small proportion recognises themselves as pilgrims, while the majority identify themselves as tourists. A journey of secular pilgrimages, thus involves a hybrid set of activities with visitors going through mixed experiences (Shuo et al., 2009).

3   Easter Rising Rebellion

Ireland was ruled by the British since the twelfth century for approximately 800 years (Power, 1979). At the start of the twentieth century, Ireland consisted of four provinces of 'Leinster' (east), 'Munster' (south) 'Connacht' (west), and 'Ulster' (north). People in Ulster were mostly Protestants who were loyal to Britain. They supported the Unionist Irish political party. However, most of Irish were Catholic. Catholics supported the Nationalist party which had wanted to formulate Home Rule for Ireland (Power, 1979).

Between 1912 and 1914, there were serious disputes between the Nationalists and the Unionist over whether British Parliament was to initiate Home Rule for Ireland or not. The British parliament made a decision that Home Rule would not be

granted to Ireland until WWI finished. Most of Irish believed that once the war was over, Home Rule would begin for Ireland. However, there were skepticism all around about the British government's commitment to grant Home Rule (Power, 1979).

In 1916, the Irish Republic Brotherhood (IRB) determined to fight for their independence, rather than just taking Home Rule. The Nationalist Army, consisting of Irish Volunteers, also joined the fight for the freedom of Ireland (O'Brien & O'Brien, 1972; Power, 1979). On 24 April, Easter Monday, the leaders of the rebellion marched off up O'Connell Street in the centre of Dublin with Irish Citizen Army and they charged the General Post Office (GPO). They proclaimed the provisional government the 'Irish Republic' to the people of Ireland. However, the rising was over on 30 April and leaders of the rebellion surrendered to British Troops.

After the surrender, 16 leaders of rebellion were executed by British at the Kilmainham Gaol and 14 were buried at Arbour hill cemetery. Also some of leaders who fought for the struggle for independence after the rising were buried at Glasnevin cemetery (1916 Rebellion, 2014; O'Brien & O'Brien, 1972; Power, 1979). Before the rising, not many Irish supported the rebels. However, the executions and the rising inspired the whole of Ireland and Irish freedom movement became stronger and very popular (O'Brien & O'Brien, 1972; Power, 1979).

Now, GPO at O'Connell Street and Kilmainham Gaol are iconic sites to remember the 1916 Rising in Dublin (Heritage Ireland, 2013). Also the National Museum of Ireland, which is located in Collins Barracks which was a scene of fight during Easter Rising, and Glasnevin cemetery attract visitors as 1916 Easter Rising related sites (Glasnevin Trust, 2014; National Museum of Ireland, 2014). Moreover, '1916 Rebellion walking tour' and 'Historical walking tours of Dublin' guide visitors to the 1916 Rising related sites every day (Historical Walking Tour of Dublin, 2014; 1916 Rebellion, 2014).

4   Research Methods

Sites related to Easter Rising rebellion are located across Dublin city. Among a number of sites managed as places of visitor attractions, first two sites were temporarily selected for the study. They were Kilmainham Gaol and Arbour Hill cemetery. However, due to the lack of a number of visitors at Arbour hill cemetery, this site was rejected after a pilot study. Instead the Easter Rising exhibition in National Museum of Ireland and the 1916 Rebellion Walking Tour were added to conduct the research survey. The National Museum of Ireland, Decorative Art and History is located in Collins Barracks which is the oldest military Barracks in Ireland. In the museum, there is a commemorative exhibition 'the Easter Rising Understanding' for the 90th Anniversary of the Easter Rising. Significantly, there is an original copy of the Proclamation of the Republic, as read outside of the General Post Office occupies in the exhibition. Also the museum exhibits 'Solders and

Chiefs: the Irish at war at Home and Abroad, from 1550' (National Museum of Ireland, 2014).

Kilmainham Gaol is a meaningful site in Irish history as many leaders of Irish rebellions were detained and some executed by the British during the period of the struggle for the independence from Britain. The leaders of Easter Rising rebellion were imprisoned and executed after the rising. Now this jail is open to the public as a museum and it is one of the popular visitor attractions in Dublin. The 1916 Rebellion Walking Tour was founded in 1996 by an Irish historian. This tour visits historical Easter Rising related sites in the Dublin city centre with a guided escort. This half day tour was used to conduct the questionnaire survey among the tour group.

