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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to understand motivations to visit dark tourism sites, particularly, in South Africa and generally internationally. Dark tourism or tourism to places associated with death, pain and suffering is relatively new and under researched. Although dark tourism literature is growing, there was still some uncertainty in academic circles about its theorisation and conceptualisation. Some have argued that dark tourism was just branding in a competitive academic landscape.

Touring places associated with dark events started back in the Middle Ages, however, since the last quarter of the 20th century there had been a notable increase in the organisation of tourism to dark attractions. The negative sightseeing concept appeared to be the first concept to be used in the 1970s to characterise this form of tourism. However, meaningful scholarly endeavour to understand this phenomenon emerged in the 1990s. The concepts that emerged during this time to dominate theorisation of dark tourism are thanatopsis (contemplation of death), and intimations of postmodernity from which the dark tourism concept emerged. The dark tourism concept has become popular in literature. Some of the other terms which have been used to describe tours to places associated with dark events and to describe sites of that nature are: black spots tourism, assassination sites tourism, dissonant tourism, morbid tourism, disaster tourism, conflict tourism, poverty tourism, slum tourism, landscapes of violent tragedy, and, geographies of trauma.

This study was conducted at three sites in South Africa: the Robben Island Museum, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, and the Apartheid Museum. This study was concerned with a deeper understanding of tourists’ motives to engage in dark tourism in general, and to tour the research sites in particular. Further this study explored how tourists and curators (of the museums, the research sites) interpreted them. The research adopted a qualitative research approach which stressed social interaction, social construction, and the creation of meaning. Qualitative research approach is a major tool in the pursuit for a deeper and broader understanding of the meanings of events, activities, situations and actions of research participants.

This study revealed that visitors toured dark tourism sites intentionally in order to: pay homage to the victims of difficult pasts; learn, especially history; remember victims of difficult pasts; pay homage to Nelson Mandela, and connect with South Africa’s political struggles. Visitors also toured the dark tourism sites because they were in bigger trips which also involved visiting nature reserves. Tourists labelled visits to nature reserves as safaris; finally, visits were motivated by curiosity and desire to know. This study found that the following intermediaries played important roles in influencing visits to dark tourism sites: tour operators; educational institutions in the USA; television, internet, and social media; TripAdvisor; Nelson Mandela’s autobiography, Long Walk to Freedom; and friends. This study also found that tourists who toured as a couple, it is usually women spouses who normally initiate the trips.
Curators presented the research sites as places where people learned about: past injustices, prejudice, and suffering. Curators further hoped that visits to the research sites would touch visitors intellectually, emotionally, and spiritually. Visitors interpreted dark tourism sites as: educational and cultural places; sometimes gloomy and emotional, but still educational sites; and, also as special places, sites of freedom, sites of empowerment, and, as shrines. Tourists were generally positive about sites, however, some hoped for platforms that facilitated interactivity as opposed to passive reception of information. This study also found that some tourists had some issues relating to the organisation of the tours to the Robben Island Museum.

This study divided recommendations concerning policy and management of the research sites into: recommendations directed to the Government and recommendations directed to the three sites of this study. With respect to the Government this study recommended that wild-life be protected by all means because it is the main draw card for international tourists. This study also recommended that the South African and the Zimbabwean governments cooperate in matters of tourism. This should be so because most tourists combined visits to South Africa with visits to Victoria Falls in Zimbabwe which visitors described as safaris. With regards to the three study sites, this study made recommendations that if the research sites wished to attract more tourists, they might consider doing the following: work with tour operators; make use of social media (face book); and integrate the concept of active visitor engagement mostly for purposes of attracting younger visitors. This study also recommended that the Robben Island Museum should revisit their idea of the Museum tourism experience because a few visitors voiced some concerns regarding the organisation of the tours.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

South Africa is still perceived mainly as an adventurous wildlife destination with striking natural beauty (South African Tourism, 2010). Readers of the Lonely Planet in India in 2012 voted South Africa as the world’s best wildlife destination (Williams, 2012). Even though South Africa is marketed as a wildlife tourism destination, the country’s cultural assets are largely unclear in the consumer’s mind and undifferentiated from the rest of the continent (South African Tourism, 2010). Launching South Africa’s domestic tourism strategy on the 2nd of May 2012, former Tourism Minister, Mr Marthinus van Schalkwyk, noted that South Africa has breathtakingly beautiful scenery, a treasure trove of cultures to explore, urban leisure experiences, and fascinating people to meet (South African Government Information, 2012).

Whilst most people travel to see a beautiful landscape, to experience pleasant climates and to experience something different, some tours offer ‘darker’ experiences where tourists are given the opportunity to experience something darker; such as a visit to see a concentration camp where thousands of people were gassed to death, to visit a natural disaster zone that they might have seen on television, or to have a first-hand experience of people living in poverty (sometimes with the intention of trying to help). Such visits have been encapsulated by the umbrella term of dark tourism (Biran, Poria, and Oren, 2011).
Dark tourism involves visits to places associated with tragedy, disaster and the dead. It includes visits to a wide range of sites including graves and cemeteries; battlefields and other war sites; places associated with genocide; locations associated with individual and mass murder; sites associated with the death of celebrities and other noteworthy individuals; exhibits about death, such as Gunther von Hagens' Body Worlds\textsuperscript{1}; conflict zones and dangerous places; and museums of torture (Young and Light, 2016).

In the aftermath of hurricane Katrina in 2004, New Orleans became a big tourist attraction (Robbie, 2008). In New York, Ground Zero is the iconic memorial to the 11 September 2001 attacks which attracts thousands of tourists annually (Neal and Oregon, 2008; Stone, 2012). Outside the United States, places like Auschwitz in Poland and Cambodia’s killing fields have been drawing tourists for decades (Koleth, 2014; Ashworth and Isaac, 2015). In South Africa, the Pretoria Central Prison gallows has been restored as a museum (Govender, 2011). Reconstruction is also planned for the gravesite of Nelson Mandela in Qunu (Mthatha), and the intention is to unlock the tourism potential in the Eastern Cape (Sidimba, 2017).

Dark tourism or thanatourism is not a new phenomenon, it has existed for millennia and pilgrims travelling to places associated with the death of Christ and the martyrdoms of His apostles provide original examples (Timothy and Boyd, 2006). There is also a parallel between dark tourism and such historical activities as gladiatorial contests in Ancient Rome, public executions in the Middle Ages and guided tours of morgues in

\textsuperscript{1} Gunther von Hagens’ Body Worlds was a travelling exhibition of preserved human bodies and parts, created by Gunther von Hagens, whose real name is Gunther Gerhard Liebchen, a German anatomist.
Victorian England. There is a growing awareness that tourists are attracted to an astonishingly wide variety of sites associated with death, disaster and atrocity (Yong, 2014). Yankholmes and Akyeampong (2010) suggest that this increased interest in dark tourism is attributed to disenchantment with the traditional sea, sun and sand (SSS) tourism products offered by mass destinations around the world, and tourists now seek more authentic experiences, especially in the realm of dark tourism.

Dark tourism or thanatourism is a relatively recent field of study and only emerged as an area of scholarly interest in the 1990s. Its development is partly attributed to the contested and maturing area of tourism studies. When this field of study emerged it was located within broader death studies and thanatology (Sharpely, 2011; Stone, 2013), hence the concept of thanatourism is a derivative of thanatology. The term dark tourism is attributed to Foley and Lennon (1996); Lennon and Foley (1999; 2000) and that of thanatourism is attributed to Seaton (1996). There are other terms which have been used to denote the phenomenon of dark tourism, for example, black spots tourism (Rojek, 1991; 1993), assassination sites (Foley and Lennon, 1996), and morbid tourism (Blom, 2000), however, the term dark tourism is now commonly used in the literature (Stone and Sharpley, 2008; Stone, 2012).

Dark tourism has attracted interest from varied disciplines such as geography, sociology, anthropology, and business studies. Even though dark tourism as an area of academic scholarship has been in existence for about 20 years (Robb, 2009; Miller and Gonzalez, 2013; Stone, 2013; Yan, Zhang, Zhang, and Guo, 2016), there are still many
unanswered questions (Biran and Hyde, 2013; Yan et al., 2016), including: are those who tour sites of human tragedy and suffering perverted ‘ghouls’, or are they just manifesting a normal human curiosity in the unusual? Should these ‘dark tourism sites’ be conceptualised within the dark frame of reference? What are the motivations to visit these ‘dark sites’?

These questions have informed this study, which investigates the motivations to engage in dark tourism in South Africa. This study focuses on three sites: the Robben Island Museum; the Apartheid Museum; and the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There are basically four issues that have motivated this study: firstly, increasing numbers of people are consuming dark tourism; secondly, the theoretical interpretation of the consumption of dark tourism is still in its infancy and it is still eclectic, with no common agreement on what dark tourism is; thirdly, most of the theoretical reflections on this phenomenon have emerged from supply side perspectives, whilst the demand side of dark tourism has somehow been neglected; and, the final motivating factor stems from the paucity of research on the subject of dark tourism in South Africa.

There has been a tremendous increase in interest in dark tourism or visits to places associated with a difficult past since the mid-1990s (Seaton, 1996, 1999 and 2009b; Lennon and Foley, 2000; Timothy and Boyd, 2006; Best, 2007; Lisle, 2007; Hartmann, 2009, 2013; Robb, 2009; Burman, 2010; Potts, 2012). According to Darlington (2014),
millions of tourists annually visit sites and attractions worldwide associated with death, tragedy and other atrocities (Miller, 2008; Dunkely, Westwood, and Morgan, 2012; Isaac and Çakmak, 2013; Yan et al., 2016). Visiting sites where martyrs once stood, patriots met a heroic death, or a mass of people died has become a common occurrence which is drawing large numbers of people closer to the event (Miller, 2008). With the increase in dark tourism consumption there is also a notable increase in interest by researchers and scholars in the subject (Farmaki, 2013; Raine, 2013; Poade, 2015; Yan et al., 2016). Dark tourism as a set of practices and object of enquiry is thus enjoying growing popularity (Clarke, Dutton, and Johnston, 2014), and more and more areas of research related to this field are emerging (Yong, 2014; Podoshen, Venkatesh, Wallin, Andrzejewski, and Jin, 2015a; Podoshen, Andrzejewski, Venkatech, and Wallin, 2015b). Global media, tourists and researchers alike are showing an interest in travel to sites associated with death, suffering and the seemingly macabre (Stone, 2011a; Biran and Hyde, 2013; Poade, 2015).

Scholarly analysis of dark tourism still remains limited and thus far it has been under-theorised (Smith, 1998; Knox, 2006; Biran et al., 2011; Minić, 2012; Biran and Hyde, 2013; Carrigan, 2014; Zhang et al., 2016a). As dark tourism literature still remains eclectic and theoretically fragile, there is scope for more rigorous conceptualisation (Stone, 2006a; Stone and Sharpley, 2008; Biran and Poria, 2012; Dürr and Jaffe, 2012; Benckendorff and Zehrer, 2013; Biran and Hyde, 2013; Buda and McIntosh, 2013). Tourism to sites of mass political violence is significantly more complex than current dark tourism or moral or amoral tourism suggests (Hughes, 2008). Lisle (2007)
theorises dark tourism as motivated by the desire to experience the unmediated and authentic encounter with ‘the real’, which borders on voyeurism, and according to Korstanje (2011), dark tourism is driven by people’s fascination with the suffering of others and also represents an attempt to intellectualise the uncertainty of death. Therefore, the uncertainty about dark tourism reflected above serves to show that the scope for empirical research in this field of tourism is still wide (Zhang et al., 2016a).

Much of the literature on dark tourism remains supply-side focused (Isaac and Çakmak, 2013; Raine, 2013; Zhang, Yang, Zheng, and Zhang, 2016b), while only a few studies (Yong, 2014; Liyanage, Coca-Stefaniek and Powell, 2015; Brown, 2015b) have examined the demand side of dark tourism, such as research on why people visit or do not visit dark tourism sites and how they experience or consume such sites. Recent analysis of dark heritage sites has shown that studies have yet to engage fully with the experiences of tourists at dark sites (Biran et al., 2011; Isaak and Çakmak, 2013; Miles, 2014). Yankovska and Hannam (2014) also note that even though the development of dark and ‘toxic’ tourism and interest in death, suffering or disasters has grown significantly, there is still a need to achieve an in-depth understanding of tourists’ experiences at such sites. Wight (2006) agrees that empirical research of visits to sites representing death is still lacking and touristic experiences in such sites are yet to be explored. This is partly the reason why understanding of this phenomenon remains limited (Biran et al., 2011).
There isn’t much research in the field of dark tourism in Africa. After a careful reading of the literature on the subject, only a few studies have hinted at dark tourism in Africa (Shackely, 2001; Strange and Kempa 2003; Rolfes, 2010; Mowatt and Chancellor, 2011; Nahimana, 2011; Dürr and Jaffe, 2012; Friedrich and Johnston, 2013). Sharkely (2001) identified potential uses of Robben Island before it was declared a World Heritage Site in 1999. Strange and Kempa (2003) have compared the Alcatraz high security prison in the United States and the Robben Island in South Africa, and argue that these former sites of incarceration should not be interpreted as ‘dark tourism sites’ but rather be understood with multi-hued forms of interpretation. Similarly, Mowatt and Chancellor (2011) maintain that in conceptualising the West African Slave Castle in Ghana, careful consideration needs to be given to the nuances that are evident in its history: the interactions and interpretation of the site by the tourists, and, its management and oversight.

Hahimana (2011) studied the attitudes and perceptions of local and international tourists regarding the protection of the genocide memorial sites in Rwanda. The study aimed at generating ideas regarding how to conserve, protect and market the Rwandan genocide and memorial sites as tourism destinations. In terms of other dark tourism studies done in Africa, Strange and Kempa (2003) and Mowatt and Chancellor (2011) have incorporated some measure of the touristic motivations and experiences of dark tourism, but they tend to focus more on the visitor interpretation of dark tourism sites.
In the South African context, there have been few studies that have dealt with dark tourism and its associated events. Rolfes (2010) has established that township tours, which include sites of anti-apartheid struggle and contestation, are promoted by tourist companies who regard them as an important extension of their product range. Booyens (2010) has researched township tourism and local economic development and recommends responsible township tourism since it does not automatically ensure pro-poor benefits. Rogerson and Mthombeni (2015) extend the international and local debates around slum tourism by shifting the focus away from townships as destinations for tourism, and instead centre their research on the role of slum areas as tourist-generating areas. Their study focuses on the Katlehong, Thokoza, and Vosloorus (Katorus) Townships in Gauteng. Other scholarship (Hoffmann, 2013; Ivanovic and Saayman, 2013) work has focused their research on heritage and cultural tourism.

Only a few studies have explored museums, memorials and tourism in South Africa, and those studies have tended to focus on the context that has shaped these structures. Mathers (1993) assessed the image of museums in Cape Town within the context of a changing technological and social environment. Draper (2008) also followed the theme of the old and the new in a study to evaluate the extent to which colonial ideologies continue to influence museum society and contemporary museum practices. Likewise, Meents (2009) investigated the ways in which museums and memorials embody post-modern or modern thought. This study aimed to determine how museums were able to remain relevant in the context of a fluid environment. Dlamuka (2003) has argued that museums are political institutions and reflect the
political identities of their circumstances. They cannot be divorced from their time and environments.

It is thus evident from the above review that there have been no meaningful studies of dark tourism in South Africa, hence the present study could be regarded as pioneering. Since this study is conducted at two museums and at a memorial museum, this is the theme of the next section.

1.3 MUSEUMS, MEMORIALS AND ENQUIRY

The discussion is divided into three sections. The first part focuses on man-made landscapes which like museums and memorials, are textual structures. Man-made landscapes are conceived as signifying practices that are read; not just passively, but rewritten as they are read (Duncan and Duncan, 2010). The second section proceeds to define what museums and memorials represent, and the final section concludes by exploring the relationship between museums and tourism.

Critical analysis of human landscapes and artefacts shows that they could be used as metaphors, representing power, control, and domination. Human landscapes could be embodiments of power and control which could write out the voices of others (Smith, 2007). Man-made landscapes, their visual representation and artefacts are understood to be sites of contestation and negotiation (Smith, 2007). As sites that reflect social relations of power, landscapes and artefacts legitimate and validate some truths while they delegitimise and invalidate others (Azaryahu and Foote, 2008). Configurations of
geographical elements which include buildings, markers, memorials and inscriptions are positioned with great care to provide a spatial story-line (Azaryahu and Foote, 2008). Relations of political and social power influence the representation of the story-line.

Poststructuralist geographical analysis has noted the intersection of collective memory and space (Dwyer and Alderman, 2008). According to Davis (2013), space and place are powerful forms of communication that help construct narratives of identity and belonging. Rhetorical and metaphorical studies of places and/or objects, such as quilts, gravestones, coffee houses, markets, parks, cityscapes, museums and monuments show that objects and the built environment may be just as packed with hidden meaning as words (Lynch, 2013). Public symbols are part of the larger cultural landscapes that reflect and legitimate the normative social order. The specific building, neighbourhood and the city in which each museum is located constitute a significant aspect of its rhetorical power.

It has been suggested above that museums and memorials are not neutral (Johnson and Thomas, 1998; Crampton, 2001; Lynch, 2013). They provide a text for critical examination that seeks to uncover the voices and communities outside of museum rhetoric (Mancino, 2015). An analysis of the museums’ discursive contours reveals their cultural placement as key sites for public memory. Exhibitions in museums shape museum narratives and visitors’ opportunities to engage and make meaningful connections to both public and personal memories. Artefacts used in museums are interpretive, and through their reconfiguration they reveal how information is prioritised.
According to Kaylor (2009), not only is the inclusion of artefacts in museums rhetorical, but the style and placement of the artefacts involves a process of ‘decontextualising’ and ‘re-contextualising’ meaning. Also, how a visitor moves through a museum and passes by artefacts and related images and texts is important in a museum’s textual analysis (Lynch, 2013).

Museums, together with memorials, are important sites at which national traditions are invented. They are also major repositories of a country’s stock of objects and specimens of educational value (Johnson and Thomas, 1998; Crampton, 2001). As key institutions through which people understand their past and present identities, museums and memorials are a mirror through which a nation comes to understand itself. They are considered to be trustworthy houses of ‘authenticity’ and ‘history’, and as such they are among the most prominent institutions for education and for preservation of the past. As gatekeepers of history and the past, they are also spaces in which social, civic, and national identities are preserved, displayed and shaped (Sodaro, 2013).

Museums are never politically or culturally neutral, and behind every exhibit is an ideology; the result of many conscious or unconscious acts of selecting what to include and what to exclude (Stanish, 2008). Museum space is now recognised as a space with history of its own, a space active in the making of meaning and, most importantly, a space open to change (Geoghegan, 2010). Like museums, memorials are erected to signify important people, places and events in history. They provide a strong, visible, legible representation of national identity and values, and in the process lend a nation both historical and conceptual grounding (Stevens, 2015). Also, like museums, they are
not neutral in terms of their political purpose. They are designed and activated in ways that promulgate a version of national identity that explains military achievement as a national virtue; a part of the national mythscape (Sumartojo, 2016).

Memorial museums are edifices of commemoration (Jaques-Ross, 2011). Memorials are often landmarks that pay homage to lives lost and locations where devastation occurred. They are intended to celebrate or honour the memory of those who perished in the devastation. Memorials address future audiences, seeking to ‘colonise’ an imagined future with heroic values of the current time (Ashley, 2016). Memorials could be sites of conflicting emotions, as it is in the memorial places that memories converge, condense, and conflict. Memorialising requires more than just the marking of an event; it also incorporates the construction of what the marker should signify to future generations. Memorials created to honour the dead are inspired by the overwhelming power of grief; the belief that the presence of the deceased can be felt and recognised; and the understanding that the place where life was lost is important for memorialisation (Veil, Sellnow, and Heald, 2011).

The deep-seated motivations for memorial creation, namely, overwhelming grief, the presence of the dead and the significance of the location, assist in the rhetorical transformation of a place of death and loss into sacred ground (Veil et al., 2011). Memorials represent a powerful case of a space of absence in which people have simultaneous experiences of both the absence and the presence of death. Such a space of absence need not literally be a space, but can also be an object that has the
ability to evoke this response (the deceased need not actually be interred in that location) (Ochsner, 1997).

Memorial museums are sites where identity is represented, official memory is canonised and the dominant historical narrative is made visible to the present (Radonic, 2014). Memorial museums are specific kinds of museums dedicated to a historic event commemorating some form of mass suffering. These constructions are also not autonomous (Jaques-Ross, 2011). They focus and direct memory and perform similar commemorative functions to monuments (Teeger and Vinitzky-Seroussi, 2007). These structures of commemoration are a blend of the memorial, which is defined as anything that serves in remembrance of a person or event, and the museum is an institution devoted to the acquisition, conservation, study, exhibition and educational interpretation of objects with scientific, historical or artistic value. In many cases, graveyards and fields containing corpses and human ashes are situated on the site or close to memorial museums (Jaques-Ross, 2011).

The 1970s saw unprecedented growth of museums in the Western Industrialised world (Burton and Scott, 2003). This period experienced museum boom both quantitatively, that is, in terms of numbers of new museums, and qualitatively, in terms of significance attributed to museums in these Western societies (Burton and Scott, 2003). Museums have come to be acknowledged as part of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984) which is associated with the increasing commodification of culture since the late twentieth century (Hamnett and Shoval, 2003; Grodach, 2008; Gulyás, 2009). Sayer (1997)
refers to this phenomenon as the economisation of culture, while Harrison (1993; 1997) expands on the phenomenon and analyses the relationship between museums and the economisation of culture through tourism. A further inquiry suggests that the expanding role of cultural institutions such as museums in advanced capitalist economies represents the imperatives of sustainable development (Herreman, 1998; Taftus and Milne, 1999; Henderson, 2000; Hyndman and Amarasingam, 2014).

In the contemporary era museums have become an increasingly visible and significant feature of cities around the world, especially in urban redevelopment and city marketing strategies. They promote cultural economy and create a more attractive image that enables cities to compete regionally and globally for tourists, business and new residents (Taftus and Milner, 1999; Loukaitou-Sideris and Grodach, 2004). The educational and cultural mandates of museums are being transformed as they play an increasingly important role in urban economic development and in tourism promotion strategies (Taftus and Milne, 1999). Museums have become important contributors to the urban economy (van Aalst and Boogaarts, 2002), as they evolve as part and parcel of the consumerism which is prevalent in today’s societies (Herreman, 1998; Wollaston, 2006).

Representation of museums has undergone some changes. The needs and expectations of museum professionals and visitors have become increasingly sophisticated. Weil (1996) (cited in Panero, 2016) understands museums as moving from being about something to being for somebody. Traditionally, the core activities of
museums have been the conservation and the pursuit of scholarly research (van Aalst and Boogaarts, 2002). The museum of the past focused on its permanent exhibitions, however, the museum of the present shifts from its established role to cater for the wishes of the many visitors (van Aalst and Boogaarts, 2002; Panero, 2016), thus today’s museums are visitor driven.

Museums of the past tended to take a homogenous representation of people in that they ignored factors such as age, class, gender, sexuality, and religious and political affiliation. Established museums are now beginning to adopt a different approach, and are trying to present the visitors more as individuals and less as a statistics (Wollaston, 2006). The challenge for contemporary museums is that they have to become more responsive – in all aspects of their development, which includes their operations, functioning and programming – to the diversity and constant demographic changes. This needs to be so as the environment that transforms the work of museums emerges (Herreman 1998; Sodaro, 2013). Going to a museum has increasingly been presented as taking part in a ‘spectacle’. Moreover, in their policies and programming, museums increasingly accentuate participation by the public at large (van Aalst and Boogaarts, 2002).

It has been shown above that if museums are to remain relevant for modern visitors, they must adapt to meet the changing needs and expectations of their users (Chang, 2006; Marty, 2007). Visitors are easily distracted and have many options from which to choose. Most visitors prefer a short and effective trip to a museum so that they can
easily fit in other activities. Combination arrangements, like the so-called multipurpose trips, are often included in the tour packages offered by travel agents (van Aalst and Boogaarts, 2002), therefore, successful museums of the 21st century need to be able to communicate effectively with visitors and be willing to become better listeners.

Against the modern contexts of development of museums and their concomitant stability, postmodern frameworks show that contemporary museum activities are increasingly fragmented and superficial, and demand little commitment from the participants (Burton and Scott, 2003), whereas museums that are traditional modernist institutions demand time and engagement. In the postmodern period representations of museums have changed and their social purpose is being revised within the framework of consumption. Moreover, in the postmodern era places have also lost their individuality and assumed some characteristics of far off places in a highly globalised world (Jonas, 2011), and this then suggests that museums can ill afford not to embrace diversity.