A questionnaire consisting of 29 self-completing questions was designed to find out tourists' motivations for engaging in battlefield tourism in Easter Rising sites and the relationship between their motivations and background. The questionnaire was distributed among randomly selected visitors in the three sites. Out of a total of 197 questionnaires distributed, 161 were completed and returned in useable form, providing a response rate of 82 %. Data analysis was carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Before the analysis responses were coded numerically, labeled, and added values as necessary. Descriptive-statistical analysis was carried out to summarise the data. Answers questions inviting respondents to describe themselves (part two) were ranked according to the frequency. Responses to the 20 motivational statements were analysed to identify their mean scores.

5   Findings

The socio-demographic profiles of Easter Rising tourists are shown in Table 1. Irish (44.1 %) made up almost half of the total sample, European (23.0 %), American (13.7 %), British (12.4 %) and the remaining 6.9 % comprising of three people from Australia and New Zealand and eight people from other countries. For the total sample, 14.9 % of the participants had Irish ancestral link while 45.3 % of the participants were Irish and 39.8 % of people had no connection with Ireland. The reason why the total percentage of Irish nationality and the total percentage of Irish are not equal is because two tourists were from Northern Ireland. They identified themselves as Irish.

Approximately half (43.5 %) of the participants were aged between 18 to 29 years and 59.0 % had at least a college/university degree. The total samples of 57.8 % had already visited Easter Rising related sites before and 34.7 % of the participants were likely to visit the other Easter Rising related sites in a future.

For the question of self-assessed tourists' type, a number of participants described themselves as 'a tourist who is travelling around in Ireland' (36.0 %), 'local visitor' (25.5 %), 'day tripper' (14.3 %) and 'an individual tourist' (11.2 %).

Table 1 Profile of the sample (N = 161)

Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Nationality	Age group
Ireland 71 (44.1 %)	18–29 years 70 (43.5 %)
Europe 37 (23.0 %)	30–39 years 29 (18.0 %)
USA 22 (13.7 %)	40–49 years 23 (14.3 %)
UK 20 (12.4 %)	50–59 years 24 (14.9 %)
Australasia 3 (1.9 %)	60 years over 15 (9.3 %)
Others 8 (5.0 %)	Educational level
Irish family link	Secondary education 26 (16.1 %)
Irish 73 (45.3 %)	College/University 95 (59.0 %)
Irish ancestral links 24 (14.9 %)	Post-graduate 35 (21.7 %)
No links 64 (39.8 %)	Others 5 (3.1 %)
Gender	Have you visited Easter Rising related sites
Male 89 (55.3 %)	Yes 68 (42.2 %)
Female 72 (44.7 %)	No 93 (57.8 %)
	Will you visit Easter Rising related site
	Yes 56 (34.8 %)
	No 105 (65.2 %)

Table 2 Tourists type (self-assessed) (N = 161)

		Frequency	Percent
	I am a pilgrim who visits Irish sacred historical sites	3	1.9
	I am a pilgrim but also tourist	2	1.2
	I am a battlefield tourist who loves visiting war-related sites	2	1.2
	I am not a huge fan of battlefield but I am interested	4	2.5
	I am a tourists who is travelling in Ireland	58	36.0
	I am a day tripper	23	14.3
	I am a group tourists	2	1.2
	I am a individual tourist	18	11.2
	I am a local visitor	41	25.5
	Others	5	3.1
	Total	158	98.1
Missing	System	3	1.9
Total		161	100.0

Only 1.9 % of the participants described themselves as 'a pilgrim' and 'battlefield tourists' (1.2 %), 'a pilgrim but also tourist' (1.2 %) (see Table 2).

Table 3 shows the mean score for 20 motivational statements. The most highly rated statements are "Because of historical interest" (mean = 4.38), "Because I want to know about Ireland" (mean = 4.34), "To enjoy a holiday/day out" (mean = 4.14) and "To experience the authentic sites where important events occurred" (mean = 4.03). The most poorly rated statements are "Because I had personal link with this site (or sites)" (mean = 2.35), "Because of morbid curiosity" (mean = 2.17) and "This is a spiritual pilgrimage" (mean = 2.10).

Table 3 Descriptive statistics of motivation statements

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Because of historical interest	161	4.38	0.806
Because I want to know about Ireland	160	4.34	0.753
To enjoy a holiday/day out	160	4.14	0.853
To experience the authentic sites where important events occurred	161	4.03	0.965
To have a good time with friends/family	161	3.90	1.108
To learn more about Easter Rising	161	3.88	1.244
To see the war artefacts	157	3.36	1.220
Because information sources (people, internet, guide books) recommend	160	3.33	1.291
To pay respects people who died for Ireland's freedom	161	3.23	1.347
To understand about my heritage	161	3.23	1.582
To connect with my country and birth place	159	3.13	1.603
Because I am interested in war-related cultural genre	161	3.06	1.243
Because I am interested in battlefield tourism	159	2.99	1.175
To see the sites of conflicts and death	159	2.82	1.334
Because it is near other visitor attractions	159	2.63	1.271
Because it is near Hop-on Hop-off or other buses stop	156	2.47	1.351
Because I am interested in places of atrocity	161	2.43	1.327
Because I had personal link with this site (or sites)	158	2.35	1.321
Because of morbid curiosity	159	2.17	1.218
This is a spiritual pilgrimage	158	2.10	1.147

Note: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

This overall results of descriptive statistic shows that most of the sample tended to visit Easter Rising related sites to obtain knowledge of history and Ireland. However, they wanted to enjoy their holiday as well. The majority of the sample preferred to describe themselves as a tourist or a visitor rather than a pilgrim or a battlefield tourist.

6 Discussion and Conclusion

This study of tourists visiting sites where a historical rebellion happened in Dublin has illustrated the complications of examining battlefield tourists. In the aftermath of WWI, visits to the battlefield were likely to be classified within a dichotomy concept between pilgrims and tourists (Lloyd, 1998; Seaton, 1999; Winter, 2011). Those who visited the sites of the battle to mourn and remember the fallen were identified as pilgrims (Lloyd, 1998). Those who visited the battles to look at the land of death with curiosity were identified as tourists (Seaton, 1999). Tourists

needed their comfort, and souvenirs and snacks were sold in the land of the battle (Mosse, 1990).

However, as Cohen (2004) points out, tourism is a vague theory, and the boundaries between tourists and non-tourists or pilgrims and tourists have become blurred and unclear. Although tourists visit the battlefields as secular pilgrimages, it implies hybrid activities, and experiences depend on individuals' expectations and motivations (Seaton & Lennon, 2004; Shuo et al., 2009).

This study analysed the motivations and characteristics of visitors to Easter Rising related sites, to investigate whether they could be categorised into dichotomy concept between pilgrims and tourists. The result of Table 2 demonstrates that the dichotomy concept to visitors to Easter Rising sites is not feasible. Whether it considers the dichotomy concept or not, the majority of tourists did not assess themselves as pilgrims. Only 1.9 % of the total sample classified themselves as a pilgrim and 1.2 % of the total responded as a pilgrim but also tourist.

The greater number of participants assessed themselves as tourists, day trippers and local visitors. This result demonstrates that most tourists to Easter Rising sites could be described as tourists. Moreover, visiting to Easter Rising sites might not be their only reason to visit Dublin and Easter Rising sites might play an insignificant role in their decision to visit the Irish capital (Le & Pearce, 2011).

Le and Pearce (2011:461) discuss their research of battlefield tourists to Vietnam which suggested that battlefield tourists could be more suitably expressed as 'Battlefield visitors for a day' rather than 'Battlefield visitors to Vietnam'. Similarly, visitors to Easter Rising sites responded highly on the 'Holiday' and 'Educational purpose' factors than the 'Pilgrim and identity' and 'Battlefield interest' factors. Not surprisingly, most participants did not identify themselves as a battlefield tourist either. Only 1.2 % of the total sample identified themselves as a battlefield tourist.

Future study is also required to compare motivations in other battlefields and sites of conflicts. As the nature of wars are different, it would be worthwhile to study how the motivations will change depend on sites and ideologies. It would be also interesting to explore how each individual has deep experiences and how they are engaged with sites emotionally depending on their personal backgrounds and the level of understanding with qualitative research approaches.