Today’s museums reflect the co-existence of cultures and a break from the crypto-racist frameworks (Stanish, 2008). This means that they retain their status as prestigious temples of art and science, but also aspire to serve as forums for the representation of diverse identities and points of view (Loukaitou-Sideris and Grodach, 2004). The use of new technologies and digital means of representation play a significant role in this new orientation (van Aalst and Boogaarts, 2002). Today’s visitors have the expectation that when they walk into a museum, they will be interacting with the content on display, that
is, curating their own virtual exhibits, sharing information about museum artefacts via social media, or participating in some kind of public dialogue around issues important to them (Gibson, 2016; Mittelman, 2016). Museums have to promote personal value and be relevant to the visitor, by allowing opportunities for visitor participation and interactivity (Mancino, 2015). Museums now also emphasise three themes: experiential learning, personalised experiences, and visitors as experiential consumers.

In order to appeal to younger generations who have grown up immersed in technology, the internet and other social media, museums themselves have to become a form of mass media. The new museums have to be geared towards a society that is increasingly looking for emphatic experiences and instant illumination. These new experiential museums are focused more on teaching and creating an experience for the visitor than they are on the more traditional museological functions of collecting and displaying; rather than simply telling the story of the past, experiential museums seek to make the visitor ‘experience’ it (Sodaro, 2013).

Being public institutions, museums are also recognised for their role as community change agents (Munley and Roberts, 2006; Nolan, 2010). As structures that reflect social class experiences, their facilities and environments are required to be accessible and inclusive for the broader public (Chang, 2006).
The above section has defined museums and memorials. It further explored their role in a changing globalised environment. The conceptual orientation of this study is presented in the next section.

1.4 THEORETICAL REFLECTIONS ON DARK TOURISM

The major theories of dark tourism that emerged from an extensive literature review, and which are presented comprehensively in Chapter two, are summarised in Figure 1.1. The theories include: thanatopsis; a shift from an industrial to a post-industrial mode of production and consumption; relational tourism; reality and authenticity; tourist gaze and utility of meaning; and questions of the dark in dark tourism. This diversity of theories of dark tourism is perhaps a reflection of the now dominant post-modern paradigm which is noted for its hostility to dominant meta-narratives (Smith, 2004). These models represented in Figure 1.1 are used to frame the research aims and research questions.

Figure 1.1 Main theories framing this study (Source: Author)
1.5 AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study is to understand the motivations to visit dark tourism sites in South Africa.

The objectives of this study are to:

1.5.1 Understand why international and South African tourists visit sites associated with death, pain, and suffering;

1.5.2 Find out the reasons for visits to places associated with poverty and slums, internationally and in South Africa;

1.5.3 Investigate the roles of modern communication media, marketing and intermediaries in dark tourism;

1.5.4 Analyse how international and South African tourists understand dark tourism sites;

1.5.5 Evaluate how curators interpret the museums which are the locations of this study.

1.6 NEED FOR THE STUDY

This study is relevant and necessary for the following reasons:

1.6.1 Dark tourism is an emerging field of research. Given South Africa’s colonial and apartheid history, there is a huge potential for dark tourism to grow in this country.

1.6.2 This study is important in that it will inform policy and management of dark tourism.
1.7 GUIDING QUESTIONS

This study is guided by the following key questions about dark tourism:

1.7.1 Why do international and South African tourists visit sites associated with death, pain and suffering? This question sought to determine if there were motives to visit sites associated with painful pasts.

1.7.2 What are the reasons for tourists to visit places associated with poverty and slums, internationally and in South African? People visited sites of poverty and slums which Rolfes (2010) describes as poorism, therefore, this question wanted to understand if there were reasons that informed these visits.

1.7.3 What is the role of modern communication media, marketing and intermediaries in dark tourism sites? Some theory states that dark tourism is mediated by modern communication media and the totality of the modern project, it is because of this assumption that this study investigated if these elements promoted dark tourism.

1.7.4 How do international and South African tourists understand dark tourism sites? This study needed to understand the meaning that visitors attached to dark tourism sites. The meaning that visitors had of these sites would determine how they related to them.

1.7.5 How do curators interpret the museums which are the sites of study of this research project? This study also deemed it important to determine the meaning that curators had of the research sites. Curators’ understanding of the research sites would determine how they were presented to visitors and such presentations would in turn influence the impression that visitors would have of the study sites.
1.8 LOCATION OF THE STUDY SITES

This study was conducted in three sites associated with dark pasts in South Africa: the Robben Island Museum (near Cape Town); the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg; and the Hector Pieterson Memorial and Museum in Soweto (named after Hector Pieterson, the first student to be killed during the 1976 student uprising in Soweto). Chapter three discusses the relevance and significance of the study sites in detail, and Figures 3.1 and 3.2 in Chapter three show the location of the study sites.

1.9 METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This study investigated the motivations to engage in dark tourism in South Africa. It argued that motivations to engage in dark tourism would only be uncovered by exploring the subjective experiences of those who engaged in this phenomenon (Ryan, Coughlan, and Cronin, 2007). This study also sought to understand how tourists interpreted dark tourism, and to obtain their narrative accounts of dark tourism sites. Hence, a qualitative research approach was considered an appropriate approach to arrive at this understanding.

The qualitative research approach stresses social interaction, social construction and the creation of meaning (Rapport, Clement, Doel, and Hutchings, 2015). It is used to examine subjective human experience by using non-statistical methods of analysis (Ingham-Broomfield, 2015). The qualitative research approach is a major tool in the quest for a deeper and broader understanding of the meanings of events, activities, situations and actions of research participants. The aim of qualitative research is
usually to understand the phenomena and processes by considering why and how they occur, and not just the ‘what’, ‘where’ and ‘when’ of things. Qualitative research ‘digs deeper’ than the numerical data generated by quantitative studies, and qualitative methods offer the ability to reach the parts that other methods cannot reach (Sinkovics, Penz, and Ghauri, 2005; Shuval, Harker, Roudsati, Groce, Mills, Siddiqi, and Shachak, 2011; Abdullahi, Senekal, van Zyl-Schalekamp, Amzat, and Saliman, 2012; Arendt, Roberts, Strohbehn, Paez, and Meyer, 2012; Shelton, Smith, and Mort, 2014; Barnham, 2015).

A qualitative research approach has been chosen because it offers insights into the question of why people engage in dark tourism, and in the process the researcher will gain a better understanding of what dark tourism is. In order words, the qualitative research approach provides a way to get an in-depth understanding of the underlying reasons, attitudes and motivations of visitors. It focuses on the complexities of content, experience and meaning, thus enhancing the depth of understanding of dark tourism (Gaya and Smith, 2016; Haycock-Stuart, MacLaren, MacLachlan, and Jam, 2016).

Chapter three expands on the above exposition and provides a detailed discussion of the research methodology of this study.

1.10 DARK TOURISM AND ETHICAL ISSUES

There are ethical implications to travel and tourism (Payne and Dimanche, 1996; Hudson, and Miller, 2005; Hudson, 2007; Lansing and De Vries, 2007) which relate to
environmental and social considerations (Earth Island Institute, 2006). The consensus is that tourism needs to remain in harmony with the natural and social environment (Kruczek and Kruczek, 2016). Some have even suggested a need for a code of ethics in tourism consumption (Fleckenstein and Huebsch, 1999). Furthermore, others have proposed that ethical issues would need to be integrated in a country’s overall tourism strategy (Carbone, 2005). However, evaluation of tourism and sustainable development and ethical codes has not yielded positive results (Stroebel, 2015). For example, South African tourism, which brands itself as a preferred African tourist destination bears ethical dilemma and challenges. South African tourism brands itself as African and at the same time as not African (Mathers and Landau, 2007). The strategy targets the African tourism market, but at the same time South Africa must grapple with issues of xenophobia. Similarly, it cannot be denied that the dark tourism practice remains disputable (Stone, 2015). In Western secular societies ordinary death is often consigned to medicine and related professions, yet extra-ordinary death is remembered for popular consumption (Stone, 2015). This raises questions about morality and contemporary approaches to death and representations of the dead in this post-modern era (Stone, 2015). With the foregoing discussion as a backdrop, this study is aware of ethical challenges in tourism in general and in dark tourism in particular. However, this study subscribes to ethical tourism.

1.11 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

This study has six chapters, which are organised as follows:
Chapter one presents the introduction to this study. The chapter covers the following: the relevance of the topic as a subject of scholarly study; museums and memorials as objects of inquiry; the conceptual framework of this study; the sites of this study; the research methodology; and the structure of this study.

Chapter two presents the literature review and theoretical framework of this study which centres around: thanatopsis, a shift from an industrial to a post-industrial mode of production and consumption; relational tourism; reality and authenticity; tourist gaze and utility of meaning; and the interrogation of the dark tourism construct.

Chapter three presents the methodology of this study. It discusses the relationship between the philosophy of research and research methodology, the study areas, the research methodology, research ethics, the disposal of data and the challenges encountered in this study.

Chapter four presents findings of this study on motivations to engage in dark tourism. It concluded that, generally, the desire to learn and to pay homage to the victims of difficult pasts motivates dark tourism. This study also found that intermediaries such as modern communication media, tour operators and tour guides, and institutions of learning particularly in the USA played major roles in the tours to the research sites.

Chapter five deals with findings how visitors and curators understand and conceptualise the research sites. While some visitors viewed the research sites as representations of
hope, others equated the Robben Island Museum to a shrine. But the overall view which both visitors and curators held is that the research sites were places of learning.

The final chapter evaluates the findings of this study against the theoretical framework of dark tourism and also makes policy recommendations and suggestions for future research.

1.12 CONCLUSION

This chapter has introduced this study. It explains that dark tourism as a phenomenon dates back to ancient times, and since the last quarter of the 20th century there has been an increased interest in visiting places of or associated with death, pain and suffering. Moreover, there has been a notable increase in interest in dark tourism as an academic field of study, especially since the 1990s. A brief introduction to the qualitative research approach of this study has been presented, and the chapter concludes by presenting the structure of the thesis. The next chapter presents a comprehensive analysis of dark tourism theory and a review of the literature on this theme.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter introduced this study. The main areas that were covered included the statement of the problem, the statement of the aims of this study and a brief overview of the research methodology. The present chapter is a critical review of the current literature on the subject. The chapter begins by describing the growing interest in dark tourism, and proceeds to trace the historical developments of dark tourism; however, the main focus of the chapter is an assessment of the contemporary theories of dark tourism.

2.2 GROWING INTEREST IN DARK TOURISM

As it was shown in Chapter one, touristic interests in places associated with human suffering and death have become a feature in recent years (Seaton, 1996; 1999; 2009a; Lennon and Foley, 2000; Timothy and Boyd, 2006; Best, 2007; Lisle, 2007; Hartmann, 2009; Robb, 2009; Burman, 2010; Potts, 2012). Evidence suggests that contemporary tourists are increasingly travelling to destinations associated with death and suffering, sites of dark events (Sharpley, 2009). This fascination is observed to have been there for some time. Recounting the massive flood at Johnstown in the US in 1889, Godbey (2006) concludes that this disaster offered an opportunity to examine late 19th century attitudes about tourism and tragedy. Curious visitors flocked to the scene of the disaster (instead of away from it) and seemed to get a shivery pleasure from seeing a city turned into a morgue. Johnstown’s rubber-necks, behaving like tourists, reframed
disaster into the rhetoric of leisure. Visitors to Johnstown took souvenirs and pictures of the destruction, and the morgue was a destination of choice where people seemed to be attracted by morbid curiosity (Godbey, 2006).

According to Smith (1998), the relationship between tourism and war, despite its horrors and destruction (probably also because of it), also constitutes the largest single category of tourist attractions in the world. Smith (1998) refers to a French tourism scholar, Marie L’Enfant, who once observed that every hamlet in Europe advertises its ‘ruins’ to tourists. No matter how small or large, battered or reconstructed, virtually all of the publicised ‘attractions’ are war related - where there is war there is tourism (Smith, 1998).

Published literature suggests that dark tourism occurs in a number of variants, namely, slum tourism (Meschkank, 2011; Dürr, 2012; Dürr and Jaffe, 2012; Frenzel, 2012); poverty tourism or poorism (Rolfes, 2010); pro-poor tourism (Rogerson, 2006); cemetery tourism (Venbrux, 2010); tragedy tourism (Godbey, 2006); fright tourism (Bristow and Newman, 2004); slave tourism (Dann and Seaton, 2001); volunteer tourism (Stoddart and Rogerson, 2004; Wymer, Self and Findley, 2010; Koleth, 2014), ghost tourism (Gentry, 2007), and penal tourism (Welch, 2013) or prison tourism (Barton and Brown, 2015). These variants, also called ‘new tourism’, are attributed to transformations in tourism. Hence, tourism is becoming an important site for the development of ethical and consumption initiatives, especially following critiques of the social, cultural and environmental impacts of mass-tourism, and in the context of more
individualised post-Fordism desires (Stoddart and Rogerson, 2004; Dürr and Jaffe, 2012). Dürr (2012), Dürr and Jaffe (2012), and Stoddart and Rogerson (2004) further note the new trend of pro-poor, community based, volunteer, ethical and other forms of responsible tourism, which they contend are viewed as better options for pursuing development and combating inequalities. Miller and Gonzalez (2013) situate death tourism, which is commonly known as assisted suicide, as a variant of dark tourism.

Following this brief recounting of the growing interest in dark tourism, the next section traces the historical perspectives of dark tourism.

2.3 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS OF DARK TOURISM

With regards to the historical developments of dark tourism, the discussion centres on the periods of the Middle Ages and the Age of Enlightenment.

2.3.1 The Middle Ages

Some form of dark tourism emerged and developed during the Middle Ages, around the third century when early Christians undertook religious pilgrimages (Seaton, 2009a). This period is considered to be the golden age of religious pilgrims in the western world, which began after the persecution of Christians by Romans had ended (Deprez, 2007). Becoming a pilgrim was a serious commitment during this era (Craig, 2003). The Roman Christian doctrine promoted and espoused the ideal that Christians had to undertake pilgrimages (Maignant, 2007). Important pilgrimage sites during this time were Rome (Italy), Jerusalem (Israel), Compostella (Spain) and Canterbury (England).
Deprez (2007) identifies the tomb of Christ in Jerusalem as the most venerated of all the pilgrimage sites. In the Orient, Rome appeared early as a very busy pilgrimage site. Pilgrims came from Britain, Gaul (now France) and Ireland to worship the tombs of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and to visit the catacombs and memorials to early Christian persecutions (Deprez, 2007). The church also promoted pilgrimages which involved visits to shrines of venerated saints (Theilmann, 1984).

Most of the pilgrimages which the church promoted were regarded as penitential and sacrificial acts (Theilmann, 1984; Craig, 2003; Olsen, 2010). During the height of the Middle Ages, pilgrimages were regarded as meritorious and pious (Turner, 1973; Favreau-Lilie, 1995). Pilgrimages were undertaken for the purposes of spiritual union (Campo, 1998; Wynn, 2007), and they were motivated by the idea of a relationship of physical proximity with the dead (Maignant, 2007). At the shrines or gravesides, pilgrims supposed that they were not alone but in communication with the deceased. Pilgrims wished to touch some relic, or to stand on the ground where a martyr perished, or where a body was interred, or where a vision took place. Presence at the graveside provided an occasion to reminisce about the deceased person, and to rehearse various thoughts about them. Medieval Roman Christianity interpreted visiting bodies of the saints as a cathartic act. At the sites pilgrims became one with the Christian saints who had lived and suffered, and they would go away spiritually refreshed, renewed and hopeful (Maignant, 2007).
The systematic study of saints and their cults is one of the oldest areas of medieval history. The concept of the cult of saints, relics and shrines played a major role in promoting pilgrimages. The cult of relics can be seen as one of the most singular and characteristic aspects of western Christianity in the Middle Ages (Bynum and Gerson, 1997). The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church defines the word ‘relics’ as applying to the material remains of a saint after his death, as well as the sacred objects that have been in contact with his body (Bonser, 1962). The cult of relics goes back not to the earliest days of Christianity, but rather to the second and third centuries AD, a period during which Romans persecuted emergent Christians (Bynum and Gerson, 1997). In the early Roman world, the persecutors of Christians maintained strong prohibitions against moving the dead bodies or dividing them up or burying them within the walls of the city of Rome. The result was that early Christian martyrs who had died by execution or burning did not have their remains buried peacefully and respectfully. However, with the recognition of Christianity as a religion by the late third and early fourth centuries, the Fathers of the Roman Christian Church became convinced of the miraculous powers of the fragments of the martyrs and they came to be revered as domiciles of power and having special access to the divine. Hence, these relics soon became sought after articles (Bynum and Gerson, 1997).

The acquisition of relics and the pilgrimages to the shrines in which they were displayed became two of the customary activities of the medieval church. In the early years the bodies of saints and the holy men were conserved by friends and followers as objects to be revered and cherished. The idea was that worship was reserved for God, but honour
was accorded to the relics (Bonser, 1962). The bodies of saints and holy men were considered to be imbued with spiritual power or grace and so were their graves, and this power was as much in the parts (fragments) as in the whole (dead body). Hence, a custom emerged to dismember the bodies and to distribute their parts. It was held that one who touched the bones of a martyr received a share of the sanctification from the grace dwelling in them (Bonser, 1962).

With the decay in moral standards in the medieval church, the once perceived laudable role of relics began to be used by monasteries to enhance their status (Bonser, 1962). It was decreed by the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 that no church would be dedicated without the placing its relics, which were required for the consecration of altars. This necessitated the fabrication of a relic if no genuine article was to be found. If a monastery was poor, it would be tempted to secure some relic which would be a source of income and wealth for the monastery, this would happen through indulgences which visitors paid to view the relics on display at the monastery. As more and more pilgrimages were made to the monasteries and shrines where relics were displayed, even more bodies were divided up and displayed as fragments to take advantage of income generation opportunities presented by pilgrims. Relics and reliquaries were traded, stolen and purchased. It was believed that they represented ordinary mortals before God’s throne. The most popular body part reliquaries were those of the heads and arms, the logic was that the head and arms are the most expressive and communicative parts of the body (Bynum and Gerson, 1997). According to Bonser (1962), shrines, relics and reliquaries attracted an increasing number of pilgrims.
The sixteenth century saw the weakening of Roman Christianity as the Protestant Reformation challenged its doctrines. Moreover, Europe was also becoming more secular (Seaton, 2009b). Whereas during the Middle Ages pilgrimages were spiritual, many late medieval pilgrimages tended to follow a more formal pattern than before, even to the point of becoming largely ceremonial actions. Some pilgrims were simply tourists, travelling from place to place, with little thought to the spiritual significance of their actions. Also, pilgrimages were undertaken in order for the pilgrims to have their social standing in their communities enhanced. A successful pilgrimage, especially to a major site, gave the returned pilgrim a cachet of holiness (Theilmann, 1984). According to Favreau-Lilie (1995), pilgrimages were also motivated by private incentives such as love, a thirst for travel and adventure, a desire to see the world, and the hope of improving one’s social prestige. At the close of the Middle Ages the numbers of pilgrims who went to Jerusalem solely for religious motives were marginal. Favreau-Lilie (1995) further adds that pilgrims in the Holy Land needed money at all times to pay for confessions, alms, pious souvenirs, votive prayers, or perhaps for palm branches. Journeys to Jerusalem undertaken in the twelfth century for purely pious motives to visit one shrine or another developed into mere indulgence pilgrimages in the late Middle Ages, and indulgences also served the purpose of raising funds for the churches.

During the later years of the Middle Ages, a gap developed between the set structure of Christendom and people’s yearning for a freer encounter with all possibilities of life and art (Stumpf, 1977). Within the church itself there were debates about the appropriateness of employing philosophy as the hand maiden of theology. This
eventually led to the conclusion that as a discipline, philosophy was separate from theology and religion. This period marked the beginning of the Renaissance period. This was a time of discovery and emancipation. New continents were discovered and new worlds of the mind and spirit were opened. The Renaissance served as a transitional period between the Middles Ages and the Enlightenment period (Stumpf, 1977).

2.3.2 The Age of Enlightenment

The Enlightenment denoted the period circa 1660-1800, which was understood as a gaining of true knowledge or understanding (Sherratt, 2000). During Enlightenment there was open disdain for organised Christianity, which was seen as the major cause of Europe’s intellectual immaturity. Europe embraced and espoused scientific inquiry about the natural world as a means to liberate people’s minds from the chains of superstition and ignorance (Donato, Schwartz, and Weber, 1992). The philosophy of Enlightenment, also known as the Age of Reason, passionately believed in independent reason which surpassed all forms of superstition, unexamined presuppositions, dogma (Rockmore, 1987), freedom to live one’s life unconstrained by orthodoxy, freedom from superstitious fears, an unenlightened past (Donato et al., 1992) and the pursuit of liberation (Coyle, 2009). All of these developments motivated travel in new ways and expanded the number and kinds of places people thought were worth visiting. The rise of the Enlightenment era signalled the beginning of controversies over religious issues in the 18th century. During this time the concern was not only with the different interpretations of Christianity, but also with the appearance of secularism and
agnosticism, which tended to question the entire legacy of Christianity and all other religions (Seaton, 2009a; Mansouri and Keshavarzi, 2014).

Antiquarianism and Romanticism are offshoots of this period (Seaton, 2009a). Antiquarianism represents the quest for national heritage in the western world. According to Kaufmann (2001), the term antiquarian describes an activity or interest that is concerned with documents and objects of the past in an effort to reconstitute their appearance and nature. Antiquarianism provides a basis for historical research and relates to keeping alive a sense of the past. It brings to mind such activities as the restoration and preservation of the past in the form of, for example, colonial architecture and the erection of Revolutionary War monuments. Antiquarianism involves the geographical tracking down of national heritage and heritage sites, which could include battlefields, the death sites of national heroes, ruined monuments and castles (Michaelson, 1956).

There are four themes in the development of antiquarianism and archaeology during the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries in Western Europe (Hoffman, 1974). Firstly, the emergence of the national states interested in glorifying and publicising their ancient past; secondly, the interest in both the Classical and non-Classical history (and pre-history) of Europe; thirdly, the interest in the recovery and description of the ancient and curious artefacts and monuments; and finally, the beginnings of accurate fieldwork and description within a context of general and comparative studies. During the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, these interests were espoused by an
increasingly educated and prosperous class of gentleman scholars who carried the
tradition of archaeology through its formative stages. Their interests and discoveries
finally permeated the great national museums, which became the focal points for
research in the nineteenth century.

Brylowe (2012) identifies two categories of antiquarianism, the classical and the
popular. The classical antiquarianism was commonly associated with a constellation of
affinities, including cosmopolitanism, the reverence for classical art, an interest in pagan
religions and some frank and omnivorous appetites, which often found outlet in grand
tourism and the homosexual club culture and its attendant sexual liaisons. By contrast,
popular antiquarianism was characterised as more isolating, its practitioners often pre-
occupied with the ancient artefacts, old ballads and vernacular languages. There is
also another Western brand of antiquarianism that deals mainly with the
commemoration of violence and sudden death (Brylowe, 2012). Violence and sudden
death are issues of interest in dark tourism. Antiquarianism led to the development of a
new concept called national heritage. The antiquarianism movement was the first
manifestation of the secular-sacred in travel (Seaton, 2009a).

Once the idea of antiquarianism took hold it stimulated a cult of tourism amongst lay
populations to the sites the antiquarians had described, as well as to others associated
with dead cultural figures – literary, artistic, military, political, religious and communal –
that were regarded as makers, shapers or charismatic representations of nationhood
(Seaton, 2009b). Later still concepts of heritage and antiquarianism stimulated the
establishment of museums, galleries, the preservation of important buildings and sites, and the inauguration of many kinds of ‘heritage’ organisations (Seaton, 2009b). All of these developments motivated travel in new ways and expanded the number and kind of places people thought worth visiting. Monasteries which had been an excluded category of location, after the Protestant Reformation, gradually became popular tourists’ targets, seen less as religious institutions than as architectural and cultural monuments of emerging national heritage.

The Age of Enlightenment also provided a fertile environment for Romanticism and Romantic literature to develop and flourish (Mansouri and Keshavarzi, 2014). Romanticism refers to a period of European thought and art running from the Middle to late 18\textsuperscript{th} century through to the 1840s (Bennett, 2006; Goodman, 2008). Romanticism was a revolt against, and a rejection of, Enlightenment or its manifestations (Parker, 1918). The genesis of the philosophy of Romanticism is attributed to Rousseau who was disgusted with the social order of the time which was based on ownership of land and goods which came with industrialisation (Furst, 1968; Burgum, 1941; Bewell, 2004). This led him to idealise the primitive state of humankind and to call for a return to nature. He developed a slogan that promoted liberty, fraternity and equality. Romanticism cultivated notions of primitiveness, nature, spontaneity and imagination as the means of countering such concepts as civilisation, reason and learning. Romanticism represented a cultural nostalgia for simpler times, or an escape from revolutionary industrial history. The concept of nature, natural harmony and beauty pervaded romantic thought (Bewell, 2004).
Romanticism is identified with youth, the primitive and love of the simple, spontaneous and untutored life and also with pastiness, fever, disease and death; with turbulence, conflict and chaos, but also with peace; with the exotic, the mysterious, darkness, moonlight, enchanted castles, giants, nameless terrors, but also light, sun, pastoral idylls, and the sights and sounds of healthy country life (American Academy of Arts and Sciences (AAAS, 1966). Romanticism is also associated with yearning for the exercising of will and self-assertion, purity and motive, the sacrifice of life in search of some unattainable ideal – and above all, an abhorrence of any sense of compromise. It is also associated with free choice. It is based on dialogic and dialectical models emphasising the interaction between ‘mind and nature’, and often emphasising the power of the sublime (Bewell, 2004).

The Gothic era emerged and sprouted out of Romanticism in the 18th century (Morris, 1985; Parker, 2005; Seaton, 2009a). However, Hogle (1998) suggests that Romanticism and Gothicism are interrelated. While Romanticism is noted for promoting imagination, Gothicism is marked by unbridled, unconstrained imagination (Alam, 2012). The Gothic era represents opposition to the Enlightenment era of reason, the privileging of science, the rejection of superstition, and all that society attempted to suppress in the name of psychic and social stability. The Gothic era is noted for the celebration of the dark, disorder, ruin, deviancy and transgression (Parker, 2005). The Gothic era negates, denies and buries in the shadow that which had been brightly ignited, and brings into the light that which had been repressed. The Gothic era is associated with the mysterious dark and dusty cloisters, stormy nights in wild nature or in towering
castles, long shadows that hide those who are inclined to lurk in them and whose identities are never easily determined, and a feeling of sublime which is horror that excites and intrigues (Crawford and Worley, 2009).

Whereas the Gothic of the Renaissance was a label applied to buildings that departed from the golden age of symmetry and proportion, the Gothic which developed in the middle of the 18th century was influenced by the notions of the ‘sublime’ and the ‘picturesque’. The sublime was characterised by vastness, darkness, danger, power and suddenness (Parker, 2005). Parker (2005) further states that the emergence of concepts like the ‘sublime’ and the ‘picturesque’ began to make nature into an object of a new form of aesthetic interest. The Gothic had a preoccupation with death and disasters, often historical ones, set in castles, wild ruins and picturesque landscapes. Scenes such as those of execution, incarcerations, ghostly appearances and hauntings are important features of the Gothic. All these elements of the Gothic entered the Romantic psyche and had an impact on burgeoning tourism tastes (Seaton, 2009a).

A Romantic sublime moment relates to a liberating escape from the self and its associated self-consciousness (Whale, 2001). Burke (2005) writes of the sublime as anything that is fitted to thrill the ideas of pain and danger, or anything that is sort of terrible, or operated in a manner analogous to terror. The sublime is the production of the strongest emotion which the mind is capable of feeling. Seaton (1996) describes the sublime as a sense of elevated pleasure produced by exposure to phenomena that inculcated terror and awe. Burke (2005) invented numerous properties of the
phenomena likely to induce sublime effects, including: infinity, darkness, solitude, vacuity and uniformity. The idea was that pain might produce the sublime pleasure. Seaton (1996) points out that the theory on the sublime directly relates to interest in murder and violent death, the subject of dark tourism. Apart from emphasising the power of the sublime, Romanticism is also credited with privileging the subjective, aesthetic taste at the expense of older notions of communal morality and belief.

Appreciation of the sublime could be encountered by travelling to untamed natural areas such as crashing waterfalls, ice-bound wastes, dizzying peaks, dangerous seas, frightful chasms, mighty storms, volcanoes, earthquakes, and also in human affairs through displays of conspicuous power, ritual pomp and splendour, and in some of the grander memorials to the distant dead (Seaton, 2009a). Romanticism helped to reconstruct individual subjectivity. The fans of Romanticism were the middle class which provided the first generation of mass tourists in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The above ideas have sketched the histories and philosophies that have influenced the development of dark tourism. However, before the discussion turns to concepts that frame this study, it reviews a variety of terms that have been used to describe dark tourism. This diversity of the terms, perhaps, reflects the fact that scholarship has not been in full agreement about the theorisation of dark tourism.
2.4 KEY CONCEPTS DESCRIBING DARK TOURISM

MacCannell (1973; 1976; 1999) was one of the earliest tourism theorists to be drawn to the phenomenon which denotes dark tourism, and characterised it as negative sightseeing. This involved touring places of disgust that were distinguished by uncontrolled garbage heaps, muggings, abandoned and dilapidated buildings, polluted rivers, and other spaces of social ills. A number of names and strands have since emerged to intellectualise the phenomena that are associated with dark or negative sightseeing: black spots tourism (Rojek, 1993); thanatourism (Seaton, 1996); assassination sites (Foley and Lennon, 1996); dissonant tourism (Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996), holocaust tourism (Ashworth, 1996); dark tourism (Foley and Lennon 1996; Lennon and Foley, 2000); morbid tourism (Blom, 2000); grief tourism (O’Neill, 2002); and disaster tourism (Bly, 2003). Other concepts include: tourism to places with a difficult past (Hartmann, 2009); dissonant tourism and dissonant heritage (Ashworth, 1996; 2002; Soyez, 2009; Ashworth and Isaac, 2015); difficult heritage tourism (Knudsen, 2011); a heritage of atrocity and a heritage associated with unwanted memory (Isaac and Budrtye-Ausiejiene, 2015); collective memory (Yankholmes and McKercher, 2015); conflict tourism (Cochrane, 2015); war-zone tourism (Marhouse, 2016); and post-disaster tourism (Tucker, Shelton, and Bae, 2016).

The geographical perspective to dark tourism was presented by Lowenthal (1985) and subsequently Hartmann (2014) who identified geographies of memory; Foote and Azaryahu’s (1997) landscapes of violent tragedy; Hoelscher and Alderman’s (2004) sites of memory (memory-scapes); disasterscapes (Perera, 2010); landscapes of
memory, and geographies of trauma (Maus, 2015). Notwithstanding this diversity of terms, the dark tourism concept has become popular in literature (Stone, 2005). So as the discussion continues it now turns to the ideas that have coalesced to explain dark tourism.

2.5 THEORETICAL REFLECTIONS ON DARK TOURISM

Conceptualisation of dark tourism can be categorised into the following theories or frameworks: thanatopsis; a shift from an industrial to a post-industrial mode of production and consumption; relational tourism; reality and authenticity; tourist gaze and utility of meaning; and, questions of dark tourism. This diversity of theories of dark tourism is perhaps a reflection of the post-modern paradigm and its hostility to dominant meta-narratives. The discussion opens with the thanatopsis concept.

2.5.1 Thanatopsis

Seaton (1996) developed the thanatopsis model of dark tourism. Thanatopsis is a component of thanatology which deals with studying death and its associated phenomena and practices (Seaton, 1996). De Quincey’s article (1827 cited in Seaton, 1996) entitled ‘On murder considered as one of fine Arts’, which was published in Blackwood’s Magazine, is at the root of Seaton’s (1996) formulation of the thanatopsis hypothesis of dark tourism. De Quincey (1827 cited in Seaton, 1996) satirically writes of murder becoming a spectacle. Murder, which would otherwise be viewed solemnly, is presented in a mode of grotesque and sinister comedy. Seaton (1996) cites the Old English Dictionary which defines thanatopsis as the contemplation of death.
Moreover, thanatopsis denotes more than just the contemplation of death. It also relates to the motivations by which contemplations of death are generated and the forms of reflective responses that such motivations tend to produce (Seaton, 1996). Thanatopsis embraces all signifying forms of representation, symbolisation and material evidence by which the ideas of death are communicated to an individual in time and space within a given society. The forms of representation of thanatopsis could include tombstones, monuments, and, statues. Thanatoptic signifiers tend to produce meanings which comprise: ideas on death in general; conceptions of an individual’s own death; and notions of the death of others, both close and distant in time and space (Seaton, 1996).

The travel facet of thanatopsis is thanatourism (Seaton, 1996). According to Seaton (1996), thanatourism is distinguished as a behavioural rather than an essentialist phenomenon. This means that thanatourism is understood in terms of a traveller's motives rather than by an attempt to specify the discrete features of a travel destination. Secondly, thanatourism is not absolute in form but exists across a continuum of intensity. The purest form of thanatourism is travel motivated exclusively by a fascination with death, irrespective of the person or persons involved. It is not initially focused on the dead, but on the forms or scale of death. The other end of the thanatourism continuum is a situation where the dead are both known to, and valued by, the visitor (for example, a visit to a war memorial commemorating a dead relative). The more differentiated and comprehensive the traveller's knowledge of the dead is, the weaker the purely thanatouristic element (Seaton, 2009a).
Stone (2005); Sharpley (2005) and Sharpley and Stone (2009) further developed the thanatoptic tradition of dark tourism on the basis of sociologists Mellor and Shilling (1993) and also from Seaton (1996). Mellor and Shilling (1993) point to the observation that ever since the field of study of sociology was founded, it has been concerned almost exclusively with life, rather than with the subject of death. Sociology relegated death as a taboo, whereas in earlier times, death and dying took place in the domestic space. From around the 1880s and 1890s aspects of death (that is, rituals, laying-out, and visiting) were increasingly shifted into civil-institutional contexts and sequestrated from the domestic realm. Death occurred in nursing homes and hospitals, and the deceased were laid out in funeral parlours rather than in the domestic space. This institutional sequestration of death, Mellor and Shilling (1993) point out, resulted in it being privatised and medicalised. Death thus became a relatively private experience, rather than being the open communal event it initially was (Stone, 2012).

Even though the changing organisation and experience of death is still in the hands of professionals, the revival of death consciousness in late modernity opened up a new field of investigation into the meaning of the modern self (Mellor and Shilling, 1993; Lee, 2004). This revival of death consciousness has rendered death to be at a crossroads. The paradox is that whereas modernity generated a disenchanted attitude towards dying, it also produced conditions that forced human kind to confront the meaning of dying. Whilst professionalisation, medication and privatisation rendered death absent, popular culture, collective grief and mortality rendered death present (Lee, 2004; Walter, 2009; Young and Light, 2016).
The contradiction goes further that; even though society removed death from the public realm, death has long been present within the wider popular culture and the media, through what Gorer (1955 cited in Stone and Sharpley, 2008, p. 584) calls society’s apparent fascination with the ‘pornography of death’. Gorer (1955 cited in Stone and Sharpley, 2008, p. 584) makes reference to the fact that while natural death became more and more smothered in prudery, violent death has played an ever-growing part in fantasies offered to mass audiences – detective stories, thrillers, westerns, war stories, spy stories, science fiction, and eventually horror stories. Fantasies like these help in making absent death present. Dale and Robinson (2011) also note the contribution of the media, in the form of detective and crime movies and television shows, in creating interest in the darker side of life; an area which normally would not have been noticed. Dale and Robinson (2011) cite the success of such television shows as Crime Watch Daily, Cold Case, Cracker, Sensing Murder, Crime Scene Investigation (CSI), and Criminal Minds as some of the factors that fuel the interest in dark tourism. Stone (2011b) views the Gunther von Hagens’ Body Worlds exhibition as a medium whereby absent death is rendered present.

Similarly, dark tourism is conceived as a representation and a touristic experience of death and dying. It is an academic field of study that represents a nexus between death and tourism scholarship (Stone, 2013). Sharpley (2005) developed a continuum of intensity framework which was first advanced by Seaton (1996) in his thanatopsis framework. Sharpley’s (2005) matrix model explains the supply and demand of dark tourism attractions and experiences. According to the model, the supply of dark tourism
attractions or experiences varies from accidental supply (that is, places that have become tourist attractions by accident) to a supply that is directly intended to exploit, for profit or otherwise, people’s thanatopsis.

When tourists visit a site where the interest in death or suffering is minimal or limited, and the site is not intended to be a tourist attraction, this is referred to as pale tourism. When a site is visited because of a fascination with death or suffering, but the site was not intended to be a dark tourism site, then this is referred to as grey tourism. In a situation where a site is intentionally established to exploit death or suffering but attracts visitors with some, but not dominant interest in death or suffering, then in such a situation one would still speak of grey tourism. In a situation where a fascination with death or suffering is satisfied by a purposeful supply of experiences intended to satisfy this fascination, however, this is called black tourism (Sharpley, 2005).


Stone’s (2006) spectrum model identifies two poles of the dark tourism supply spectrum. On the one end of the spectrum are the sites of death and suffering. These
constitute the darkest thanatourism sites, with the following attributes: a higher political influence and ideology; an education orientation; history centric (conservation/commemorative); perceived authenticity; a shorter time-scale from the event; the supply is non-purposeful; and they have a lower tourism infrastructure. At the other end of the supply spectrum are the sites associated with death and suffering, and these constitute the lighter thanatourism sites. They are marked by a lower political influence and ideology; they are entertainment oriented; they are heritage centric (commercial/romanticism); they are perceived to be inauthentic; there is non-location authenticity; there is a longer time-scale from the event; the supply is purposeful; and they have a higher tourism infrastructure (Stone, 2006).

2.5.2 Industrial to post-industrial shift

This study also asserts that dark tourism is embedded and can also be explained within a shift from an industrial to a post-industrial mode of production and consumption. This entails a mode of living where aspects of a society such as culture and heritage are packaged for tourism consumption. This form of tourism consumption started growing in the mid-20th century (Abad, 2016). It is believed to have evolved partly from concepts and drives to promote a sustainable development paradigm; a paradigm that has become a feature of the 21st century (Jansen-Verbeke, 1999; Dürr and Jaffe, 2012; Abad, 2016; Kruczek and Kruczek, 2016). As a result of the move from an industrial to a post-industrial society, tourism has been turned into a major industry (Jansen-Verbeke, 1999). Along with the growth in tourism in general, dark tourism has also become a tourism product that is increasing in popularity (Yuill, 2003) and it has been
identified as an emerging market niche (Best, 2007). Death has become a focus for mainstream tourism providers and it is being marketed as such (Stone, 2013).

Within the context of the capitalist system, the argument is that dark tourism is part of the commodification of culture and heritage. In order for the capitalist system to grow and be able to sustain itself it has to continuously mutate and revolutionise itself in what is called creative destruction (a phrase coined by the German economist Joseph Schumpeter). In the quest for economic growth and profits, market forces cannibalise and convert cultural practices into saleable commodities for economic return (Su, 2011). Similarly, disasters in the form of tornadoes, hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, uncontrolled fires, famine, and disease can all be commodified (the concept of commodification is associated with Karl Marx), appropriated and redirected to facilitate the spread of capitalism (Perera, 2010).

Commodification is a process by which things (and activities) come to be evaluated primarily in terms of their exchange and profit value, within the context of trade. The exchange value of things (and activities) becomes determined by the vicissitudes of the market (Cohen, 1972; 1988). In further describing commodification, Mrozowski (1999) makes reference to Karl Marx who views commodification as attaching exchange values and use values to things. Commodification of culture involves fetishising of the world, whereby social relations are reduced to exchange relations and measured in cash terms (Nash, 2000). Packaging of cultural activities and artefacts for the tourist market is known to be part of the commodification of culture (Venkatesh, 1992).
There has been rapid growth in the commodification of culture and heritage tourism and an associated increase in interest in the museums and historical sites since the 1980s (Goodey, 1998; Goulding, 2000; Mbaïwa, 2011). Heritage has undergone a process of industrialisation (Goulding, 2000). Interest in heritage is not limited to museums and historical sites but also includes tourism to obsolete and disused mines and breweries; fishing ports; car factories; tenement flats; castles and stately homes; cathedrals; fishing villages and past agricultural practices, all which are being turned into heritage sites (Hannabuss, 1999). Commodification of culture and heritage involves globalisation of the local; a process whereby local identities are dis-embedded from the localities to which they belong (Olsen, 2003). Heritage and culture are reduced to images which can be orchestrated for profit (Goodey, 1998).

Cases of commodification of culture began as early as the 1970s: in Scotland in the 1970s (Peach, 2007) Scottish crafts and souvenirs were commodified in order to satisfy the consumption appetites of tourists. Halewood and Hannam (2001), writing on Viking heritage tourism in Sweden, point out that this has grown since the 1970s. Halewood and Hannam (2001) add that it is the more bloodthirsty image of the Vikings that has inspired tourists to visit the sites which consist of museums, heritage centres, theme parks, village reconstructions, and seasonal trading fairs or markets supplemented by the activities of Viking re-enactment or ‘living history’ societies. Similarly, in Northern Ireland the Tourist Board has embarked on a strategy to depoliticise Irish culture in order to package and commodify it. The issue here is that culture, instead of being an engaging terrain of questions, problems or criticism, can become a commodity which
can be consumed. Commodifying the Irish culture has entailed commodifying conflict in what is dubbed ‘Troubles Tourism’. This is viewed as part of consumer capitalism (Thompson, 1999). Over time, the conflict has become absorbed into a consumable tourist commodity that sanitises the conflict into a form of heritage (Cochrane, 2015).

Heritage tourism has become a strategy to save ailing economies and tourism represents a significant phenomenon in terms of its scale, especially its global reach and its contribution to local economic development (Halewood and Hannam, 2001). Attempts to boost economic development have also involved the promotion of village heritage tourism (Xu, Yan, and Zhu, 2013). In order to keep up with the changing market environment, heritage industry has also had to increasingly put emphasis on ‘experience’, that is, first-hand experience of, for example, how people used to live (Hannabuss, 1999).

There have been criticisms of the commodification of dark tourism. There is concern that former areas of atrocity are shaped for tourist consumption and often bundled as ‘heritage’. The challenge is to maintain a balance between recreation and respect, which can be fraught with tensions. The commodification of culture can also raise questions of autonomy and authenticity in the production of heritage and built environments (Figal, 2008).

In the early 1990s Rojek (1991) observed an increased interest in what he calls black spots, which he defines as commercial developments of grave sites for celebrities or
large numbers of people who have met with sudden and violent death. During this period (early 1990s) there was also gigantic capital investment in escape areas organised around spectacle and sensation. These forms of development are characterised by Rojek (1991) as reproductions of postmodernity. One of the attributes of postmodernity is that it replaces meaning with spectacle and sensation as dominant values. The postmodernity framework is further expanded upon by Foley and Lennon (1996) and Lennon and Foley (2000), who view dark tourism as an intimation of postmodernity, where the stress on dark tourism developments is on the commercial aspect, in contrast with its possible historical/educative mission. Turning grave sites and cemeteries into tourist attractions is part of the process of de-differentiation in a post-modern culture.

In the twenty first century advancements in technology are recognised as inadvertently having played a major role in advancing dark tourism. Audio-visual media, internet technology, social media, wide access to information, media displays, images and film footage play an important role in furthering the consumption of dark tourism. Reality is replaced with an omnipresent simulation and commodification (Lennon and Foley, 2000; Dale and Robinson, 2011; Biran and Hyde, 2013), however, the goal of greater authenticity persists.

2.5.3 Relational tourism
This concept understands dark tourism within a relational framework. The relational concept derives from post-structuralism (Murdoch, 2006), and thinking of space
relationally has become the mantra of the early 21st century or since the last decade (Bosco, 2015; Sanz-Ibáñez and Clave, 2014; Spence, 2014). Poststructuralist human geographies identify places and space as relational constructs (Baldwin, 2012; Spence, 2014). Places and spaces are thus increasingly relational, with a focus on material relationalities or interactions that continuously transcend boundaries (Spence, 2014). A relational framework focuses on the interconnectedness of places. It suggests that places, rather than being discrete materialities or entities, are embedded within networks of flows and connections (Jones, 2011; Binnie, 2014).

This turn towards a relational ontology marks a general move away from a sedentary metaphysics, instead towards a fluid, mobile and interconnected understanding of particular social-spatial situations (Spence, 2014). Relational thinking departs from the concerns of absolute space; it dissolves the boundaries between objects and space, and rejects forms of spatial totality. Space does not exist as an entity in and of itself (Jones, 2009). Relational geographies stretch material and social relations across and through spaces (Nash and Gorman-Murray, 2015). Relational turn is advantageous insofar as it enables a more sophisticated understanding of the consequences of global interdependencies and their relation to processes of local concentration and specialisation (Bathelt, 2006).

The relational concept broadly points to the significance of all forms of networks and relations between entities. It stresses interconnectedness which offers opportunities for discovering pluralities of scalar interactions and meanings (Sunley, 2008; Mosedale and
The relational understanding of space puts territorial bounding on shaky grounds as it frames processes in a global economic context (Mosedale and Albrecht, 2011; Sigler, 2013).

In recent years there has been an increased awareness of tourism and tourism studies as relational, as they are conceptualised within relational geographies (Mosedale and Albrecht, 2011; Grimwood, 2015). Through its focus on space and space production, the relational view of space has also influenced the conception of tourism destinations (Briassoulis, 2017). The view is that tourism is a relational activity as it involves the connectivity of social relations across time and space. Flows of capital and tourists accentuate leisure spaces as relationally made (Jönsson, 2016). Tourism and migration represent two kinds of mobility which are typical of a globalised, highly connected world (Grimwood, 2015). As there are questions regarding territorially bound tourism and its ability to succeed, the relational tourism framework implies changes in the orientation and organisation of tourism beyond spatial scales. This means that tourism (and dark tourism) practices and organisations have to shift to better reflect network relations across places and space (Mosedale and Albrecht, 2011). Relational tourism is a concept that involves more active exchanges between the creativity of ‘locals’ and the creative and relational needs of ‘tourists’ (Richards, 2014).

2.5.4 Reality and authenticity

The next concept that frames this study is the reality and authenticity concept. The quest for reality and authenticity as it applies to tourism has its roots in cultural
authenticity (Nate-Chei, 2011; Croes, Seung, and Olson, 2013). This framework is based on the premise that people engage in tourism because they are driven by the desire for real and authentic experiences and self-expression without constraints. Linking dark tourism and the desire for authentic experiences, Burroughs (2014) cites Richard, the narrator of *The Beach*, who reveals dark tourism to be a symbolic fulfilment of the desire for an authentically scarring experience, where ‘fatal’ and disastrous events become the ‘banal’ or ordinary (Burroughs, 2014).

The quest for the reality concept appears to have its roots in the work of Goffman (1959); Boorstin (1962), and MacCannell (1973) appears to have formulated it into the authenticity theory of tourism. Goffman (1959) explains that as individuals present themselves to others they guide and control the impressions they form of themselves and those of others. Individuals as ‘actors’ present things they may and may not do while sustaining their performance. In order to further clarify his theory Goffman (1959) uses the metaphor of life as a stage where individuals are actors. For Goffman (1959), interaction between people is an ‘act’ or a ‘scene’ which is acted out and which bears little resemblance to reality. In essence, Goffman (1959) contends that human phenomena and their representation are inauthentic, hence the need to search for authentic experiences.

Subsequent to Goffman (1959), Boorstin (1962) also argues that public life is filled with ‘pseudo-events’ – staged and scripted events which are a kind of counterfeit version of

---

2 *The Beach* is a novel by Alex Garland, written in 1996. It is set in Thailand, in the novel Richard, a young traveler relates his itinerant experiences.
actual happenings. Even the tourism industry, which once offered adventure seekers a passport to reality, now insulates travellers from the places they visit, and instead provides 'artificial products', which are staged events (Boorstin, 1962).

Building from the concepts that analyse social phenomena in terms of acts or scenes and in terms of pseudo-reality, MacCannell (1973; 1976; 1999) further extends the analysis. In elaborating on the concept of reality and authenticity in tourism, MacCannell (1973; 1976) contends that the motive behind the original pilgrimages is similar to that behind tourism, as both are quests for authentic experiences. Pilgrims attempted to visit a place where an event of religious importance actually occurred (these ideas link with the ideas discussed above). In a similar manner, today’s tourists present themselves at places of social, historical and cultural importance, which are regarded as authentic places. Therefore, reality and authenticity are motivating factors in tourism.

In tourism reality and authenticity is a modern construct whose emergence is closely related to the impact of modernity on social existence (Cohen, 1988). Modernity is alienating (just as it has been stated above) and as a consequence individuals have lost their sense of reality. The alienating effect of modernism between individuals and society has now reached its zenith (Berger, 1973); hence the individuals have been left with no option but to burrow into themselves in search of the real, which has to be in opposition to any external (modern) social formation (Berger, 1973). The search for authenticity is one way of articulating this alienation (Berger, 1973). Just like
MacCannell (1973, 1976) and Berger (1973), Cohen (1988) also sees the modern individual as being on a quest for authenticity, which sometimes could be contrived. At any rate, the alienated modern tourists set out to look for the real and authentic, the pristine, the primitive and natural; that which is as yet untouched by modernity. Modern individuals hope to find it in other times and other places, since it is absent from their own world (Cohen, 1988).