References

1916 Rebellion. (2014). The history. [WWW]. Accessed July 01, 2014 from http://www.1916rising.com/history.html

Agrusa, J., Tanner, J., & Dupuis, J. (2006). Determining the potential of American Vietnam veterans returning to Vietnam as tourists. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 8*, 223–234.

Baldwin, F., & Sharpley, R. (2009). Battlefield tourism: Bringing organised violence. In R. Sharpley & P. R. Stone (Eds.), *The darker side of travel: The theory and practice of dark tourism* (pp. 186–206). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Beech, J. (2009). Genocide tourism. In R. Sharpley & P. R. Stone (Eds.), *The darker side of travel: The theory and practice of dark tourism* (pp. 207–223). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Cohen, E. (2004). Who is a tourist? A conceptual clarification. In E. Cohen (Ed.), *Contemporary tourism: Diversity and change* (pp. 17–36). London: Elsevier.

Collins-Kreiner, N. (2009). Researching pilgrimage: Continuity and transformations. *Annals of Tourism Research, 37*(2), 440–456.

Digance, J. (2003). Pilgrimage at contested sites. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(1), 143–159.

Glasnevin Trust. (2014). Tourist services. [WWW]. Accessed August 06, 2014 from http://www.glasnevintrust.ie/tour_guides

Henderson, J. C. (2000). War as a tourists attraction: The case of Vietnam. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 2*, 269–280.

Heritage Ireland. (2013). Kilmainham gaol. [WWW]. Accessed August 02, 2013 from http://www.heritageireland.ie/en/dublin/kilmainhamgaol

Historical Walking Tour of Dublin. (2014). Main tour. [WWW]. Accessed August 03, 2014 from http://www.historicalinsights.ie/index.html

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

Iles, J. (2008). Encounters in the fields—Tourism to the battlefields of the western front. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 6*(2), 138–154.

Le, D. T., & Pearce, D. G. (2011). Segmenting visitors to battlefield sites: International visitors to the former demilitarized zone in Vietnam. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 28*(4), 451–463.

Lloyd, D. W. (1998). *Battlefield tourism*. Oxford: Berg.

Mosse, G. L. (1990). *Fallen soldiers: Reshaping the memory of the world wars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

National Museum of Ireland. (2014). Decorative arts and history. [WWW]. Accessed June 20, 2014 from http://www.museum.ie/en/intro/arts-and-history.aspx

O'Brien, M., & O'Brien, C. C. (1972). *A concise history of Ireland*. London: T&H.

Power, E. G. (1979). *The Easter Rising and Irish independence*. London: Longman.

Ryan, C. (2007). Introduction. In C. Ryan (Ed.), *Battlefield tourism: History, place and interpretation* (pp. 1–10). London: Elsevier.

Scates, B. (2007). Soldiers' journey: Returning to the Battlefields of the Great War. *Journal of the Australian War Memorial*. [WWW]. Accessed June 01, 2014 from http://www.awm.gov.au/journal/j40/scates.asp

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

Seaton, A. V., & Lennon, J. J. (2004). Thanatourism in the early 21st century: Moral panics, ulterior motives and alterior desires. In T. V. Singh (Ed.), *New horizons in tourism, strange experiences and stranger practices* (pp. 63–82). Oxford: CABI Publishing.

Shuo, S. Y., Ryan, C., & Liu, G. (2009). Taoism, temples and tourists: The case of Mazu pilgrimage tourism. *Tourism Management, 30*, 581–588.

Smith, V. L. (1998). War and tourism: An American ethnography. *Annals of Tourism Research, 25*(1), 202–227.

Swarbrooke, J., & Horner, S. (2007). *Consumer behavior in tourism* (2nd ed.). London: Elsevier.

Winter, C. (2009a). Tourism, social memory and the great war. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(4), 607–626.

Winter, C. (2009b). The shrine of remembrance Melbourne: A short study of visitors' experiences. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 11*, 553–565.

Winter, C. (2011). Battlefield visitor motivations: Explorations in the Great War Town of Ieper, Belgium. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 13*, 164–176.