Friedrich and Johnston (2013) also arrive at the similar conclusion that tourism to sites of death and disaster seems to represent a quest for authentic experiences which are often stimulated by encounters with authentic objects, but which can equally be stimulated by recreated objects. Authenticity also appears a crucial factor in visitors’ overall evaluation of tourism sites (Naoi, 2003). Authenticity is an attractive feature for a range of visitors, but the manipulation of sites may diminish the impressions of authenticity (Naoi, 2003). Trinh, Ryan, and Cave (2015) examined the extent to which visitors of three heritage sites in New Zealand showed evidence of a serious motivation to understand the culture and heritage that was on display at the sites (authenticity of the displays). Their study concluded that visitors to the heritage sites were holiday-takers, rather than holiday-makers, which suggested that visitors were content with what they saw, and did not show any desire to go beyond the surface value of what was displayed.

Wang (1999) is critical of the real and authentic argument to tourism. The critique centres on the proposition that the authenticity framework is premised on the ontology
of the ‘real’ world out there. This form of authenticity is viewed as absolute and objective, as it suggests that the authenticity of objects is based on pre-determined norms. Understanding phenomena in terms of pre-determined norms is part of modernist philosophy and it also conforms to a positivistic object based mode of analysis (Wang, 1999). This positivistic object based mode of analysis influenced the shift to postmodern perspectives (Wang, 1999). However, postmodernism decentres the concept of authenticity and moreover, it not only rejects the possibility of the 'representation', of 'accuracy', or 'copies' of an experience; it also denies absolute truth and all values (Wang, 1999; Reisinger and Steiner, 2006).

Subsequent to the rejection of the positivistic and post-modern frames of analysis of authenticity, Wang (1999) introduced the model of existential authenticity. This model focuses on the personal investment of the tourist. Existential authenticity places the personal existential quests of the tourist at the centre of interest (Knudsen and Waade, 2010), and tourism is driven by a quest for existential authenticity. In their search for new experiences, tourists are preoccupied with an existential state of being which is activated by certain tourist activities (Wang, 1999). According to Wang (1999), existential authentic tourism is regarded as simpler, freer, more spontaneous, more authentic, or less serious, less utilitarian, and less romantic. Existential authenticity is related to human nature and the essence of human individuality, and it is a state of being that can be produced or pursued through tourism activities. Key concepts that relate to existential authenticity include self-identity, individuality, meaning-making and anxiety (Steiner and Reisinger, 2006).
An existential authenticity orientated lifestyle enables people to keep a distance from or transcend their daily lives. People who engage in existential authenticity orientated tourism do not literally concern themselves about the authenticity of the toured objects. They are rather in search of their authentic selves, with the aid of activities or toured objects. According to Wang (1999), existential authenticity involves personal or intersubjective feelings activated by the liminal process of tourist activities. Tourists undergo journeys of self-discovery or introspection which are more freely self-expressed than in everyday life. This is not because they find toured objects as authentic, but simply because they are engaging in non-ordinary activities, free from the constraints of the daily routines (Kim and Jamal, 2007).

2.5.5 Tourist gaze and utility of meaning

This study also understands dark tourism from the perspective of tourist gaze, following on from Urry (1990); Retzinger (1998); and Urry and Larsen (2011). Volkman (1990) also points out that tourism denotes a distinctive sort of ‘gaze’. The concept of gaze means to stare, gape, gawk, look fixedly at something, or to look steadily and intently at something; especially at that which incites admiration, curiosity or interest (Thompson, 1995). The concept of tourist gaze posits that when tourists visit a particular situation they are guided by the anticipation of pleasure directed towards objects of the situation, which could include an ethnic group, a landscapes or a cultural performance (Prins and Webster, 2010). This concept also relates to the idea of conceptualising tourism in terms of ordinary and every day encounters and extraordinary or unfamiliar events (Urry and Larsen, 2011). This binary opposition concept proposes that tourist destinations
are packaged simultaneously as ‘out of the ordinary’ and a ‘home away from home’ (Witz, Minkley, and Rassool, 2017). Extending this understanding of tourism to dark tourism, one can conclude that visits to dark tourism sites might also be motivated by the desire to be out of the familiar, but at the same time the unfamiliar environment must mirror the familiar in some way.

Tourists’ gaze is organised and systematised socially (Urry and Larsen, 1990; 2011; Retzinger, 1998). This suggests that society conditions the way tourists relate to their places of tourism. Tourist gaze is produced from the familiar and is constituted by an ideology (Retzinger, 1998). Gazing refers to the discursive determinations of socially constructed seeing or scopic regimes, meaning that the manner of gazing results from negotiated processes of interaction (Urry and Larsen, 2011). The looking gaze is a learned ability that it is never neutral (Urry and Larsen, 2011). According to this concept, when tourists visit places they see what they have been conditioned to see. Looking is socio-culturally framed and there are various ways of seeing. Gazing is conditioned by personal experiences and memories and framed by rules and styles. Valko (2009) also implies that tourist gazes are not uninformed; people are taught when, where and how to gaze by clear markers ranging from guidebooks to plaques. Similarly, Urry and Larsen (2011) further point out that just like medical gaze which Foucault and Smith (1973) defined as dehumanising, the power of the visual gaze within modern tourism is tied into, enabled, constructed and sustained through a variety of non-tourist technologies, such as film, TV, literature, magazines, CDs, DVDs and
videos, which construct and reinforce the images of tourist gaze. Tourists’ gazes are also structured according to class, gender, ethnicity and age (Urry and Larsen 2011).

The concept of tourist gaze further explains that tourism is driven by unfamiliarity of the sites, which suggests that tourists search for difference from routine (Retzinger, 1998; Steinbrink, 2012; Mahrouse, 2016). Tourism results from a binary division between leisure and work; the ordinary or everyday experiences and the extra-ordinary and unfamiliar (Urry, 1990; Urry and Larsen, 2011). Tourists tend to gaze upon things that are different from what is found at home in order to free themselves from daily life and to experience novelty (Huang, King, and Suntikul, 2017). Urry (1990) and Urry and Larsen (2011) also bring up the concept of ‘othering’ in the understanding of tourism. Urry (1990) and Urry and Larsen (2011) point out that tourist gaze also reflects on the power dynamics between tourists and hosts and the relationship between self and ‘other’ (Urry and Larsen 2011). This suggests that tourism is also driven by the interest in the ‘other’.

Using the theory of ‘othering’ as a frame of reference, Steinbrink (2012) also maintains that slum tourism or urban poverty tourism (a subset of dark tourism) is motivated by the desire to see the place of the unknown ‘other’ – and not just the difference in economic terms. Similarly Mahrouse (2016) theorises dark tourism in terms of ‘othering’, where economically privileged subjects of the global north safely consume war-zones which are places where racialised others are in danger.
While Urry and Larsen (2011); Steinbrink (2012) and Mahrouse (2016) pay attention to theories of difference as some of the motivators of dark tourism, Seaton (2000) adds another dimension to the understanding of dark tourism. Seaton (1996) initially conceptualises dark tourism in terms of thanatopsis, but subsequently proposes utility of meaning as an important factor in dark tourism, and perhaps this serves to indicate the evolving nature of dark tourism (Seaton, 2000). The idea is that in order to understand tourists' behaviour, attention needs to be directed at the utility of meaning. The meaning people have of words, events and phenomena reflects and creates a deeply subjective view of the world (Enfield, 2015). Tourists are less driven by discrete forces and motivators, but are prompted by meaning systems that are socially produced (Seaton, 2000) and this idea corresponds with Urry and Larsen's (2011) view that looking or gazing is socio-culturally framed. Totalising theories of dark tourism, those that disregard utility of meaning, are inappropriate, as dark tourists are not homogenous but heterogeneous and disparate, and totalising theories presuppose homogeneity (Seaton, 2000). Contradictory to Urry (1990) and Urry and Larsen (2011), however, Seaton (2000) discounts the 'othering' theory as a major theory in dark tourism.

Similarly, Frenzel (2012) goes beyond 'othering' as a motivating factor of slum tourism. According to Frenzel (2012), slum tourism emerged out of politically motivated circumstances. The original slum or township tours in South Africa were motivated by 'struggle junkies', that is, supporters of the struggle or resistance of black South Africans against apartheid (Frenzel, 2012, p. 54). Frenzel (2012) further points out that similar tours to the Rio de Janeiro favelas in Brazil and to the Kibera slums in Nairobi,
Kenya were initially motivated by global political events. Tours to the Rio favelas were initiated by the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, and those to the Kibera slums were initiated by the 2007 World Social Forum and not necessarily by interest in the ‘other’.

The final part of this conceptualisation of dark tourism relates to the question of whether tourists are committed members of a tourism experience. In this regard, Sumara (1994) asserts that tourism does not necessarily change the life a tourist leads after touring has been completed. This suggests that tourist experiences are normally fleeting experiences. Retzinger (1998), however, contradicts this view by stating that landscapes or tourist sites can exert an influence on those who gaze upon them, and thus alter ‘their self’. This links with the next concept, that of emotions and dark tourism.

2.5.6 Emotions and dark tourism

This theoretical perspective takes the view that visits to sites associated with occupation, death and suffering are considered emotionally laden (Miles, 2002; Isaac and Budryte-Ausiejiene, 2015). Ashworth and Isaac (2015) identify eight primary emotions: joy, sadness, acceptance, disgust, fear, anger, surprise and anticipation, which are associated with dark tourism. Bigley, Lee, Chon, and Yoon (2010); Le and Pearce (2012); Darlington (2014); Yong (2014); and Buda and Shim (2015) theorise that visiting places of danger has emotional and cognitive constituents. Braithwaite and Lee (2006) and Tucker (2016) further maintain that there could be a level of empathy created when tourists visit dark tourism sites. Braithwaite and Lee (2006) further state that dark tourism could be motivated by a desire to resolve grief; understanding terrible
things that could have happened, sharing with and learning from those who had similar family experiences, increasing intercultural understanding, and learning about how horrific and ineffective war is as a means of resolving problems. Buda and Shin (2015) understand visits to unusual places of danger in terms of novelty, something that cannot be experienced in other places.

### 2.5.7 Questioning dark tourism

The dark tourism construct which is predicated on the assumption that there are tourists who have a fascination with visiting places associated with death, suffering, tragedy and atrocity (Young and Light, 2016) has come under critical scrutiny (Bowman and Pezzullo, 2010; Biran and Poria, 2012; Potts, 2012; Miles, 2014; Ashworth and Isaac, 2015; Connell, 2015; Golańska, 2015). When dark tourism first emerged it was viewed as blithe and even trivial, and an innocent activity. The notion that it could have dark attributes that could be keenly sought was thus both novel and shocking (Ashworth and Isaac, 2015). This suggests that the view of darkness in dark tourism could be just people’s imaginations. Miles (2014) raises questions about thanatopsis or dark tourism conceptualisation, stating that there is little evidence for a thanatoptic experience for visitors to dark sites. Visitors tend to have multi-faceted experiences of the heritage sites, and not specifically dark tourism sites. Heritage sites that interpret and represent death and dying, whether untimely or in violent or calamitous circumstances often exist for memorialisation or educative purposes (Stone, 2015). Similarly Biran and Poria (2012), in questioning the negative connotations of the concept, argue that visits to the dark tourism sites often lead to enlightened experiences with positive benefits.
Moreover, such sites are also part of a broader service sector where tourism and the commodification of culture and heritage has been a mainstay for many years (Stone, 2015). Potts (2012), drawing from the theoretical framework of Jacques Ranciére, Bruno Latour and W.J.T Mitchell, interrogates the framing of New York’s Ground Zero in New York as a dark tourism destination. Potts (2012) also questions the idea that the presence of kitsch at dark sites risks the *kitschification* of dark tourism. Potts (2012) maintains that the notion of darkness in dark tourism advances what is termed as dangerous political subjectivism.

In a similar vein, Bowman and Pezzullo (2010) and Golańska (2015) query the concept of dark tourism and its negative connotations. Bowman and Pezzullo (2010) and Golańska (2015) suggest that it may be necessary to rethink the term dark tourism and its negative connotation since it may prejudice research. Prejudice may present an impediment to the detailed and circumstantial analysis of dark tourist sites. Connell (2015), for example, challenges the concept of presenting North Korea as dangerous, secretive and unique. Connell (2015) points out that it is because of the negative branding that North Korean tourism has been constituted as belonging to danger zone tourism. Rather than seeking or desiring darkness, Connell (2015) confirms that tourists in North Korea are actually seeking to shed as much light as possible on a country and a political regime that is very poorly known, but which is widely perceived in negative terms. Contrary to popular assumptions, North Korean tourists believe that the country must have some positive characteristics and a sense of normalcy.
2.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter opened by highlighting the growing interest in dark tourism. The case of Johnstown in the US in 1889 was mentioned as one of the first cases of morbid tourism, where visitors who flocked in numbers to Johnstown appeared to be drawn to the town of disaster in order to experience a thrill. The discussion proceeded to analyse the historical aspects of the development of dark tourism during the Middle Ages and the period of Enlightenment. Contemporary theories of dark tourism which constituted the larger part of the chapter – thanatopsis, industrial to post-industrial shift, relational tourism, reality and authenticity, and tourist gaze and utility of meaning concepts – were critically reviewed. The final part of the chapter critiqued the dark connotations of the dark tourism construct. The next chapter discusses the methodology of this study.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION
This study explores the motivations to visit dark tourism sites in South Africa. In many ways this study is innovative and exploratory in nature as very little is known about dark tourism in South Africa. Exploratory research is significant and relevant in that it has the potential to inform paradigms, create conceptual frameworks, and build knowledge for further research (Beall, 2002; Mosavel and Simon, 2010). Exploratory research is a useful means to qualitatively explore attitudes, behaviours and beliefs when little is known about the phenomenon of interest (Beall, 2002; Tyl, 2009; Mosavel and Simon, 2010; Jorgensen, 2013; Ramers-Verhoeven, Parrone, and Oliver, 2014; Fuglseth, Grønhaug, Jørnsten, 2016). This study adopts a qualitative research approach, which is appropriate for a deeper examination of phenomena from the point of view of the participants. Moreover, the literature search did not yield any established theory accounting for dark tourism, which might have necessitated a different methodological approach to this study. A qualitative research approach studies the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of things and not the ‘what’, ‘where’ and ‘when’ of things. This study attempts to understand why tourists engage in dark tourism and how tourists and museum curators interpret dark tourism.
This research methodology chapter opens by exploring the role of paradigms in research methods, and the chapter proceeds to provide details of the procedures that will be followed in carrying out the present study.

3.2 RESEARCH PARADIGMS AND ENQUIRY

The choice of a research approach is not a neutral uninformed process; it is predicated on philosophical paradigms or research premises (Meredith, 1998; Clark, 1998; Avramidis and Smith, 1999; Holden and Lynch, 2004; Williamson, 2006; Scotland, 2012). The research paradigm creates a bridge between the aims of a study and the methods by which to achieve those aims. It is the role of the researcher to see to it that the paradigms, methods and aims of a study are ontologically and epistemologically integrated (Mills, Bonner, and Francis, 2006a, b; Houghton, Hunter, and Meskell, 2012).

Two paradigms that have been dominant in academic research are positivism and interpretivism (Allan, 1998; Fitzgerald and Howcroft, 1998; Weber, 2004; Smith, 2006; Clark, 2009). The dichotomy in the paradigms (positivism and interpretivism) is explained by their holding of opposing views about the nature of reality (Allan, 1998; Fitzgerald and Howcroft, 1998). Fitzgerald and Howcroft (1998) characterise the dichotomy as being between 'hard' positivist and 'soft' interpretivist research paradigms, which is usually expressed as positivism versus interpretivism; quantitative versus qualitative; and exploratory versus confirmatory. A positivist and post-positivist paradigms underpin quantitative research, and, an interpretive and constructionist
paradigm underpins qualitative research approaches (Thomson, Perry, and Scholes, 2014).

There have been questions of whether it is justifiable to utilise the positivist scientific methods of the physical sciences for social and human issues (Potamäki and Wight, 2000; Denzin and Lincoln, 2011; Henderson, 2011; Manjikian, 2013). The failings of objective positivism have brought about a shift to post-positivism (Cooper, 1997; Packard, 2013). The argument is that most social phenomena are complex and linked to multiple bodies of knowledge that belong to different disciplines (Jabareem, 2009). Therefore, it would be inappropriate to subject them to scrutiny using positivist approaches, and this then brings interpretivism to the fore.

The philosophical foundations of interpretivism are attributed to Immanuel Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*, in which it is argued that humans interpret their sensations; they do not directly experience the world ‘out there’ as positivists proposed in the seventeenth century (Willis, 2007). In the eighteenth century, Wilhelm Dilthey added to the foundations of interpretivism by arguing that *verstehen* (understanding) was the goal of social science research and that the proper topic of social science research was the lived experience of humans. For Wilhelm Dilthey the natural reality was not the same as social reality, and that meant that different methods of research were needed to study social reality (Willis, 2007).
Interpretivism is a broad term that encompasses a number of different paradigms – which according to Willis (2007) are existentialism, phenomenology, Gestalt psychology, constructivism, and hermeneutics – all concerned with the meanings and experiences of human beings, since the central tenet of interpretivism is that people are constantly involved in interpreting their ever-changing world. Researchers who are interpretivists believe that the social world is constructed by people and is therefore different from the environment of nature (Williamson, 2008). The interpretive paradigm believes that reality is not objectively determined; rather it is socially constructed (Kelliher, 2005). Interpretivism thrives upon subtlety, which reveals where hidden and important meaning is buried within superficially inconsequential inflections of voice, body language or situational details (Black, 2006).

According to Pickard (2013), interpretivists believe that realities are multiple, constructed and holistic. There is no single, tangible reality; instead there is only the complex, multiple realities of the individual. Interpretive researchers study people rather than objects, with a focus on meanings and interpretations rather than behaviour. The purpose is to understand how others construe, conceptualise and understand events and concepts. In contrast to the implicit absolutism of rationalism, interpretivism is relativistic because facts are not considered independent of the theory or the observer. Interpretive researchers explain by placing behaviours in a broader context in which the behaviours make sense (Meredith, 1998).
The aim of interpretivism is to use direct discourse to uncover naturally occurring concerns and meanings, with the goal of understanding lived experiences rather than the prediction and control of events (Forbes, King, Kushner, and Letourneau, Myrick, Profetto-McGrath, 1999; Black, 2006). Interpretivism is contextually laden, subjective and richly detailed. Assumptions that underlie the interpretivist perspective are: the complex world of the lived experience can be understood by exploring subjective human experience; secondly, that knowledge is contextually bound (linguistically, historically and culturally); and finally that the shared meanings of human experiences must be interpreted to reveal the constitution and enactment of those meanings (Forbes et al., 1999).

The underlying assumption of interpretivism is that by placing people in their contexts, there is greater opportunity to understand the perceptions they have of their own activities (Kelliher, 2005). Scotland (2012) and Pickard (2013) summarise the ontology, epistemology and methodology of interpretivism. They state that the ontological position of interpretivism is relativism. Interpretivists believe that realities are multiple, constructed and holistic. There is no single, tangible reality; instead there is only the complex, multiple realities of the individual. Reality is seen as individual and embedded in context, as opposed to universal, and the interpretive epistemology is one of subjectivism. The known and the knower influence each other; all descriptions are time and context bound. It is impossible to separate cause and effect as all that is acquired is a product of the interaction between the known and the knower.
Interpretive methodology is directed at understanding a phenomenon from an individual perspective. Events are not reduced to simplistic interpretations; new layers of understanding are uncovered as phenomena are thickly described. Interpretive theory is usually inductive (Scotland, 2012), and interpretivism seeks to understand the entire context, at both the macro and micro environmental level. Qualitative methodology is applied, including dialect interchange with participants and hermeneutics, depending on both the tacit and the explicit knowledge of the researcher. By its nature, interpretivism promotes the value of qualitative data in the pursuit of knowledge. In essence, this research paradigm is concerned with the uniqueness of a particular situation, contributing to the underlying pursuit of contextual depth. Interpretivists favour 'naturalistic inquiry' (where fieldwork usually takes place in a natural setting), embrace an inductive style of reasoning, and emphasise qualitative data (Pickard, 2013). Qualitative epistemology recognises the explicit involvement of the researcher, who is viewed not as an intermediary, but as an instrument of research (Medico and Santiago-Delefosse, 2014).

Making a case for qualitative research, Denzin and Lincoln (2011) state that a researcher ought to be viewed as a *bricoleur*, a maker of quilts; and a researcher is also likened to a film maker who assembles images into a montage. Denzin and Lincoln (2011) view research as a non-linear process, with the researcher being innovative and creative in seeking out the different pieces of the puzzle until they reach a point when they are able to present as complete a picture as possible. The researcher has to take account of subjectivity, of the people’s ethics, values and politics, and use a range of
appropriate interconnected interpretive methods to maximise understanding of the research problem (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004).

The aim of this study is to investigate the motivations to engage in dark tourism in South Africa. In Chapter One it was explained that the qualitative research approach was considered to be the appropriate approach for this study. Details of the methods of this study which deal with data collection and analysis will be provided later, but for now the chapter turns to a brief review of the research and methodologies that have been used in tourism, dark tourism research, and museum research. The objective of this is to understand how the research methods of the present study compare with the research methods of similar studies.

3.3 CURRENT APPROACHES TO DARK TOURISM AND MUSEUM RESEARCH

Despite its flaws in social sciences, the scientific-positivist imperatives which are underpinned by the neo-liberal values of ‘performativity, consumerism and profitability’ have continued to dominate tourism research, with the interpretive paradigm lagging behind (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004; Ren, Pritchard, and Morgan, 2009). There is also a general consensus that the ‘master paradigm’ in the social sciences, including the fields of tourism and hospitality, is the quantitative or scientific method (Mehmetoglu, 2004). Reviews of tourism research methods have concentrated on studies underpinned by positivist science or assessments of quantitative methods and analyses, but conspicuous by their absence are reviews that focus on studies supported by the interpretive paradigm and assessments of qualitative analyses. Tourism studies
have, for the most part, sidestepped the issue of subjectivity in research practice and reporting (Riley and Love, 2000).

The general view is that qualitative approaches to tourism studies have played a secondary role to quantitative approaches. For Hollinshead (2004), tourism researchers have been neither theoretically nor methodologically advanced in the ways in which they have probed the ontological identifications which exist between population and place, and the various interconnectivities which lie between culture and power. Ren et al., (2009) point out that even though there has been a phenomenal growth of tourism and the field has matured, there remains a crucial challenge to develop conceptualisations of tourisms that encompass multiple worldviews and cultural differences, as well as research praxis that recognises and reflects the plurality of multiple positions, practices and insights. Additionally Squire (1993), writing on the under-researched literary tourism, that is, travels to places famously associated with books or authors, notes the neglect of interpretive analysis in tourism.

In contrast to Goodson and Phillimore (2004); Mehmetoglu (2004) and Ren et al., (2009), however, literature research shows that over the past couple of years there has been a burgeoning of tourism and particularly dark tourism scholarship which has adopted a qualitative research approach. In the broader social sciences there has been a growing interest in matters of reflexivity, a process in qualitative research of continuously examining both oneself as the researcher and the research relationship. This has arisen out of a critique of the previously detached and distant writings which
are the result of what has been termed a ‘disembodied intellect’ (Feighery, 2006). The immediate discussion below focuses on scholarship that has adopted a qualitative research approach, and this is followed by studies that have followed a quantitative approach. The discussion will show that there are a number of studies which have researched visitors’ experiences and understanding of dark tourism sites.

Adopting a qualitative research approach, Tinson, Saren, and Roth (2015) analysed visitors’ stories around their experiences in dark tourism sites. The study aimed to understand and explore ‘emically’ (from the perspective of the research participants) the key influences and relationships between the motivations and narratives of the experiences in dark tourism sites. The research employed a two-stage interview approach of 20 young American dark tourist site visitors, 11 of whom were re-interviewed. Wording and flow of the questions became more or less open-ended and they were adapted by the researcher to allow for a mixture of responses and to permit the participants to give their accounts in their own words. The findings of the study confirmed that dark tourists were not necessarily fascinated with the macabre; they visited these places for educational purposes, entertainment, and to enhance national pride. Cheal and Griffin (2013), employing a qualitative research method involving in-depth interviews with Australians who had visited Gallipoli, explored tourists’ experiences at Gallipoli in order to better understand how tourists approached and engaged with battlefield sites and how experiences at the sites transformed them.
In another qualitative research, Yankovska and Hannam (2014) adopted in-depth semi-structured interviews with tour guides and visitors to explore and understand tourists' experiences at dark tourism sites and also to understand tour guides' interpretations of tourists' experiences. Kim and Butler (2015) used a qualitative exploratory research approach to examine local community perspectives towards dark tourism development. Using a convenient sample of 140 serial killers, Gibson (2006) examined the link between travel, tourism and serial murder. The study concluded that there have been numerous instances of tourism related to serial murders. Magee and Gilmore (2015) employed in-depth, multiple case-based methods predicated on an interpretive approach to investigate site managers’ perspectives and key issues related to visitor's experiences and engagement at the dark tourism sites in Austria, Germany and Poland. The study found that dark tourism sites could be conceptualised as transformative ‘experiencescapes’ where mutual understanding and sensitive, peaceful resolve could be encouraged. Yirik, Seyitoğlu, and Çakar (2016) used qualitative research methodology to investigate whether the Sarikamish battlefield site in Armenia could be considered as a dark tourist attraction. Marty (2007) used twenty-one semi-structured interviews to study the capacity of museum information professionals to work with information resources, tools and technologies. Marty (2007) established that information professionals were not the only ones aware of the growing convergence of cultural heritage organisations in the information age; users were also increasingly relying on online information.
Giving space to research participants to reflect on dark tours has also received attention. Miller (2008) employed an auto-ethnographic research approach to explore how disaster tourism served as a vehicle for self-reflection. Conveying information via auto-ethnographic disaster tourism helped readers develop an understanding of others by being immersed in the tour experience. The not so familiar ‘phenomenographic’ approach to questioning and textual data analysis strategy was employed by Trinh et al., (2015) to assess how visitors to three heritage sites in New Zealand described their emotions for visiting the sites and how they evaluated their visits in their own words.

Some studies have adopted interviews, participant observation and analysis of documents. Koleth (2014) employed ethnographic methods of interviews and participant observation in Cambodia, in a study which aimed to explore insights into the convergence between volunteerism and dark tourism. Using a qualitative observation method, Brown (2015a) explored the tourist responses to memorials to the victims of Nazism, and the impact they had on the tourist experiences. Friedrich and Johnston (2013) incorporated interviews and observations in a study of the Rwandan 1994 Genocide Memorials. The aim of the study was to explore the purpose and development of the Rwandan 1994 Genocide Memorials. Friedrich and Johnston (2013) viewed the qualitative research approach as the most appropriate to uncover in-depth issues in complex cultural, social and political settings like Rwanda.

Yoshida, Bui, and Lee (2016), in a study in 2014, used qualitative methodology which included interviews with each city’s staff in charge of museums, education and tourism
promotion, and also extended to discourse analysis of tourist brochures to compare the extent to which the sites of the atomic bomb explosions, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, had been memorialised and embedded in tourism promotion for educational purposes. Yankholmes and Akyeampong (2010) used face-to-face interviews containing both open and close-ended questions in a study whose purpose was to research tourist perceptions at Danish-Osu, in Ghana’s dark tourism sites.

In some studies documents were the dominant source of data. Winter (2011a, b; 2012) studied visitors’ behaviour at First World War cemeteries using the data recorded in the visitors’ books at sampled cemeteries in France and Belgium. Zhang, Zheng and Zhang (2016b) used 320 travellers’ diaries. Similarly, Buda and Shim (2015) analysed online travel reports from 12 magazines and newspapers. Isaac and Budryte-Ausiejiene (2015) analysed written comments in Visitors’ books from the Grūtas Park Museum. A qualitative content analysis was done along with quantitative techniques using a word frequency count and semantic network analysis.

Although some philosophical approaches to dark tourism research have been postmodern or post-structuralist, there have also been some positivist approaches (Wight, 2006). Exploratory factor analysis is proving to be popular in quantitative dark tourism research. Using random sampling and semi-structured open questionnaires to collect data; and exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to analyse data, Yan, Zhang, Zhang, and Guo (2016) examined why tourists approached and engaged with disaster sites; and how such experiences might affect tourists’ motivations
and emotional reactions. Also using self-administered survey questionnaire of 238 randomly sampled research participants and exploratory factor analysis for data analysis, Isaac and Çakmak (2014) investigated visitor motivations to visit sites of death and suffering, namely the former transit camp named Westerbork in the Netherlands. The study found that people visited the site mainly for 'self-understanding', 'curiosity', 'conscience', as a 'must see', and for 'exclusiveness'. Also using open-ended questionnaires to collect data and exploratory factor analysis to analyse data, Bigley et al., (2010) investigated the motivations of visitors to the Korean Demilitarised Zone (KDZ). The study found: opposing political regime, knowledge and appreciation of history, culture and security, curiosity and adventure, war and its consequences, and nature based tourism to be the reasons to visit the KDZ.

The quantitative research approach also extended to Yong (2014) who adopted the convenience sample method to select 225 research participants to complete questionnaires to study the motivations of Chinese domestic tourists visiting the seismic memorial sites of Wenchuan. Yong (2014) used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyse the data obtained. Lee, Bendle, Yoon, and Kim (2012) adopted a quantitative research approach which involved questionnaires and a survey to examine the underlying factors that affected the perceived value among South Korean tourists who visited the North Korean Mt Kumgang resort. Similarly Poria, Reichel, and Biran (2006) used questionnaires to explore the nature of the motivations for visiting a heritage site given the possible personal meaning assigned to the site, relative to the visitor's own heritage. The study found that people visited heritage sites
for: learning, connecting with their heritage, leisure pursuit, bequeathing for children, and emotional involvement. Adopting quantitative research methods, Capriotti, Carretón, Castillo (2016) analysed the degree of interactivity implemented in the websites of major international art museums, in order to assess if museums were evolving towards more dialogic systems in relation to their publics. The study found that museums still had a low level of interactivity on the websites, both in the tools used to present information and the resources available for interaction with virtual visitors.

There are studies that have relied on a quantitative research approach only, and there are also those that have combined both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Miles (2014) used a blend of quantitative and qualitative methods to determine the nature of tourists’ experiences at battlefield sites. Biran, Poria and Oren (2011) adopted a three-stage research method, which involved semi-structured interviews and structured questionnaires in studying visitor experiences at the dark tourism site of Auschwitz-Birkenau. Gentry (2007) used three methods, namely, participant observation, structured and unstructured interviews and a survey on 411 tourist groups in a study to understand ghost-themed walking tours or ghost walk tourism in the United States. The results showed that visitors had a range of experiences but there was no evidence that they considered the research sites as sites of darker aspects.

In a study of tourists visiting the Memorial of the Victims of the Nanjing Massacre in China, Zhang et al., (2016a) used both quantitative (Chinese word segmentation and word cloud) and qualitative (text mining and expert judgement) methods to content-
analyse all the narratives and visual information of the sampled travel diaries, where visitors recorded their tourism experiences of the Memorial. The results of the study indicated that culture, inquisitiveness, emotion and escape played important roles in revisit intentions.

Employing a triangulation of the research methods, Skov (2013) researched the role of information in serious leisure by investigating the everyday life information seeking behaviour of online visitors. Zaharias, Michael and Chrysanthou (2013) used quantitative data and observation methods to explore the interactive technologies employed in museums to enhance their visitors’ experiences. Soren and Lemelin (2004) examined the approaches to creating museum-based Web sites that offered quality experiences to online users. Soren and Lemelin (2004) used quantitative and qualitative online audience research strategies, and their study found considerable variety in the backgrounds, expertise, titles and training of the people developing Web sites within institutions.

Using internet based data to study dark tourism has become increasingly popular. Liyanage, Coca-Stefanik and Powell (2015) used internet based research which included 15 semi-structured interviews carried out using TripAdvisor and Facebook to explore the psychological impact of the Dachau concentration camp in Germany on visitors, and to assess any critical self-reflection processes triggered by this experience. Isaak and Çakmak (2016) collected data from popular travel blog sites to understand why people visited the Tuol Sleng Genocide Museum in Cambodia. Katz and Halpem
(2015) used an online based questionnaire to explore the use of virtual museums to motivate students to go to real museums.

Despite the supposition (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004; Mehmetoglu, 2004; Ren et al., 2009) that quantitative research methodologies have been the dominant approaches in tourism research, the above discussion has shown that there hasn’t been one overriding methodology in dark tourism and in museum research. Some studies have adopted qualitative approaches, others quantitative, and others have followed a mixed research approach. The present study employed a qualitative approach which involved interviews and document analysis. The discussion will give details later; for now the focus turns to the sites of this study.

3.4 THE STUDY AREAS

A number of museums have sprung up in South Africa since 1994, restructuring the country’s history and re-visioning post-apartheid identities. As sites for the visual management of the past, these museums have become important signifiers in the evolving South African discourse of a nation state that is branded as either new andor reborn (Witz et al., 2017). In the New Brighton Township in Port Elizabeth, there is the Red Location Museum of the People’s Struggle. However, this museum was not used as a site of study as this would render the study far-reaching the concept was to have a focus in the study. In Soweto, there is the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum which commemorates one of the first students to be killed in the 1976 student uprisings. In Cape Town, a 45 minutes boat trip takes one to another museum, the Robben Island
Museum. In Johannesburg there is the Apartheid Museum. These museums are all important parts of South Africa’s efforts to create a post-apartheid identity (Meldrum, 2006). The next section focuses on three sites: the Robben Island Museum, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum and the Apartheid Museum, which are the locations of this study.

3.4.1 The Robben Island Museum
The Robben Island Museum is located in Table Bay, about 11 kilometres out of the harbour from the V&A Waterfront in Cape Town, in a north westerly direction. The length of Robben Island is 5.4 km, the width is 2.5 km, and it has an area of 574 ha (approximately 5.74 km$^2$) (Corsane, 2006). Figure 3.1 shows location of the Robben Island in relation to the city of Cape Town in the Cape Town Metropolitan area.

Robben Island is low-lying, with the highest point, known as Minto Hill being 24m above sea level (Phaswana-Mafuya and Haydam, 2005). Robben Island has a Mediterranean climate which is marked by strong winds and comparative extremes in temperature. The island has an annual rainfall of between 300mm and 400mm (van der Bank and Greenfield, 2015).
Figure 3.1: Location of the Robben Island Museum in Relation to the Cape Town Metropolitan Area

The history of the island is documented as far back as 1488. The island contains many structures built by the Dutch East India Company since 1652 and the succeeding British occupation in 1759, including churches and structures to house lepers. On the island
there is a prison, a village and other buildings including a Muslim shrine or *karamat*, and Second World War bunkers and gun emplacements are also found (Shackley, 2001).

Robben Island is known in isiXhosa as *Siqithini* (Galla, 2008). Robben Island is named after the Dutch name *robbe* which refers to a seal (Stengel, 1993). The Island has historically been used as a place of banishment; Jan van Riebeeck first settled in Cape Town in 1652 and four years later banished his Khoi-Khoi interpreter, Autshama or Autshumato (also known as Harry) and two other captives to Robben Island for allegedly plotting an insurrection. From 1682 onwards the Dutch East India Company regularly banished prisoners and political opponents to the island (Stengel, 1993; Tomaselli, 1997).

During the eighteenth century many Muslim holy men were exiled on Robben Island. By 1784 when the Dutch East India Company lost control of the Cape, there were over 130 prisoners on Robben Island (Tomaselli, 1997). According to Marback (2004), Robben Island has been used over centuries as an asylum, a leper colony, a prison, and as a sanatorium. The island became known as a place of internment of African rebels, from the eighteenth century warrior chiefs to iconic African National Congress (ANC) leader, Nelson Mandela, who was incarcerated there from 1964 to 1982. Between 1858 and 1870 a number of eminent Xhosa chiefs were exiled on the island, following clashes with the British on the eastern frontier of the Cape Colony (Rostron, 2001, 2004).
During the Second World War the island was used as a military base. Since 1961 the island was used exclusively to house ‘maximum security political prisoners’ by the apartheid government. According to Corsane (2006), in 1960 following the Sharpville massacre of black protestors, the control of Robben Island was moved to the South African Prisons Services, and until 1991 it was the most notorious prison of the apartheid era (1948-1994). Robben Island, as a prison, was designed as a place that would cultivate a sensibility of hopelessness among those who violently opposed the apartheid government. After the release of the political prisoners in 1991, Robben Island’s maximum-security prison was used to house common law prisoners until December 1996 (Shearing and Kempa, 2004).

The ANC government wanted the island to be opened to the public as soon as possible, so that it could stand as a beacon of change and as a symbol of hope and reconciliation. On the 4th of September 1996 Cabinet decided that Robben Island should be developed into a World Heritage Site, a national monument and a museum, so as to become a cultural and conservation showcase while at the same time maximising the economic, tourism and educational potential of the island and so encouraging its multi-purpose usage (Corsane, 2006). The common law prisoners were moved off the island and the maximum-security prison was closed in December 1996 and re-opened as a heritage tourist destination in January 1997. The administration of the island was transferred from the Department of Correctional Services to the then Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology in 1997 (Corsane, 2006).
Robben Island was declared a World Heritage Site by UNESCO in 1999. The Robben Island Museum has a Memories Project to record the intangible heritage of its artefact collection which is attached to the site (Strickland, 2001). Recommendations were also made that the Mayibuye Centre Collections, which up to then had been housed at the University of the Western Cape, be incorporated into the new Robben Island Museum. Robben Island has since become a prime national museum in post-apartheid South Africa (Corsane, 2006).

Robben Island today is one of the premier tourist attractions in South Africa, receiving thousands of both local and overseas tourists each year (Gore, 2005). The discussion proceeds to explore the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum in Soweto.

3.4.2 The Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum

The Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum emerged out of the long term vision of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) to promote healing through redemptive public acts (Baines, 2007; Nieves and Hlongwane, 2007; Marschall, 2010). Figure 3.2 shows the location of the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum in relation to Johannesburg.
The Hector Pieterson Memorial is a direct result of the TRC’s political project of promoting healing and reconciliation. This, it is hoped, will be achieved through cultural forms and institutions which serve as reminders of the past of racial violence (Nieves and Hlongwane, 2007). The Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum was sponsored by the Gauteng Provincial Government and the Department of Environmental Affairs and
Tourism (DEAT), in keeping with its agenda of promoting heritage projects that have economic benefits for the burgeoning cultural tourism sector (Baines, 2007). According to Marschall (2006), the DEAT was the most important financier of the project, contributing R16.8 million from the Poverty Relief Fund. The City of Johannesburg gave another R7.5 million at a later stage for the interior of the Hector Pieterson Memorial and Museum. Standard Bank also contributed its management skills. The Bank did not provide cash, but contributed substantially over the duration of the entire project by donating the services of Bruce Vester, then Senior Manager of the Property Division, who was tasked with the management of construction and finances. The Bank also provided other staff for administrative support. The DEAT’s involvement was based on the notion that the national and international status of the Soweto Uprising could be exploited for cultural tourism. The vision was that the museum was of international interest and was expected to attract many tourists (Marschall, 2006).

The Hector Pieterson Memorial and Museum is located on the corner of Moema and Vilakazi Streets, about two blocks away from where Hector Pieterson was shot and fell (Marschall, 2006; Baines, 2007). The Memorial was erected in Orlando West, Soweto, in the proximity of other well-known Soweto sites (former residences of Bishop Tutu and Mr. Nelson Mandela) associated with the history of the apartheid struggle (Baines, 2007). The Hector Pieterson Memorial and Museum stands at the site adjacent to the source of one of the most recognisable images from the 1976 Soweto uprising. It is built alongside a memorial to one child, shot by police, and carried along the streets by a distressed young man (Crowley and Matthews, 2006). Hector’s sister, Antoinette
Sithole, is there, running alongside, wailing. The Hector Pieterson Memorial and Museum uses the 1976 uprisings by school children in Soweto as a site for depicting the atrocities of the apartheid era. The 1976 Soweto uprising was a catalyst for escalating the anti-apartheid struggles (Schmidt and Garrett, 2011). The Hector Pieterson Memorial in Soweto consists of a memorial which was unveiled on 16 June 2001 and a museum which was opened to the public and consecrated by President Nelson Mandela on 16 June 2002 (Marschall, 2006; Baines, 2007).

The Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum’s architecture acts as a container, housing contested or even conflicting narratives of the events of 16 June 1976. It acts as a platform for new social justice practices through its exhibitions, collections and public outreach projects. The building functions in many ways as both a medium and an artefact of the historical narratives of the 1976 uprisings – in this way disrupting the possibility of amnesia and helping in the collective memory-making (Nieves and Hlongwane, 2007). Regarding the architecture of the Memorial Museum, Marschall (2006) maintains that its red face brick was meant to blend with the surrounding township houses in accordance with the community’s request. Also, the architect (Mashabane Rose Associates) utilised material with raw finishes intended to change appearance with time and exposure to the elements. Some of the metal on the outside of the building is deliberately left to corrode. The reddish colour of the rust was meant to suggest blood (Marschall, 2006). The Hector Pieterson Memorial and Museum bears some resemblance to the Apartheid Museum at Gold Reef City (GRC). Both buildings are, in turn, influenced by two very important international museum buildings, namely,

On a critical note, Baines (2007) maintains that the Hector Pieterson Memorial and Museum does not necessarily pay tribute to the memories of the other victims of the Soweto Uprising; but is clearly devoted to one symbolic figure. Further (Baines, 2007), this museum, like many others such as the Holocaust remembrance sites, enjoys an ambiguous status, that of being dubbed a shrine of the nation and it has also become part of the struggle tourism circuit. The discussion now proceeds to the Apartheid Museum which is the third site of study.

3.4.3 The Apartheid Museum

The Apartheid Museum, just like the Hector Pieterson Memorial and Museum, was erected as a result of the recommendation by the TRC (Labuschagne, 2012). The Apartheid Museum’s broad overall purpose was to align itself with the aim of reflecting the past, but also to bring healing and reconciliation to the country. The primary objective and rationale of the Museum was to outline and reflect the nature of segregation during the apartheid era (Labuschagne, 2012). Figure 3.2 shows the relative location of the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg.

The museum was not funded by the government, but by GRC as part of its social responsibility agenda. The Apartheid Museum is located next to the GRC Amusement and Theme Park (Teeger and Vinitzky-Seroussi, 2007). Its context is embedded less in
the history of apartheid and more in South Africa’s liberalised gambling legislation. In accordance with the Gauteng Gambling Act (4 of 1995) casino bidders were required to support a social project as part of the competition to obtain a licence (Teeger and Vinitzky-Seroussi, 2007), and GRC submitted the concept of a museum. The Apartheid Museum was designed by architects Mashibane Rose Associates (who were also responsible for the Hector Pieterson Memorial), and opened its doors in November 2001 (Rankin and Schmidt, 2009; Labuschagne, 2012), but there was no official opening as such (Delmont, 2004).

Just like the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, the design of the Apartheid Museum was influenced by the Holocaust Memorial and Museum in Washington, D.C. and shares important similarities with it. The Holocaust Memorial Museum narrates the history of Nazism in order to reinforce the ideals of U.S. citizenship. The Apartheid Museum represents segregated histories of the past to underscore the values of the post-apartheid democratic era. The Apartheid Museum reflects the hardship of the migrant labour which spearheaded the system of segregation (Labuschagne, 2012).

The foregoing exposition presented the study sites and discussed their histories and their representations. The discussion now proceeds to the details of the study methods, starting with the sample and recruitment of the participants.
3.5 SAMPLE AND RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

At the heart of the research process is a complex interplay of choices and decisions which mould the nature and direction of research. Many of the challenges facing the social science researcher relate to the core activity of decision making and the justification of the strategy and methods adopted (Thomas, 2004). It is important to link paradigms, methods and aims in research (Houghton, Hunter, and Meskell, 2012). This was done in the foregoing discussion and even more details of the research methods are presented below.

3.5.1 Sample size of the study

This study used purposive rather than random sampling strategies (Devers and Frankel, 2000; Cleary, Horsfall, and Hayter, 2014). Qualitative research most often uses purposive rather than random sampling strategies (Devers and Frankel, 2000). Qualitative researchers look for a sample that will provide appropriate and adequate insight into people’s experience of the world, using people who offer depth and richness. It usually involves relatively small numbers of participants or settings; selected or recruited because of their involvement with the topic under scrutiny, and focusses on building an in-depth picture of the topic or problem (Nicholls, 2009; Shelton, Smith and Mort, 2014). Qualitative researchers use terms such as participants or informants rather than subjects, as is the case with quantitative research (Arendt et al., 2012). Using semi-structured open-ended interviews, the research participants are interviewed in-depth. In-depth interviews offer greater depth and insights into the phenomenon of study and they also offer the guarantee of anonymity, making them
ideal for the discussion of sensitive issues or embarrassing topics (Goodman and Chalofsky, 2005; Shelton et al., 2014). They are also among the most common exploratory research methods (Ruiz, Jain and Grayson, 2012).

At the Robben Island Museum twenty-three visitors, two tour operators/guides and one curator were interviewed. At the Apartheid Museum twenty visitors, two tour operators/guides and one curator were also interviewed. At the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum ten visitors, one tour operator/guide and one museum curator were interviewed.

3.5.2 Recruitment of participants

Recruitment of participants has implications for the trustworthiness and dependability of the data and hence the findings of the research (Jessiman, 2013; Leonard, Hutchesson, Patterson, Chalmers, and Collins, 2014). The recruitment of participants is also an important area of the research for ethical reasons (Jessiman, 2013; Stiel, Heckel, Bussmann, Weber, Ostgathe, 2015). Some of the barriers to recruiting research participants that researchers have to be sensitive to include the language spoken, trust, lack of time, the location of the interview, limited willingness and enthusiasm, participant factors (for example, participant anxiety about taking part), familiarity with the researcher, and the researcher’s previous experience (Nicholson, Colyer and Cooper, 2013; Waheed, Woodham, Hughes-Morley, Allen and Bower, 2015).
The discussion that follows addresses strategies that are used to overcome some of these barriers. Information in the form of a detailed cover letter explaining this study is one strategy that has been used successfully to improve participation (Khamisa, Peltzer, Ilic, and Oldenburg, 2014). Ngune, Jiwa, Dadich, Lotriet, and Sriram (2012) suggest the importance of enlisting gatekeepers – which helps minimise the experience of research as a burden – as another solution to overcoming barriers to research participation. Leonard et al., (2014) highlight the importance of building rapport with participants; and, Johnson, Powell-Young, Torres, and Spruill (2011) suggest face-to-face contact with research subjects as one of the solutions to help participation.

In order to deal with some of the issues involved in the recruitment of the participants, as identified above, this researcher approached potential participants with caution and courtesy. The purpose of this study was explained to them, and the ethical clearance for this study and the letter of informed consent were also read. It was also explained that participation in this study was voluntary. The purpose of this exercise was also to build rapport. When doing research in practice, the researcher travelled twice to the Robben Island Museum with the purpose of observing the tour, but did not interview visitors there. Visitors to the Robben Island Museum were interviewed at the Nelson Mandela Gateway to the Robben Island Museum, located at the V&A Waterfront in Cape Town. Visitors to the Apartheid Museum and the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum were interviewed inside the two museums, respectively.
3.5.3 Data collection: Interviews

In all three sites the idea was to obtain data, through in-depth interviews, from the informants who were willing to share their views and experiences with the researcher (Glaser, 1978; Thomson, Perry and Scholes, 2014). The qualitative interview process involved the combination of prior and spontaneous questions to gain the information which was relevant to the goal of the research project (Choo, Garro, Ranney, Meisel, and Guthrie, 2015). The interview involved a one participant and one investigator approach (Refer to Appendix A: Interview Schedule for Visitors, and Appendix B: Interview Schedule for Curators).

There are six types of information best collected with interviews (Campbell, 1999; Rosenthal, 2016): factual or demographic questions; feelings and motives questions; beliefs and attitudes questions; experience or behaviour questions; sensory questions; and opinion or value questions. In accordance with the above, the study interviews were designed to explore the following themes about dark tourism:

(i) Why do tourists visit dark tourism sites?
(ii) What is the role of modern communication media in dark tourism?
(iii) How do tourists understand the dark tourism sites?
(iv) How do curators understand the research sites?

3.5.4 Data collection: Use of documents and textual data

Traditionally, research has been discreet about the use of documents and textual data in an inquiry, and as a result these have been an underutilised resource (Miller and
Alvarado, 2005). They have tended to enter and to leave the ‘field’ of research in relative silence (Prior, 2008). However, there has been a realisation that documents and textual data can be used as important resources for data triangulation, to increase the comprehensiveness and validity of any study (Miller and Alvarado, 2005). Factual analysis of documents can also provide a spark that makes research thrilling (Strickland, 1990). Documents and textual data were thus used in this study because of these virtues. The main documents and textual sources that this study used were the visitors’ books and visitors’ comments forms which were obtained from the research sites. This is where visitors recorded their views and experiences and how they related to the research sites.

Wolff (2004); Miller and Alvarado (2005); Prior (2008); Bowen (2009) and Flick (2009) provide guidance on how to use documents in research. Flick (2009) suggests four criteria to use when deciding whether or not to employ a specific document for research, namely: authenticity, which seeks to understand if documents are genuine and of unquestionable origin; secondly, credibility, which is about whether documents are free from error or distortion; thirdly, representativeness, which is about whether a document’s content is typical of its kind, and if not, if the extent of its ‘untypicality’ is known; and lastly, meaning which asks the question whether evidence in a document is clear and comprehensive. To these criteria Bowen (2009) adds accuracy.

All visitors’ comments which were received from the Robben Island Museum and the Apartheid Museum were used and re-written as they were; while visitors’ comments
from the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum were randomly selected as they were many in number. Through this exercise this study was able to understand how visitors related to the study sites and the meanings they ascribed to them.

3.5.5 Data analysis

Data gathering and data analysis were not regarded as discrete activities. The analytical process began during data collection, and as the data already gathered was analysed it shaped the data collection going forward (Pope, Ziebland, and Mays, 2000; Wright and Flemons, 2002). Data analysis involved textualising and de-identifying the raw data (Wright and Flemons, 2002; Nicholls, 2009; Ranney, Meisel, Choo, Garro, Sasson, and Guthrie, 2015), which required transcribing the tapes. The transcripts were subsequently verified with the audiotapes, which involved listening and reading a number of times.

The initial set of transcripts of the responses to the interviews and the data from the documents was coded for initial themes and impressions of the data. These themes were then compared for similarities and differences in order to group them into larger categories, and the larger categories were reviewed to make sure there were no overlapping or duplicated categories. This study avoided using descriptive statistics to present the findings. Instead this study, where appropriate, discussed the findings using such words as ‘many’, ‘most’, ‘with the exception’, ‘a few’, and, ‘one participant stated’ (Ranney et al., 2015). The iterative nature of the qualitative research approach meant that one had to continuously check and re-check decisions made in the data
collection and analysis, so as to judge and re-judge their effectiveness and coherence (Chenail, 2011).

3.5.6 Use of technology in data analysis

There are numerous studies that have employed a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software programme (CAQDAS) despite its limitations and debates around its use (Bringer, Halley, Johnston, and Brackenridge, 2006; Bong, 2007; Hutchison, Johnston, and Breckon, 2010; Sinkovics and Alfoldi, 2012). In order to facilitate analysis, this study used the ATLAS.ti 7 software. The ATLAS.ti 7 software provided facilities to code and manage the data (Friese, 2012; Scales, 2013). Textual data from the interviews was uploaded onto the programme, the data was coded and common themes were identified. Data analysis was done by the researcher and not by the ATLAS.ti 7 software. This was so because qualitative data analysis software does not necessarily analyse data in a similar manner to the quantitative data software; it mainly serves the purpose of data management.

3.6 THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER

In quantitative research, the researcher’s role is theoretically non-existent. The researcher is also considered an instrument of data collection (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). In qualitative research data is mediated through the human instrument, rather than through questionnaires or machines. In view of this the qualitative researcher needs to describe relevant aspects of self, including any biases and assumptions, any expectations, and experiences in order to qualify to conduct research. Quantitative
research protocol assumes that studies ideally should be repeatable by others and, under the same conditions, should yield similar results. A qualitative researcher should also explain if their role is *emic* – an insider, who is a full participant in the research– or *etic* – an outsider or more of an objective observer (Punch, 1998).

With regards to the present study, the researcher did not harbour any biases and assumptions which necessitated that they be declared. However, this study attempted to embrace some measure of both subjectivity and objectivity. This meant enabling the respondents to express their subjective experiences and the meaning that they attached to dark tourism in an empathetic manner. A good qualitative researcher asks probing questions, then listens, then thinks, then asks more probing questions to get to deeper levels of the conversation. An effective qualitative researcher seeks to build a picture using ideas and theories from a wide variety of sources (Simon, 2011). During the research process the respondents were given space to air their experiences and their meaning attached to dark tourism. This was done empathetically. The researcher was also inter-subjectively immersed in this study.

### 3.7 ENSURING THE QUALITY OF THE STUDY

Trustworthiness has emerged as one important criterion for ensuring quality in qualitative research (Arendt et al., 2012; Thomson, Perry, and Scholes, 2014; Rapport, Clement, Doel, and Hutchings, 2015; Amankwaa, 2016). Elements of trustworthiness include credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability and authenticity (Lincoln and Guba, 2000; Munn, Porritt, Lockwood, Aromataris, and Pearson, 2014; Thomson et
al., 2014; Hays, Wood, Dahl, and Kirk-Jenkins, 2016). In as far as credibility criterion was concerned; every attempt was made to render the research process as sound as possible, so as to achieve accurate research outcomes. Interviews were recorded and transcribed accurately. Regarding dependability, this study could expect similar findings among researchers within and across studies. Lastly, in order to adhere to the conformability criterion, this study was an accurate and a genuine reflection of the participants’ views and not those of the researcher.

Furthermore, in order to demonstrate qualitative rigour this study embraced the audit trail concept. Audit trail is one of the most important elements of trustworthiness of the results (Reese, 1996; Whiteside, Mills, and McCalman, 2012; Krueger and Casey, 2015; Wu and Beaunae, 2014). In order to accommodate the principle of an audit trail Chapter Four of this study shows in detail how the data was analysed and how themes were derived. This means that it would be possible for a third party to gather similar material and data to that used in this study and arrive at comparable conclusions. Additionally, the method in which this study was conducted was presented in such detail that other researchers could use it as an operating manual to do other studies of this nature (Cooney, 2011; Krueger and Casey, 2015).

3.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical considerations deal with the following: research aims should contribute to the good of society; research must be based on sound theory; research must avoid unnecessary physical and mental suffering; no research project can go forward where
serious injury and or death are potential outcomes; the degree of risk taken with research participants cannot exceed the anticipated benefits of the results; a proper environment and protection of the participants is necessary; human participants must be allowed to discontinue their participation voluntarily at any time; and finally, scientists must be prepared to terminate the experiment if there is cause to believe that continuation will be harmful or result in injury or death (Brasier, 1995; Centre for Bioethics, 2003; Hegtvedt, 2007; Resnik, 2011).

A number of measures which this study employed in order to adhere to the code of research ethics are discussed below. A letter of informed consent was presented to the participants, which they signed. The purpose of the research, the expected duration and all procedures were explained. It was explained that participants had the right to decline to participate and to withdraw from the research at any stage if they deemed it necessary. This study took cognisance of all the factors which could influence the willingness of the participants to take part in this study, and the importance of this study was explained to the research participants. The research participants were made aware of their confidentiality as they participated in this study; this entailed informing them of whom they could contact at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) if they had any questions. Over and above all of these, this study received the seal of approval from the UKZN Humanities and Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee before it was undertaken.
3.9 DATA STORAGE AND DISPOSAL

Storing and disposal of data used in this study was be guided by the provisions of the Electronic Communications and Transactions (ECT) Act of the Republic of South Africa (2002), which came into effect in August 2002. Chapters eight and nine of the Act deal with the handling of data. Chapter eight of the Act particularly deals with personal information and privacy protection. This Act stipulates that collectors of personal information (data collectors) may subscribe to a set of universally accepted data protection principles. Some of the universally accepted data protection principles are: that the data collector may not use the personal information for any other purpose other than the disclosed purpose without the express written permission of the data subject (provider of data), unless the data collector is permitted or required to do so by law. Secondly, the data collector must, for as long as the data collected is being used and for a period of at least one year thereafter, keep a record of any person to whom the personal information was disclosed, and the purpose for which it was disclosed. Thirdly, a data collector may not disclose any of the personal information held by them to a third party, unless required by law or authorised to do so in writing by the subject from whom the data was obtained. Finally, the data controller must delete or destroy all personal information which has become obsolete.

This research project has used the Electronic Communications and Transactions (ECT) Act (2002) as a frame of reference in handling the data. Data collected will be securely kept for a period of five years at the UKZN Geography Department. Thereafter, the data
in the form of hard copy will be shredded and the cassette recordings will be incinerated.

3.10 CHALLENGES OF THE STUDY

Some of the challenges which this study initially encountered and was able to effectively deal with included: getting permission from the gatekeepers of the three research sites to do this study; negotiating protocol with the gatekeepers; and it was also very difficult to find willing study participants on the first day of research at the Robben Island Museum. In order to overcome the challenge of negotiating the protocols of the three research sites, the advice of Schwieson (2010) was useful. Schwieson (2010) advised that a prospective researcher should not stop at the first rejection. The researcher thus persevered, built relationships with the gatekeepers of the institutions where the research was to be done, showed the importance of this study to these gatekeepers and the study participants, and arrived prepared with all supporting documents in case they were needed.

On reflection, during the first two days of research at the Nelson Mandela Gateway to the Robben Island Museum, the researcher found doing research a more daunting task than theory (Schwiesow, 2010) had led the researcher to believe. It was very difficult to get willing research participants. However, an American couple on the ferry from the Robben Island Museum were so willing to be interviewed that they even gave some advice on how to recruit more research participants; which helped the researcher a lot as their tips worked well. With the experience gained from interviewing at the Nelson
Mandela Gateway to Robben Island, the researcher did not have a lot of problems with interviews in Johannesburg at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum and the Apartheid Museum.

3.11 CONCLUSION

This chapter presented the philosophy and the methods of this study. The chapter opened with a discussion of the relationship between ontological and epistemological considerations and how they influence the direction of research and this study in particular. The chapter proceeded to review the current approaches to tourism research. This deals with methods that different researchers have adopted in tourism studies and in dark tourism in particular. This was followed by a review of the study sites, namely, the Robben Island Museum, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum and the Apartheid Museum. The qualitative research approach of this study, sample selection, data sources and analysis methods were explained. The last part of the chapter dealt with issues like ensuring the quality of this study, ethical considerations, data storage and disposal, and the challenges encountered during this study. The following chapter presents the findings of this study and the data analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR
DARK TOURISM MOTIVATIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Over the past couple of years there has been a considerable amount of progress in dark tourism research. Earlier conceptions of dark tourism tended to assume that the thrill to ‘gaze’ at something dark at dark tourism sites motivated tours to these locations. However, further research has shown that visits to sites associated with death, pain and suffering are not necessarily motivated by pleasure seeking at these sites (The terms dark tourism, and ‘visits to sites associated with death, pain and suffering’ are used interchangeably to mean one and the same phenomenon). This chapter also confirms this, and concludes that dark tourism is much more than seeking pleasure at places associated with hardship and atrocity. The results presented below are based on interviews which were conducted at the three research sites: the Robben Island Museum; the Apartheid Museum; and the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum. This chapter opens by discussing the findings on the nationalities of the tourists, and ends by examining the roles of communication media, marketing and other intermediaries in dark tourism.

4.2 NATIONALITIES OF THE TOURISTS AT THE RESEARCH SITES

Visitors to the research sites originated from all over the world, however, countries with higher representations were the United States of America, and from Europe – Germany, England, the Netherlands, Ireland, Wales, Scotland, and France. There were also
many Indian, Australian and Chinese visitors (however, the Chinese visitors could not be interviewed because they could not communicate in English). The overall picture was thus that the research sites drew visitors from all over the world including – Canada, Denmark, Brazil, Colombia, Taiwan, Romania, the rest of Africa, for example, Nigeria, Kenya, and, Namibia. There were also a number of former South Africans – those who had emigrated to the United States of America and to Britain who visited the study sites. This study also interviewed a number of South African citizens.

4.3 DARK TOURISM SITES VISITED

Most of dark tourism sites that the tourists had visited internationally were in what could be called the developed world. Visitors did not indicate that they had been to dark tourism sites in Africa, even though there were such sites (slave ports) in countries like Ghana, Nigeria and Senegal. Dark tourism sites that visitors had toured the most included: concentration and Nazi camps in Buchenwald and Dachau in Germany; Auschwitz in Poland; concentration camps in the Netherlands; the Holocaust Museum in Washington DC, USA; the Jewish Museum in Berlin, Germany; the killing fields of Cambodia; Hiroshima, the site of the atomic bomb, in Japan; the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem, Israel; the Alcatraz Prison Island in San Francisco, USA; the Kilmainham Goal in Dublin, Ireland; the Tower of London, England; Port Arthur and Norfolk Island, in Australia; Perth Gaol, in Australia; colonial Jails Museums in India, and the Taj Mahal (where Mumtaz Mahal is buried), in India. Some international visitors had been to local sites, for example, the Jewish Cemetery in Pretoria; and some had been to Qunu
(Nelson Mandela’s burial place) in Mthatha. These last two sites of tourists’ attractions are classified under graveyard or cemetery tourism.

Visitors had also been to places associated with poverty or slums. Chapter Two showed that poverty or slum tourism is a variant of dark tourism (Rolfes, 2010; Meschkank, 2011; Dürr, 2012; Dürr and Jaffe, 2012; Frenzel, 2012). This form of tourism is popularly known as township tourism in South Africa. Visitors had toured black townships such as Langa and Khayelitsha in Cape Town (refer to Figure 3.1). Still others had been to Soweto, Kliptown and Alexandra, in Johannesburg (refer to Figure 3.2). Others who had not been to townships showed that they intended to visit such places during their stay in South Africa. Internationally some visitors had been to poor places in the USA, such as the Bronx in New York (which a visitor considered to be relatively poor). Visitors had also visited poor places in Thailand, India, Malaysia, Colombia, Cambodia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Tanzania.

Other popular tourist attractions which international visitors toured which were not necessarily associated with dark tourism included: Vilakazi Street in Soweto (where the early Nelson Mandela house which has been turned into a museum is located; and where Bishop Tutu’s house is); places of culture such as Mary Fitzgerald Square, Johannesburg; the Cradle of Humankind, Gauteng; the Kirstenbosch National Botanical Gardens and the Castle of Good Hope in Cape Town; the Winelands in the Western Cape; and Swaziland.
4.4 REASONS TO HAVE VISITED DARK TOURISM SITES

It was mostly international visitors who had been to dark tourism sites in other parts of the world, as South Africans who were visiting the research sites tended not to have visited dark tourism sites internationally. The reasons for visiting dark tourism sites were grouped into: reasons to have visited sites associated with death, pain and suffering; and reasons to have visited sites associated with poverty and slums (township tours). Participants’ responses were divided into those of the international visitors; and those of the South Africans and former South Africans.

4.4.1 REASONS TO HAVE VISITED SITES OF DEATH, PAIN, AND SUFFERING: INTERNATIONAL VISITORS

This section discusses the variety of reasons that motivated international visits to sites associated with death, pain and suffering.

4.4.1.1 History, lessons, and memorialisation

This study found the desire to learn history and to be educated to be the main motivation to tour dark tourism sites internationally and in South Africa. The idea was that it was about a country’s history or history in general. The following case illustrated this:

    I have been to [the] Killing Fields in Cambodia. I have been to the places where torture went on in Cambodia. It was basically about history (American citizen, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 15 June 2016).
Another research participant stated the following as the reason to have visited the Robben Island Museum:

It’s about history. …it’s necessary of course (when asked if the visit to the Robben Island Museum was because of Nelson Mandela), it’s also about history. We want to know more about history, just to gain knowledge about it (Dutch citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 2 June 2016).

The latter research participant felt history to be more of a compelling factor than Nelson Mandela to have visited the Robben Island Museum. Some research participants, however, went beyond just learning history at dark tourism sites. They also considered the present day relevance of the events of the past. There was a need to take note, to memorialise, take lessons from the events, gain insight into them, and to ensure that they were not repeated. This could be interpreted to mean that some visitors looked for a better world. Some research participants were also inclined to judge the people who had committed the cruelties of the past. One could also have understood this to mean that some tourists were concerned with ethical and moral issues. On the reason to visit concentration camps in Germany, a research participant stated the following about their motive:

It was to learn history. I think it is important to remember exactly what happened and to make sure that it does not happen again (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 15 June 2016).
Another research participant who went to the Auschwitz concentration camp in Poland responded:

*Those issues that I have gone to visit; I think today they are still historically present. You talk about the 1970s, you talk about the 1940s, the mass killings of the Jews; it is still lifetime problems which should not be happening in the modern day. It is to understand the history of it* (British citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 13 June 2016).

This research participant expressed concern that human kind kept on repeating the mistakes of the past. Adding another dimension to the visits, the next respondent was inclined to make value judgements:

*…To learn. I think it is part of history which we should remember, history which should not be ignored, and thinking about it makes you feel uncomfortable. It compels you to make judgements about what’s going on today, events which should not be repeated* (American citizen, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 17 June 2016).

This interviewee above suggested that human kind take lessons from past atrocious events so that they would not be repeated. The next participant referred to the Robben Island Museum as an unjust prison:

*…Robben Island is an unjust prison …and to get to know South African history, apartheid and things like that. The aim is to understand how people spent twenty
years on the island; to learn the history of apartheid and injustice in South Africa
(Australian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 2 June 2016).

The next response revealed that even though there was an emotional side to their visit, the respondent was still rational about the tour; they wanted to understand more. On the reason to have visited concentration camps in Europe:

I (hesitant, there is a moment of silence), explain it…am (moment of silence) because it is heart breaking, some of the things that happen in this world and I would like to understand more about it (American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 13 June 2016).

Previous studies have found the desire to learn to be important in dark tourism motivations (Yan et al., 2016; Yoshida et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2016a). One could also read from the above responses that people in general were becoming more concerned about the injustices committed against other people. Perhaps this showed an increase in concerns with morality as people interacted transnationally? Apart from Bigley et al. (2010); Yan et al. (2016); Yoshida, et al. (2016) and Zhang et al. (2016a), Isaac and Çakmak (2014) have also found conscience to be one of the motivating factors of dark tourism. Perhaps the global community has become galvanised to do something about some of the perceived injustices of the world?
4.4.1.2 Nelson Mandela, paying homage and the Robben Island Museum

Many respondents indicated that they were visiting the research sites, particularly the Robben Island Museum, for the following reasons: Nelson Mandela, paying homage, and to seeing the museum itself. However, paying homage to global icon Nelson Mandela topped the list. The first two excerpts below show how the visitors felt about Nelson Mandela:

I am going to cry (Sobbing), (When the visitor got to the Robben Island Museum). Nelson Mandela was one of the greatest men (sobbing) that ever lived. Yes, I have read his autobiography. And even before I knew I was coming to Africa, and I just had to come. I think it (the visit to the Robben Island Museum) will reinforce how I feel, nothing will change but it will intensify how I feel (a moment of silence). I love life and he (Nelson Mandela) did too (almost sobbing). You know when there is one thing that everybody has said; it is that the former political prisoners are old like me. And they are not going to be around for longer and we need to know what they say. Yeah, no, nobody can as a second hand tell you what it was like. The words they express, the way they look, the way they say it will tell you what it was like (American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

Concurring with the above, two other research respondents stated the following as their reasons to have visited the Robben Island Museum:

To see part of history and to see exactly how they had to go through as prisoners (Female interviewee, wife). (The husband adds) It’s just one [reason]. Nelson
Mandela, he was my main attraction; he did not just waste his time in prison, he spent thirty years of his life in incarceration. Nelson Mandela was my main attraction he is the reason for our coming here. Nelson Mandela was my main motive. I wouldn’t care about anything else. In his fight for democracy in South Africa, he was able to visualise what he wanted for South Africa (American couple, interviewed on the boat from the Robben Island Museum, 27 May 2016).

A number of conclusions could be made from the above responses: visitors shared their experiences back in their home countries. Also, visits to the Robben Island Museum stirred up a lot of emotions for some visitors (the interviewee sobbed during the interview). The first visitor also felt duty bound to come to Africa and to South Africa, evidenced by “I just had to come”. He also appeared to model himself around Nelson Mandela, evidenced by “I love life and he (Nelson Mandela) loved life too”. The quote “he loved life too” could also have suggested that if Nelson Mandela had not loved life he could easily have given up in prison. The visitor’s admiration was not limited to Nelson Mandela alone; it also extended to other former political prisoners. The second interviewees attached importance to the tour to the Robben Island Museum in that they described it as seeing “part of history”. In contrast with the first interviewee, the second interviewees were specifically driven by a deep sense of admiration for Nelson Mandela, evidenced by “Nelson Mandela was my main attraction…wouldn’t care about anything else”. The interviewees further presented Nelson Mandela as a visionary with “he was able to visualise what he wanted for South Africa”.
The next respondents made a comparative reference between visits to concentration camps in Germany and Poland, and their visits to the Robben Island Museum. They had visited the Robben Island Museum several times:

[We have visited] concentration camps to see and pay respects. Yes, it was interesting to be there (the Robben Island Museum) because Nelson Mandela was always…er…, it was very interesting for me, and I grew up with him. I always go there because of Nelson Mandela, to see the cell but also the Table Mountain… (She laughs) the view from there is just spectacular. Without Nelson I wouldn’t go to the Robben Island Museum. Yes, when I went to the Robben Island Museum I just wanted to see the cell, yes, but not especially his cell… I think it was interesting to see how and where he slept for a large part of his life (German citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 29 May 2016).

One could also read from the excerpts that people visited the sites of the research and possibly also South Africa for more than one reason. The research participant above was also fascinated by the beauty of nature: “the view from there – Table Mountain – is spectacular”. In addition, even though the interviewee was in Germany while Nelson Mandela was on Robben Island in prison, she appeared to have developed a distant personal relationship with him, verbalised by “I grew up with him”.

The following interviewee, however, shifted the focus from Nelson Mandela to the Robben Island Museum as a World Heritage Site:
Mainly to see the prison and where Mandela spent his life, not just about Mr Mandela but to see the island as well. Well it’s a World Heritage site isn’t it, the Robben Island? There is something special about it (British citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to the Robben Island Museum, 1 June 2016).

The above interviewee and his girlfriend wanted to see the prison and where Nelson Mandela spent his life, however, their visit was not just motivated by Nelson Mandela. The tourists also wanted to see the Robben Island Museum as it was a World Heritage Site. The designation of the Robben Island Museum as a World Heritage Site made it special to some visitors.

The following research participants stated the following about their visit to the Robben Island Museum:

…to learn more about history, we would like to go there also (concentration camps in Germany and Poland) as part of learning history… The place like Auschwitz in Poland is historical, and we would like to pay homage and to commemorate the lives of the people who died there. It’s part of history (Female interviewee, wife).

(The husband added) I think there is some merits to the factor of emotional release (When asked if places like the Robben Island Museum gave an opportunity to release emotions). I came to the 1995 Rugby World Cup; this was one year after Nelson Mandela became the president of South Africa. There was emotional release from the whole of the South African people, white and black. It was extraordinary in 1995, on the 25, June 1995 (All laugh). Yeah, absolutely! This is more
than just commemorating suffering and those who suffered (English-Dutch couple, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 30 May 2016).

In the above excerpt, the two interviewees were husband and wife, the husband was English and the wife was originally Dutch. They, together with their young daughter, were going to the Robben Island Museum. What was of note was that they had not visited concentration camps in Germany and Poland (which were closer to Britain and the Netherlands) but they had been to South Africa and Robben Island several times. The husband had come to South Africa for the 1995 Rugby World Cup. It was interesting to note that the husband (although British) remembered specific details, such as the actual date of the 1995 Rugby World Cup Final, 25 June 1995, and that it took place the year after Nelson Mandela became the president of South Africa. Perhaps this was an indication of how some visitors regarded South Africa and Nelson Mandela. Research (Isaac and Çakmak, 2014; Brown, 2015b) has shown the desire to pay homage to be a motivating factor of dark tourism.

### 4.4.1.3 Part of a bigger trip

Some of the visits to the research sites were undertaken as part of a bigger trip. This study also showed that visitors loved nature reserves and animals. They described visiting South Africa in terms of undertaking a safari:

> I am here for two reasons: one, we have a safari, we went to the animals; and secondly, we want to see the history of Nelson Mandela. Yeah, people in India are visiting South Africa more and more. Previously people used to go to other places,
Nigeria and Masai Mara (Kenya) and other places but now we are coming to South Africa, too, for two reasons. As I said one is to see the jungle, the bushes. What we call the jungle you call it the bushes and to look at the apartheid and the post-apartheid situation and all these things. We are also going to Cape Town…There are lot of differences because when tourists come; very rarely will they come to specifically see this museum (the Apartheid Museum). When we come from such a far-away place as India and we spend so much money, so we want to see everything, we want to see Sun City (resort and casino, North West Province). We also want to see the museum; we also want to see the bushes and lions and tigers and also everything. We planned this trip for three months; we planned this trip (Indian citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

The tour guide below had this to say about the nature of tourists’ visits:

I run a tour company. I used to be a guide but now I have taken over the Johannesburg branch of my father’s company. (We take tourists) …all over Gauteng, and also to the North-West province at Pilansberg (Pilansberg National Park and Game Reserve). I have got pinnacle places like Soweto and the Apartheid Museum; we also go to the Liliesleaf Farm (The farm used secretly by ANC activists in the 1960s and which was the location where many prominent ANC leaders were arrested in 1963). We go to struggle places. We take them to the pinnacle places of the struggle. We take them to these places but we are also trying to push more to places like the Maboneng Precinct (hub of culture and
business in the Johannesburg CBD) and to Newton Precinct (a development hub which houses theatres, art galleries, museums, restaurants, book stores, craft markets, clubs and cafés in the Johannesburg CBD). There is a lot of development there and we take people to the museum and the Johannesburg Art Gallery and Wits Arts Museum. We try to push the cultural side and the historical side; we try to accommodate the future market. Some younger tourists are adventurous and do bungee jumping at the Oppenheimer Towers (Soweto) (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 15 June 2016).

Another tour guide stated the following about the nature of tourists’ visits in Johannesburg:

_They go to Old Fort Constitutional Hill, and where the Constitutional Court is located. We also take them to Market Street, President Street, Mary Fitzgerald Square and Museum Africa. It is at Constitutional Hill that [the] history of [the] detention of political prisoners is exhibited. You would realise that Nelson Mandela was kept there for a few days before being moved to other prisons. This place was also used as a torturing base before a prisoner was moved. We also go to poor places like Kliptown in Soweto_ (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 14 June, 2016).

The first excerpt from the Indian tourist’s interview revealed that visitors maximised on their trips, and more Indian visitors than ever before were coming to South Africa.
Previously they went to other places in Africa for example, Nigeria and Kenya. Tourists had a huge interest in nature reserves and in their wild animals. They were interested in the post-apartheid South Africa. They also had an interest in Sun City (North West Province). It was also interesting to note that visitors planned their trips very well; they would take as long as three months to plan them. Visiting Africa and South Africa was viewed as a safari. The word safari had connotations of an expedition to a wild place, which could have had implications for how marketers packaged tours to South Africa.

The second and third excerpts above showed the important role of tour guides in tourism. The first tour guide used the term “pushing: we try to push the cultural side and the historical side”. Apart from taking tourists to places of nature, the tour guide pointed out that they also took tourists to places of culture and history. The tour guide regarded culture as the future market in tourism, and suggested that younger tourists were looking for adventurous activities like bungee jumping. The second tour guide also took visitors to places of culture for example, Mary Fitzgerald Square and Museum Africa; and to places that were associated with a difficult past such as Old Fort Constitutional Hill. One could therefore draw the conclusion that nature, culture and adventure defined tourism to South Africa.

Culture has become an important part of the tourism experience (Carter and Beeton, 2004; Tuinabua, 2005; Bleasdale, 2006; Huebner, 2015). Le and Pearce (2012) showed that visiting dark tourism sites was not always motivated by an interest in dark events; rather people undertook such trips as part of a bigger journey. Buda and Shim
(2015) found that people engaged in danger zone tourism as part of their desire for novelty.

4.4.1.4 Visit by accident

It came out in the interviews that some of the visits to the research sites were not pre-planned but occurred by chance. Such tours occurred, either because visitors had leisure time or because the site of interest was close by. For example, two colleagues were at a conference in Cape Town and they did not have anything else to do. The two colleagues would also have liked to visit nature reserves, which they called a *safari*. Another tourist interviewed had gone to visit the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem, Israel, because it was easy to access the place:

…*We are here in Cape Town specifically because we have a conference. From here we are going back to Romania. We flew for many hours and we have a three day conference. We do not have anything else to do so we decided to come and see the Robben Island Museum. I would have loved the safari but there isn’t time. We should have stayed for longer but we do not have time because of work* (Romanian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 28 May 2016).

The other interviewee had the following reason for visiting a dark tourism site:

*The reason I went there (Wailing Wall, Jerusalem) was because my husband was overseas with the army and he was in Lebanon at the time. This is just over the border, and we went to Jerusalem* (Irish citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).
Leisure pursuit has also been recognised in previous studies as a reason to visit dark tourism sites (Poria et al., 2006; Yan et al., 2016). This suggested that if tourists had had something else to do, they probably would not have visited dark tourism sites.

4.4.1.5 Curiosity and desire to know

This study also found that some people visited the townships and the Apartheid Museum out of curiosity and also because of the desire to know more:

*We were always interested in apartheid. And we wanted to see the museum (the Apartheid Museum) and townships and to see how people lived in those troubled years…I think Nelson Mandela brought a lot of it (interest) and people admire him so much* (Irish citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

The following interviewee showed a lack of commitment to the tour to a dark tourism site. The trip occurred out of curiosity:

*I have also visited the Jewish Museum in Washington, DC. It’s just about curiosity. It is curiosity I think, to see the past* (Scottish tourist, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

The above excerpts showed that there were research participants who had visited the research sites in South Africa just because they had wanted to see: the footprints of Apartheid; Nelson Mandela’s legacy; townships and how people lived there. There were also those whose visits to international dark tourism visits – Jewish Museum in Washington DC – were motivated by curiosity. Curiosity was previously reported to
have played a part in dark tourism (Bigley et al., 2010; Isaak and Çakmak, 2014; Yong, 2014; Liyanage, 2015; Yan et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2016a).

4.4.1.6 Witnessing the struggle for liberation: Africa and India

For some Indian tourists, Mahatma Gandhi served as one of the reasons for them to have visited some tourism sites in South Africa:

*Mahatma Gandhi is the father of our nation (India), he is also a giant. He went on a train (Pietermaritzburg) and he had a first class ticket but he was not allowed… Mahatma Gandhi was a highly educated person. We are not going to Cape Town. This museum (the Apartheid Museum) is very well known in India, we come from India. Mahatma Gandhi started his political career in South Africa. He was inspired in South Africa because of the gross injustices and he took this movement to India and so we know this place. From here we are going to Victoria Falls in Zimbabwe and to the National Park (Kruger National Park),* (Indian citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 16 June 2016).

Learning about the struggle for liberation also emerged as a reason for visits to the research sites. Nelson Mandela was seen as an embodiment of the struggle for liberation, not only for South Africa but also for the rest of Africa, and visitors wanted to learn from him:

*We visit it (the Robben Island Museum) for reasons of political interest, to see the development of Africa. The reason is that Mr Mandela is a personality in Africa. He was detained there (the Robben Island Museum), so we want to find out where...*
he was detained and as part of history. Mandela is a point of reference throughout Africa. We regard him as a hero. I am interested in the history of Africa. That is why I am here, and not because of any other reason. People like Mandela have suffered for Africa. So we go there to appreciate them and to see the type of suffering they went through. By going there we will be able to appreciate what they did for Africa. I come from Nigeria, far, far away from South Africa (Nigerian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 31 May 2016).

The above visitor was a Nigerian, as indicated. During the interview this tourist indicated that he had not visited similar dark tourism sites in other parts of Africa, for example the slave ports in Ghana and Senegal, which were actually closer to Nigeria. Instead, this visitor was visiting South Africa (and the Robben Island Museum) and had acknowledged that it was far, far away from Nigeria.

For some visitors, visiting Robben Island served as an educational tour which would stimulate further debates:

The intention is to feel and experience the connection of what the site used to be and that we also aim to conduct a dialogue on democracy (A Congolese-South Africa citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 1 June 2016).

What emerged from the above transcripts was that the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi was important to the Indian visitors. Some visitors also combined visits to South Africa with visits to Victoria Falls in Zimbabwe. For other African visitors the Robben Island
Museum experience served as a foundation for ideas on the discourse of democracy, and appreciation for who participants considered as struggle heroes was one of the drivers of dark tourism (Brown, 2015b).

4.4.1.7 Obligation and understanding global issues

Some visitors went to research sites (and to other dark tourism sites in other parts of the world) because they felt obligated to do so. They were either on a school tour or their trip was part of their family’s history and heritage. Responses of the research participants below showed that:

I was young, and at school, I think it was more of history, to know more about history, about what happened in the Second World War (Dutch citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 14 June 2016).

A similar response from another interviewee was as follows:

It was when I was younger with my family. We went to Auschwitz (Poland) to just to take in, I guess, the severity of the situation that happened in Germany, and just to have a historical look at the situation. Right, we have a lot of German heritage in my family. We went there to see something that happened in history and to understand things that took place and not be ignorant of things. We wanted to have a global perspective on issues (American citizen, interviewed at the Nelson Mandela Gateway to Robben Island, 31 May 2016).
This excerpt also showed that tourists sometimes identified with the victims of dark events, evidenced by “*take in…severity of the situation*”, which was consistent with Poria et al., (2006); Budrtye-Ausijiene (2015) and Zhang et al., (2016b); that dark tourism visits could also evoke negative emotional experiences. The last tourist also wanted a better perspective of the issues at hand.

4.4.1.8 Open-mindedness

In the excerpt below, the research participant had visited the Apartheid Museum because he had regarded it as new. He may just have been curious to see it and he described himself as a progressive person:

> ...*Just because it is new, and I am a progressive person, I wanted to see it*

(American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

The Apartheid Museum first opened its doors in November 2001 (Rankin and Schmidt, 2009; Labuschagne, 2012; Schmidt, 2013). This made it fifteen years old at the time of the interview; yet this American visitor referred to it as being “*new*.” This could have suggested that the Apartheid Museum was not well marketed, or it could have meant that it was well maintained and still looked new. Furthermore, the respondent understood himself to be a “*progressive person*”, and this could have been interpreted to mean that, had this visitor not been progressive, he would not have visited the Apartheid Museum. With this, the visitor not only made value judgements about other visitors, he also made a value judgement about the museum.
4.4.1.9 Reality and authenticity

Some respondents were interested in the authenticity of the presentations and of the site itself:

*I wanted to get more information about my history* (on his visit to concentration camps in Germany and Poland). *I saw a lot of changes when I was there…I travel a lot and I get a lot of people asking me about it* (concentration camps). *And I can give some answers. I have read about it* (the Robben Island Museum) *and I want to get some information …Of course we get information about the history of the Robben Island but for me it* (the Robben Island Museum) *might not be authentic. I am not sure if I would say the cell is authentic and he (Nelson Mandela) stayed there for real. They might have re-organised the cell, so as to create the impression in people that he (Nelson Mandela) stayed there. I don’t, know it could be a fake. It would make a difference, if it is shown as what it was… and not something just to make money about. But just now I suspect that it is just something to make money about…*I will not be paying any respects as it* (the Robben Island Museum) *could be unnatural. Yes, of course, I respect all people who see others with an open mind…there were many more people on the Robben Island. It was not just Nelson Mandela alone. Yeah, it’s more about all the people who were there.* *Sorry about that* (laughing) (German citizen – who was working with street children in Colombia at the time of the interview, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 1 June 2016).
The respondent above went beyond the surface value of things in his analysis. He was very critical and sceptical, and he appeared objective in his approach. He had been to concentration camps in Europe, partly for reasons of kinship, as indicated by the words: “my history”. This visitor had seen a lot of changes to those sites over time, which perhaps suggested that the concentration camps had been altered for commercial purposes. This interviewee had read about the Robben Island Museum and appeared to be against the commercialisation of the site if that is the case. He seemed also to believe that the Robben Island Museum mostly reflected Nelson Mandela, and pointed out that there were other political prisoners at the island prison besides Nelson Mandela, yet they were not emphasised as much. A conclusion which could be drawn from this interview was that some visitors were very analytical of the sites they visited.

The next respondent had read about the Apartheid Museum and apartheid in general, and wanted to have a first-hand authentic experience of what she described as a terrible situation:

   I want to be part of the feeling and to see. In India you read about them (impacts of apartheid) that does not give you the feeling; I want to feel what happened, it was terrible (Indian citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 13 June 2016).

Authenticity of the experience has also been cited as a reason to visit dark tourism sites (Naoi, 2003; Lisle, 2007; Nate-Chei et al., 2011).
4.4.1.10 Visit places of corrective justice

Some respondents visited dark tourism sites for unusual reasons. This next respondent had visited the Robben Island Museum and former prisons in Australia, as he was interested in seeing how people who had strayed from the law had lived in circumstances where they had been forced to comply with the law. Although this participant had great admiration for Nelson Mandela, his visit to the Robben Island Museum had not necessarily been because of him; he had wanted to get a broader picture of the place:

- *It is a fact of life some people stray from the law; same [as some] people keep the law. I just want to see how they live in circumstances where they are forced to comply with the law.* (On the question of whether the Robben Island Museum could be understood as a place of people who had strayed from the law) … *Well, the law of the time, yes. The law was in place and people chose not to comply with the law. I am not saying that they were not right in challenging the law at the time. I would think that probably there were other ways of doing it. And in hindsight there are other ways of challenging the law other than violence. I have great respect and admiration for Nelson Mandela and I wanted to see the conditions in which he lived… And I wasn’t keen to see where he was kept. I wanted to see the general location and I am not particularly interested in the conditions of the cell… I am not interested in seeing something like that. He (Nelson Mandela) was confrontational. He was; both sides (and apartheid Government) were confrontational. There would have been a solution otherwise, there would have been an answer but violence is not [the] cure to problems. I*
believe in even-handedness. I believe in valued quality of life and I value human beings. I think that’s the most important thing, when someone has done wrong then I believe that judgement should be handed down (Australian citizen, a judge by profession, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 31 May 2016).

The above discussion has presented some of the findings of this study. It provided the motivations for international visitors to visit the research sites and other dark tourism sites globally. There were varieties of reasons for doing so. Some visitors had a global view and toured dark tourism sites in order to see how brutal humans could be to others, and some used their visits as a platform for further dialogue on democracy. Some visitors were critical of the sites and did not accept things at superficial level. This study also got the perspectives of South Africans and former South Africans concerning the motivations to visit dark tourism sites, and these are presented in the next section.

4.4.2 REASONS TO HAVE VISITED SITES OF DEATH, PAIN AND SUFFERING: SOUTH AFRICAN AND FORMER SOUTH AFRICAN VISITORS

The responses were arranged according to their order of importance, as determined by the number of research responses.

4.4.2.1 Desire to know

The next two former South African interviewees gave reasons to visit the research sites:
This is not touring, I came here because I wanted to (come). I heard how good it (the Apartheid Museum) was, but I needed to come here to see it. I needed to see it because I wanted to know what’s going on. It is pre-planned, yes (South African-American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 16 June 2016).

Another former South African responded that:

...for me it (visit to the Apartheid Museum) was part of my growing up here (South Africa) and sorrowful (the museum experience), yes. It was horrible (South African-American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

These two former South Africans showed affinity with South Africa. The first interviewee had felt compelled to come to the Apartheid Museum; he had "needed to see it". The next informant remarked on the magnitude of the past events, on the reasons why he had gone to the Holocaust Museum in the USA and to Hiroshima, the site of the atomic bombing in Japan:

It is because these are big events, these are huge events, and they changed the world. They are part of what everyone today should know about and also what goes on in the world (South African-American, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 16 June 2016).

The first interviewee had come to Apartheid Museum as a way of fulfilling his wish. He had heard about the museum. From this interviewee one could read the importance of intermediaries in tourism, as this visitor had "heard how good the Apartheid Museum
was”. Even though the second interviewee had also emigrated from South Africa, the country still seemed to be part of his life, evidenced by his wording: “for me it was part of my growing up here”. However, he appeared to have been sorrowed and disgusted by what he had seen growing up. Perhaps one could also conclude that even though people emigrated from South Africa they did not completely forget the country and its history. This could apply particularly to those who could be called pre-1994 emigrants, that is, those who left South Africa before 1994. Perhaps marketing of the research sites should target these emigrants?

4.4.2.2 Connecting with the struggle of the past

The interviewee below (a black South African woman who appeared to be in her early twenties) had visited Robben Island several times. She interpreted the Robben Island Museum to be a place that refreshed memories of past political struggles from which people were becoming disconnected:

…But it's different, the Robben Island is different, I have visited the place more than once. People are losing their roots, not just in terms of apartheid but also in terms of suffering, where we come from. We go to the Robben Island to get more in touch with the former politicians and politics. I feel like it’s the only place where you can remind yourself. I don’t view it as just similar to going to a beach; it’s not something that you can take for granted. (On whether Robben Island provided an opportunity for reflection, the response was) …Very much so, to reflect about the whole history of the past including Sobukwe, (Robert Sobukwe, the founder of the Pan African Congress (PAC), which was founded in 1959) all of them. To me an
adventure is something fun, exciting, but there is nothing exciting about the Robben Island. It’s truly emotional and very sad, its fun going there but not in the sense of exciting (South African, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 31 May 2016).

The above respondent enjoyed going to the Robben Island Museum but was not seeking pleasure at the Museum; she seemed to enjoy being reminded of the Museum’s past. She believed that all former prisoners of Robben Island needed to be recognised, including those from the PAC. The following research participant also repeated the theme of the Robben Island Museum being more representative of those involved in the liberation struggle:

What is important for us is history and not only Nelson Mandela. It is not only Mandela who was on the Robben Island. There are other prominent people who were also there. We want to get the whole picture of the prisoners, people who were in prison, and not just Nelson Mandela. Of course Nelson Mandela was the main man but there were also other prisoners, otherwise he was not alone he was with other people. We just want to see and learn what happened. You know, I was also in the struggle. You know what I mean, so I am brave enough to be able to accept what happened on the Robben Island. People from overseas learn a lot. They hear a lot about South Africa, and about Nelson Mandela and about all those things, so when they come to South Africa, they are likely to be emotional. But I have the practical experience of what the Boers did, the torture and stuff, I know all about it (South African, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 2 June 2016).
The above respondent, also a black South African and according to him, a former anti-apartheid activist, also hoped for a more representative picture at the Robben Island Museum.

In a related theme, the next research participant, an Indian South African, stated about his reason to tour the Robben Island Museum that:

*I think I would be better informed of what transpired here, and how people sat around the table and negotiated to where we are today. I want (also) to see how people laboured and slaved out there in the quarry stone* (South African, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 1 June 2016).

This research participant further stated that he had also visited the Phoenix settlement, the Gandhi settlement, in Durban. Like the previous interviewee, this research participant had hoped to be informed of the whole process of political settlement in South Africa. The interviewee also pointed out that he had wanted to have the quarry experience “to see how people laboured and slaved in the quarry stone”. However, the interview with the curator of the Robben Island Museum showed that the quarry experience was not feasible. The idea was to limit human impact as much as possible since the Robben Island Museum was a World Heritage Site.

4.4.2.3 Obligation

Some other participants went to the research sites and to other similar sites internationally because of family members, otherwise they would not have visited the
sites. For example, a white South African lady visited the Apartheid Museum because her son wanted to see it. She did not want to be reminded about the past which she described as “very ugly”:

No, I haven’t (been to other dark tourism areas). I am here because my younger son from America is interested in coming here. I don’t think so, no (coming to the Apartheid Museum of her own will). I don’t to want to move back to the past which was very ugly, wasn’t it? Apartheid was very bad with all those things that happened. (On whether visiting Apartheid Museum was her wish, the answer was) No, no…It drives home what happened you know, I don’t think there is somewhere like this (South African, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 14 June 2016).

The above interviewee had only gone to the Apartheid Museum because she was accompanying her son, who had left South Africa but was visiting her. This could raise questions for further research; whether some former South Africans would still visit South Africa if their relatives were no longer here. The second interviewee had gone to see Alcatraz Prison because his father had wanted to:

…maybe my father wanted to visit (Alcatraz Island Prison), when we got to San Francisco it (Alcatraz Prison) was right there. You could see it and they run trips there every day, so it’s more of curiosity (South African-American, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 16 June 2016).
There were two factors to the visit to the Alcatraz Prison, according to last interviewee. Firstly, it had not been his choice to visit the prison and it was his father who had wanted to go there, as according to him “maybe my father wanted to visit”. Secondly, there was an element of curiosity, evidence by: “so it’s more of curiosity”.

4.4.2.4 Visit by chance

This (black South African) respondent had visited the Robben Island Museum because he had had free time. It was possible to read the state of emotions of this interviewee, as he used phrases like “you get to realise that what you were told at school is distorted, it is lies”:

It’s for historical reasons. You learn from books and when you get to be told at the real place like the museum, you get to realise that what you were told at school is distorted. It is lies. The Robben Island is historical, the Robben Island has history. I have a brother who lives here in Cape Town. We are visiting him and he told us about the Robben Island. It would depend on time; if we had enough time we would go. If we did not have enough time we would not go. …The issue would have been time. We came here to visit my brother [and] since we have time, we are going there (South African, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 31 May 2016).

Some former South Africans and white South Africans tended to visit sites associated with death, pain and suffering out of a desire to know more; as part of growing up in South Africa; and also because they felt obligated to do so. Black South Africans visited
similar places because of the need to connect with the past struggle for liberation and also as part of leisure. Black South Africans further tended to believe that more attention was given to Nelson Mandela, at the expense of the other former political prisoners.

4.4.3 REASONS TO HAVE VISITED SITES OF POVERTY AND SLUMS: INTERNATIONAL VISITORS

This section of the chapter explores the reasons for international tourists to have visited places of poverty and slums, including township tours in South Africa.

4.4.3.1 Travel companies and curiosity

This study showed that there were two broad facets to the tours to places of poverty and slums (township tours) in South Africa. The first facet was visitor curiosity, which perhaps combined with an element of gazing. Township tourism could be interpreted as part of tourists’ gaze since the tours (for example, in Cape Town) were normally done on weekends when everybody was around. Having said this, it was also important to point out that visitors were not necessarily indifferent to what they described as “the plight of the poor”. They empathised with the “sad situation” witnessed. Secondly, there was also the facet of the overseas travel companies who promoted township tours in South Africa.
This interviewee explained how township tours were organised:

_They go there_ (black townships in Cape Town) _because they just want to see a township, or as part of the tour package which travel companies overseas offer._ I _do a township tour._ It _takes me about two and a half hours._ I _use a couple of my black friends in Langa and Khayelitsha (Cape Town, townships) and they (tourists) walk amongst the shacks and they get the inside view._ They _are interested; they find it very humbling because it is a very sad situation._ They _find it exceptionally humbling._ On a tour to Khayelitsha I _just drop them at the top part of Khayelitsha Township and I drive through and come out through the other end of the township._ I _show them what the township life is like and it’s much better over weekends when you see all the kids and the families walking around._ Motivation, _er..., they do not necessarily come here just wanting to do a township tour._ The _reason why they do a township tour is mainly because of the tour operators who operate township tours as an extra thing to do._ We _go to the Winelands if there are no township tours_ (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 1 June 2016).

Tour companies have been recognised as important factors in township tourism (Rolfes, 2009).

### 4.4.3.2 Service work and giving back (_voluntourism_)

The findings of this study showed that some of those who had been to places of poverty and slums had not gone there for touring reasons. Instead, they had other reasons, for
example, helping out, and in the process they had hoped to help reduce the gap between the rich and the poor. Visitors seemed to hope for a better world. Some had also wished to get a better insight into how other people lived:

...to do service work. I think there is some interest and there is a need to give back, help out. We are involved in the development in some small village, helping to build a school. We have been touring the township, Soweto, the Hector Pieterson Memorial as well... We came to understand (American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 14 June 2016).

The other response which echoed this was:

I am from Colombia, I work with street kids and I have been to a few countries as well, because I want to give something back. I want to bridge the gap between rich people and poor and I just want to help...there is too much poverty. We cannot afford not to do anything about it (German citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 1 June 2016).

The above excerpts also revealed a humanitarian factor in tourism, and volunteer tourism has been recognised as one of the reasons to visit areas of poverty and slums (Stoddart and Rogerson, 2004; Wymer et al., 2010; Koleth, 2014).

4.4.3.3 Getting the real and broader perspective of the world

Visitors did not view poor places as tourist attractions. Tourists went to these places in order to: get a “real and a fuller picture of the world, meet the real people and not just
[experience] the rich western bubble”. Visitors pointed out that they were not there to gaze, gawk, or engage in voyeurism. Rather, their aim was to see how people lived in different circumstances, and to see the differences in the wealth between the rich and the poor. Tours to poor places also served to arouse a spirit of compassion. Visitors came to realise that not everyone was as fortunate as others. Another couple interviewed remarked that Soweto appeared the opposite of what they had been made to believe:

*I have been to Asia, I live in Singapore, and so I have been to such (poor) places in Asia in Malaysia and in Thailand. It is just to get the real picture of the world, how people live in different circumstances. (And on whether tourists are developing an interest in visiting areas of poverty?) Maybe, but there is a balance; you do not get tourists walking around looking and taking pictures of poor people. I think that is the negative part of it. But the good part of it is that you realise that you do not just live in your own bubble, which is the rich western world. You come to realise how people live in different circumstances. (And further)...but we have not gone there because of poverty. I would have gone there just to see the world* (Swiss citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

The respondent below was also motivated by the desire to see the “real people” of the country. As part of their journey, this visitor had travelled through some parts of Africa and had seen poverty:

*And when you get in the country, I came here from Dar es Salam (Tanzania). [I came] by bus and minibus and you see poverty. When I travel I like to travel in the*
second and the third world. I kind of like to meet the real people of the country. Yes, not the people who live in fancy houses and big hotels, you meet the real people. I just came here straight from Namibia. I took a bus from Keetmanshoop (Namibia), to Cape Town the other day. And I will be here for two more days before I leave (American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 31 May 2016).

The following research participant stated the following about going to Soweto and getting the feel of the place:

I think many people (who have not visited the place, Soweto) believe it is dangerous. Everybody likes to have an opinion, even though they have not been to these places. When I go home (Australia) I would tell people that perhaps they need to be careful but it (Soweto) is not so dangerous (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 15 June 2016).

Two research participants (an American couple) had visited Soweto because they had wanted to “get a better understating of how people live in different circumstances”. These research participants further spoke of their impression of Soweto; “they did not see much danger in Soweto”, and “Soweto did not look so poor”. The place appeared to be “more of an antithesis to what they were made to believe”. The couple had also been to the Cradle of Mankind site in Johannesburg. In Cape Town they had visited the Botanical Gardens, and would also be going on to Victoria Falls in Zimbabwe.
4.4.3.4 Understanding culture and architecture

The need to understand the culture and architecture of places also drove tourism. Another reason to visit townships included learning about the endeavours of the people there, and the popularity of Soweto provided an important motivation for visitors. With regards to the reason for having visited Nyanga, a black township in Cape Town (refer to Figure 4.1), a research participant stated that:

*I think it’s just to have a deeper look into the culture of the people of South Africa (referring to the visit to Nyanga Township). Also to know about their suffering, where they come from, and their humble beginnings in the struggle and things like that* (American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 1 June, 2016).

*Sometimes, architecture, sometimes just to see people, to see how people lived in the 19 century, or even earlier on* (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 1 June, 2016).

On the reason for having visited Soweto, a response was:

*It is the largest township in Johannesburg. And Johannesburg is the largest city in South Africa. If one has not been to Soweto, one has not seen the real Johannesburg* (Indian citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 13 June 2016).
4.4.3.5 Progressiveness

The research participants below had also visited places of poverty and slums because of open-mindedness and because they identified with the poor:

There a lot of poor cities in the United States, [I visited poor areas] because I am a progressive person. Also, because I was poor too I do not like poverty (American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 16 June 2016).

The next respondent reiterated the values of progressiveness and how people had been socialised:

I think it all depends on the socio-economic background and education. How one’s peers and friends might think of going to Thailand or something, it all depends on the individual, I grew up in a very multicultural London (British citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 16 June 2016).

The above further showed that the values people were brought up with were important factors in tourism.

4.4.3.6 Humanity and social justice

Some visitors went to poor areas because they were motivated by humanity and the desire for an unprejudiced world:

I have a huge interest in social justice, and I feel like, that this is just an incredible example for that. I came to Cape Town for music, I am a musician, but while I am here I am trying to see as much as I can. I am capturing experience as much as I
can. The first thing that I had to do when I got here was the township tour. I am not interested in perpetuating the world view that I already know, sort of white privilege, you know, living well. I wanted to see the world through other people’s eyes. I feel like getting out of Cape Town into the townships is an important step to do. I am going there too (Nature reserves). The first thing for me you know is always people. I want to know people. You know, in the townships where I went, I saw issues of poverty and suffering. I am more interested in the issues of humanity and the situation of the children and how people manage to survive and build lives for themselves. It is certainly challenging to see poverty and to see suffering but it is also beautiful to see humanity, do you know what I mean? …It is hard to see privilege when you only are encircled by poverty in that privilege. And also it is important to step outside out of your world view and see other world views. Hopefully it would change one’s perspective on something and if it doesn’t, one would have to take another look at themselves…Yes. I am more interested in getting to know the actual experiences of people of other places. Yes, and even beyond just the cell (Nelson Mandela’s cell), but just in getting to know the people and culture. I am less interested in the tourism and more interested in the actuality of the situation (American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 2 June, 2016).

The above excerpt also suggested that tourists did not visit the townships simply just to see the “other”, the different or just to gaze. They also wanted to see the human endeavour.
4.4.3.7 Part of a tour

On the reason to visit places associated with poverty and slums, an informant stated that: “…in India, it is because I was visiting the country, India. I was visiting the country”. This interviewee had been to a place of poverty, not because he had intended to see it but because he had come across it by accident while he was touring. Travel agents thus played a role in township tours, but the broader picture that emerged from the above presentations was that empathy and the desire to observe human endeavour motivated visits to places of poverty and slums. Tourist gaze was only a minor element in these tours.

The next part explores the same reasons for South Africans and former South Africans having visited such areas.

4.4.4 REASONS TO HAVE VISITED SITES OF POVERTY AND SLUMS: SOUTH AFRICANS AND FORMER SOUTH AFRICAN VISITORS

There were two reasons which had caused South Africans and former South Africans to visit poor places in South Africa.

4.4.4.1 Desire to know

The excerpt below brought out a number of issues concerning visits to Soweto. The participant grew up in South Africa, apparently during the apartheid period, and then left for the USA. The interviewee had never had the opportunity to visit Soweto so “he came back” to South Africa to see it. Probably, people overseas had learned about
Soweto and asked questions which he could not answer, and going to Soweto now enabled this tourist to answer these questions:

Because when I was growing up, I never went to Soweto. I came back to see how it looks like. I wanna see it. Well, people learn about these [places] internationally, people hear about these [places]. They hear about countries like South Africa, [and] by going there I will be bringing these to life; I will be able to see what’s going on (South African-American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June, 2016).

4.4.4.2 Liberal reasons

The next participant, also a white South African, who lived in Johannesburg, had been to Soweto and Alexandra, seemingly to see the aftermath of apartheid. The interviewee had gone there because he held liberal values:

Only here in South Africa (on the question, which poor places had been visited), I have been to Soweto and Alexandra, I am just interested to see how things have taken place in South Africa. Yeah, there is a reason, to see how people were treated as disadvantaged. I think people previously never had the opportunity to come and have a look at it. You had segregation with whites and blacks coming from different backgrounds. It depends how one was brought up, we were brought up as liberals, which is different (South African, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June, 2016).
The phrase: “I am just interested to see how things have taken place in South Africa” could create the impression that there was still some separation between people; as if some people still lived in their own enclaves and they were possibly not aware of what was happening to their neighbours. Some tourists engaged in township tourism because, as they said, they had liberal values.

The above discussion presented the findings of this study regarding the reasons for having visited dark tourism sites, by both South African and international visitors. There were some differences in terms of their motivations: international visitors were motivated by the desire to pay homage; they admired Nelson Mandela and they also admired humanity and the human spirit. South Africans wanted to connect with their roots; they wanted to get a fuller picture of all the contributors to liberation. Former South Africans who had emigrated were driven by the desire to know more as they had never been to any townships before. The chapter proceeds to discuss the roles of the different intermediaries in dark tourism.

4.5 THE ROLES OF MODERN COMMUNICATION MEDIA, MARKETING AND INTERMEDIARIES

On the basis of theory, this study assumed that modern communication media and marketing were the dominant mediators of the visits to the research sites. However, the findings of this study showed that, although South Africa was well marketed internationally and especially in Europe, there were other important intermediaries in dark tourism. The discussion turns to them.
4.5.1 Tour operators and word-of-mouth

Tour operators influenced the decisions of the tourists. From the excerpts below it could be seen that in America and in Britain tour operators packaged tours to visit South Africa and promoted trips to the research sites:

>You see Americans and British tourists would go to tour operators in their countries – there are a lot of Americans and British who come to South Africa – and they would ask for tour packages to South Africa. Tour operators normally offer the Robben Island Museum as highpoint of the trip. When, as a tour guide I suggest alternative places to visit here in Cape Town, they would be adamant that they would wish to go to the Robben Island Museum because their tour operators offered it to them. Also, some of the tourists who come here talk to their friends (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 2 June 2016).

Apart from tour operators who promoted tours to the research sites, there was also the factor of word-of-mouth knowledge, as the tourists talked to their friends about their experiences. The behaviour of the tourists at the tourism sites was also discussed in the interviews:

>The younger people find it (tours of museums) long, they want information quickly, but the older ones really enjoy it and they sometimes spend two to three hours there, and at the Constitution Hill which comes as part of the tour (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 15 June 2016).
The differences in the tourists’ behaviour, in terms of the time required at the sites and the types or amount of information required between the younger and the older tourists would have implications for the organisation of such tours.

4.5.2 Educational institutions

Educational projects also played a very important role in tours. In the USA some educational institutions’ work required students to do academic projects abroad and some institutions chose to bring their students to South Africa. In some other parts of the world the history curriculums also included aspects about South Africa. The following excerpts showed that:

…It is part of a class project and South Africa is part of that. It’s part of a research project (American citizen, interviewed, at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

This next interviewee also was at the research site as part of an educational project:

Our visit here is part of [our] itinerary, we are studying at a university and it is part of our project (American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 2 June 2016).

Another response was:

In my experience there was no advertising that we experienced. We came as a group, as part of our academic project (American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 29 May 2016).
The next interviewee also discounted marketing as factor in their trip to research site:

*I study Sociology and Urban Studies. No, it wasn’t marketing. My programme director at my university, Fordham University in New York City, taught me about this place* (American citizen, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 16 June 2016).

The following responses were motivated by the respondents' history curriculums and history in general:

*No. History class did* (referring to their history curriculum) (Nigerian citizen, interviewed, at the Gateway to Robben Island, 2 June, 2016).

*Of course it was part of history, I heard about it in schools, and maybe in television. I heard about the events, but just as information* (Romanian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 28 May 2016).

### 4.5.3 Television, internet and social media

Television, social media and the internet influenced the tourism decisions of the visitors. Web sites that advertised things to see and do when in Cape Town played an important role, and there was also advice given that social media could be used to attract younger people. The following responses confirmed the role of modern media:

*No. I have known [about] Robben Island my whole life, and I told you Nelson Mandela was always present for me* (because of television news and documentaries), *always, and it was exciting and I wanted to see the Robben Island*
Museum, and not because of advertising and [the] internet, no. It was part of history (that provided the motivation) (German citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

Regarding the role of social media, a response was as follows:

Well, social media made me aware. I live in America [and] social media made me aware that the museum existed and that there was a museum for apartheid. I would say social media helps but it didn’t play a role in my wanting to come here, no. However, it is informative; modern technological media is informative and it alerts people about what exists (South African-American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

On the role of the internet, an interviewee pointed out that they had used Google to source information about the Apartheid Museum. Another response was:

Yes I went on the internet after I heard about this place yesterday. I read all about what happened on June the 16th, 1976 (South African-American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, on 15 June 2016).

Facebook also played an important role:

Tourists take pictures out there and post them on Facebook. Their friends see the pictures, they see what they do and they also want to come. Social media makes a lot of difference (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 28 May 2016).
Tourism websites also had an important role to play:

*Internet and TV news; I use [the] internet (Google), but not social media (Facebook). More like tourist sites on [the] internet, internet sites that show like the 15 things that one must [see] on a visit to Cape Town* (Dutch citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

The following research participant had also used the internet to learn about the research site and went on to praise the site:

*This is a well-known museum* (the Apartheid Museum). *It shows how institutionalised racism was; racism still exists in one form or the other. You had rules, 148 rules that institutionalised racism. This museum is one of the best in the world, I went to Google and [the] internet and I found this museum, which is the best one in the world* (Indian citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 13 June, 2016).

The following research participant responded by giving advice as to how social media could be used further.

*I think using social media to engage younger people might be a different avenue to attract a different market* (American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, on 29 May, 2016).
4.5.4 TripAdvisor and Websites

TripAdvisor, another internet based form of modern communication media, also came out in this study as having played an important role in visitors’ motivations. With regards to the role of TripAdvisor, research participants indicated that:

*Marketing does play a role, tourists use communication media like [the] internet and Facebook, and there is website called TripAdvisor. Visitors learn about what people who have been to South Africa say in their comments. If comments about a site are positive, that attracts more visitors. Areas are also rated on TripAdvisor and it links all the social media. I communicate with clients through TripAdvisor once they are back in their home countries all the time* (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 15 June, 2016).

Another interviewee also identified the role of TripAdvisor:

*TripAdvisor, I read about it on TripAdvisor. Also the website played a role, but I would not say social media played a role* (Scottish citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

Modern communication media was thus important in furthering dark tourism, in agreement with Foley and Lennon (2000); Lisle (2007); Dale and Robinson (2011); Scott (2012); and Biran and Hyde (2013).
4.5.5 Acquaintances

This study also found the role of acquaintances to be an important factor in the visiting patterns of the visitors.

*No, my house mate encouraged me to go to the Robben Island* (Dutch citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 1 June, 2016).

Another response was:

*I heard it from a friend who has been to Cape Town. Actually, she has a friend who is a judge, an African judge. And she went over there with the friend and she said I shouldn’t miss the trip to the Robben Island. Since I am here I wanted to see what the place was about. I have nothing to do with that* (social media) (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June, 2016).

The following interviewee was also motivated by a friend to visit the Apartheid Museum tourist site:

*A friend in South Africa brought us here* (Swedish citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

4.5.6 Books and publications

Books and other publications also played a role in promoting visits, Nelson Mandela’s autobiography in particular:

*Yes, I have read Mandela’s ‘Long Walk to Freedom’ and wish to add to my understanding and knowledge of the events of that time, intentionally as part of a*
planned visit to Cape Town (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 29 May, 2016).

Another response was:

It (visit to the Robben Island Museum) was recommended by a lot of guide books and sites (websites) (Maltese citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 1 June 2016).

Some international visitors had affiliations to international organisations and charities which had links in South Africa. Additionally, the name of Nelson Mandela came up all the time as a motivating factor. The next subheading shows that.

4.5.7 Affiliation to international organisations and women

Under this topic visits to South Africa were made possible through: international charity organisations which supported charities in South Africa; organisations in South Africa which were affiliated to international organisations; and through the initiatives of women. In both cases presented here it was women and not men (wives and not husbands) who had initiated the trips. The following participants showed that:

It (the internet and marketing) did not influence our decision making, nor did we read books. It was unique for us because we undertook this trip because we donated money to one of our favourite charities (in the USA), and through a charity auction which we won we undertook this trip and we combined this trip with a trip to [the] Nyala Game Reserve (KwaZulu-Natal). And half of the money we won for
this trip went to [the] Nyala Game Reserve and the other half went to our charity in the United States. Advertising never played any role. Also, everybody knows about Nelson Mandela (American couple, interviewed on the boat from the Robben Island Museum, 27 May 2016).

The second example here was:

In do not know how. (Husband to wife) You are the person who scheduled this, how did you find out about it (the Apartheid Museum)? (Wife) I was talking to a member of Global Surgeons, I always do. I said we wanted to spend an extra day in Johannesburg and I wanted to see all about Nelson Mandela, and the lady at Global Surgeons said we should take a tour and see the Apartheid Museum (American couple, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

Overall, this discussion presented the findings of this study, which were based on interviews. It covered the following areas; the nationalities of the tourists, and the dark tourism sites visited. A large part of this chapter was devoted to the reasons for having visited dark tourism sites. The last part of the chapter discussed the roles of modern communication media, marketing, and other intermediaries in dark tourism.

4.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter identified the nationalities of the visitors to the research sites. It showed that these research sites drew tourists from virtually all over the world, moreover, there was a notable growth in the number of Indian and Chinese visitors. The chapter
proceeded to specify the dark tourism sites which tourists had visited locally and internationally, and that the dark tourism sites which the visitors had visited were predominantly located in the Western world. This study found that it was mostly international visitors who had been to other dark tourism sites elsewhere in the world, as the South Africans who were at the research sites tended not to have visited other dark tourism sites internationally. Visitors from other parts of Africa (for example, Nigeria) were aware of similar dark tourism sites on the continent (slave ports in Ghana, and, Senegal) but they had not visited them. This study found that tourists planned their trips very well and they could take as long as three months to plan.

The next part of the chapter dealt with the motivations to visit dark tourism sites. International visitors were motivated to visit sites of death, pain and suffering, both internationally and in South Africa by: the desire to be educated, to be informed and to take lessons; the need to pay homage to the victims of past atrocities, such as at the Nazi concentration camps; a wish to respect Nelson Mandela; while on a bigger trip, they were undertaking a safari to Africa; chance, as the visitors happened to be in the vicinity of dark tourism sites; open-mindedness; curiosity and a desire to know more of the history; the need to see representations of the struggle for liberation; the fact that they were accompanying a companion who wished to go there; and lastly, concerns regarding humanity and social justice.

This study found the following to have motivated former South Africans and South Africans to visit the research sites: curiosity and the desire to know more; the need to
connect with the struggle of the past; feeling obliged to visit the research sites; while some had only visited by chance. The findings of this study further revealed that the former South Africans interviewed had not forgotten about South Africa.

The following factors motivated the international visitors to tour areas of poverty and slums (township tours): the role of the travel companies; curiosity and the desire to know more– some viewed Soweto as the antithesis of what they had been made to believe. This was because the place did not appear that poor and visitors appeared relatively safe. Community service work (voluntourism) also played a part; as did getting a real and broader picture of the world; culture and architecture; progressiveness; humanitarian factors; and social justice. Former South African visitors were motivated to undertake township tours by: curiosity, as they wanted to know what the townships were like; and also because they viewed themselves as liberals. The liberal reasons for the visits to the research sites also had connotations of the values with which the respondents had been socialised.

This study found the following intermediaries and initiators of trips to have played an important role in the tours to the research sites: tour operators; educational institutions; modern communication media, for example, the internet, Facebook, television; TripAdvisor; Nelson Mandela’s autobiography and movies; women spouses as initiators of the tours; and acquaintances. Visitors shared their tourism experiences (and perhaps about South Africa in general) with their fellow countrymen back in their home countries. This study also found tour guides to be important in the selection of places to
visit in South Africa. The tour guides preferred to take tourists to places of nature (nature reserves), places of culture and heritage, and to sites associated with the political struggles of apartheid.

The next chapter further discusses the findings of this study, but it focuses on how the visitors and the museum curators interpreted the two museums and the memorial museum.
CHAPTER FIVE

INTERPRETING THE STUDY SITES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

People around the world visited museums in order to develop and gain meaningful experiences about scientific phenomena (Vartiainen and Enkenberg, 2013; Das, 2015). Hence, apart from merely considering museums as cultural heritage sites and as tourist attractions, people also recognised them as rich spaces that could enhance their cognitive experiential dimensions (Das, 2015; Kawalilak and Groen, 2016). This happened as patrons constructively engaged with museums as agents and as places of learning (Monk, 2013; Yilmaz, Filiz, and Yilmaz, 2013). In view of these developments in museum conceptualisation, this section discusses the findings of this study with regards to: what tourists truly made of the museums which were the sites of research in this study; and how the museum curators conceptualised these sites of this study. Conclusions of this study were based on the interviews and also on what the visitors' wrote in the visitors' comments books or on feedback forms. This chapter opens by presenting the interview findings on how tourists interpreted the research sites, and ends by presenting the curators' points of view on the museums.

5.2 INTERPRETING THE RESEARCH SITES – TOURISTS

The following section shows that visitors interpreted the research sites as more than just representations of relaxation, leisure or just spots of fun.
5.2.1 Educational and cultural places

Most tourists understood the research sites as educational and cultural sites, sites of empowerment, sites where one learned about human nature, and as sites of experience. They were also seen as representations of the struggles of liberation. The excerpts below show some of the participants’ responses:

*It is more interesting, more educational. The intention was to see…what had happened first hand, you know. A little bit sad, a little bit sad, to know what people went through* (South African, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 1 June, 2016).

Still within the theme of education as a motivation, the following interviewee pointed out that:

*…people want to know what happened. They want to learn about history, culture and about apartheid as well. People are really interested in that, they want to know what it was really about* (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 17 June 2016).

The next excerpt showed that the participant understood the research site to be empowering.

*…This place is more educational. I am a student studying here. I study sociology and urban studies at Fordham University in New York City. In this country I study at the University of Pretoria. …I find this site very empowering because of the students’ movement and its impact it had in the South African history, it’s very*

An interview with a tour guide at the Apartheid Museum revealed the following about visitors:

... This is more educational; they learn, they can learn more with regards to the human nature and the mistakes made so it’s more of educational (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 2 June 2016).

In the next group of excerpts it could be understood that visitors also interpreted dark tourism sites as sites of experience. Visitors to the Apartheid Museum got to experience what apartheid was like. Another theme that emerged was that of culture; the research sites also presented opportunities to learn about other people and their cultures. The experiences of the tourists at the research sites helped make some of them better people, and for some of them their experiences at the research sites enabled them to identify with what they called their heroes. The following are some excerpts of what the visitors conveyed during their interviews:

They would view this place differently because as they entered the Museum (the Apartheid Museum), there is a door that says white or black. And I took students who are studying journalism from the Stellenbosch University, and upon arrival at that entrance they stopped because they could not choose which door to enter. So they could feel that experience. They would want to find out about the historical
past of the country (South African Tour Guide, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June, 2016).

This following research participant had, upon inquiry into his nationality, stated that he was born in South Africa and he further remarked that his experience was like mine (the interviewer).

...Coming here makes you a better person. You see what’s going on. You also see what has happened and what to avoid in the future (South African-American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

The next interviewee also pointed out that:

...My coming here is not for relaxation or enjoyment, it is specifically to know; to learn and to know something which some of our heroes have passed through (Nigerian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

5.2.2 Resourcefulness in sadness and gloom

Shock and grief were amongst the emotions that visits to dark tourism sites could evoke (Liyanage, 2015). Therefore, this study assessed whether tourists at the research sites took an objective view of what they saw, or whether they became emotionally involved. The results showed that the research respondents had mixed outlooks. While some interpreted the sites as gloomy, others took an objective stance and viewed them as just places that reflected peoples’ resourcefulness. The Apartheid Museum was viewed as
sombre, partly because of its architecture. One respondent saw the museum as representing a prison:

…I went to one in Berlin. The Jewish Museum in Berlin in Germany, it is very similar to this (the Apartheid Museum), it’s gloomy because it is a gloomy subject. Yes, but you can see that it’s like a prison, isn’t it? It is meant to be, it is meant to be a prison, it’s meant to be a serious subject, and it’s not meant to be fun, isn’t it? It shows how bad the world can be, the world can be many times a horrible place, [and] this place shows that (South African-American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

Another interviewee hoped to pass his experience of Apartheid onto his children:

I think the building and setup makes it quite sombre. Oh definitely, I would tell my children about it (the Apartheid experience) as well when they are old enough to understand (British citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 13 June 2016).

These two interviewees took an objective view of the Apartheid Museum; that it was “gloomy” and “sombre” because it was meant to be. However, the Apartheid Museum experience seemed to have overwhelmed the last interviewee, such that he hoped to pass the experience on to his children. The next interviewee understood the Robben Island Museum to be a place of duress:
Robben Island is a very sad place. ...Robben Island is a place where people were kept under duress; they were kept there [against] their free will (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

While some research participants regarded the research sites as gloomy and emotional places, others did not view them as such. There was an interviewee who stood out:

It is sad for the people who had to endure [it]. Paying homage (to the victims of the atrocities?); not really because there is one person I pay homage to and that’s my Saviour Lord Jesus Christ (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

The following excerpt indicated that the interviewee understood the research sites as informative, as places that provided experiences, as well and as places where young people could learn about the past.

It’s hard to imagine, and what happened is sad, but I think it is important for young people to come to a place like this (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 15 June 2016).

Another interviewee perceived the Robben Island Museum as a place that was “thought-provoking”:

...More than just ‘of interest’, probably more ‘thought-provoking’ than gloomy (American-British citizen, interviewed, at the Getaway to Robben Island Museum, 1 June 2016).
In the next excerpt the research participants presented a different perspective, they appreciated the ingenuity and the ability of the prisoners to mobilise themselves in the prison. They also appreciated the role of the former prisoners who were working as tour guides:

*I think back to one of the Nazi sites in Munich, in Germany. ...That was more gruesome and it shows numbers of dead people. Here, (the Robben Island Museum) to me it was more interesting to see how political prisoners interacted and how they developed communication systems. On the Robben Island Museum you see former prisoners taking ownership; on the other hand at Alcatraz they just give you a verbal description of it. At the Robben Island you get the first-hand knowledge from people who participated as prisoners of the Island* (American couple, interviewed on the boat from the Robben Island Museum, 27 May 2016).

These last interviewees contrasted the Nazi camps in Germany and the Alcatraz prison (USA) on the one hand, and the Robben Island Museum on the other hand. The interviewees seemed to be of the view that the Robben Island Museum did not reflect as much cruelty as the Nazi sites in Munich, Germany did. The interviewees also seemed to appreciate the role of the former prisoners of the Robben Island prison who served as tour guides at the museum.
5.2.3 The Robben Island Museum: relevance to current global affairs

Some research participants looked at the Robben Island Museum as a representation of the negative, however, some understood it as a site where the good triumphed over the negative. The excerpts below describe the Museum:

…It (the Robben Island Museum) has a strong historical connection to social injustice – dehumanisation of black activists. The interviewee went further to state the following about the museum: Well, people might as well want to experience a ship tour or to visit an “ISLAND”. But for me and my group we chose the site for a socio-political dialogue due to its history (A Congolese-South African, interviewed at the Gateway to the Robben Island Museum, 1 June, 2016).

This interviewee viewed Robben Island in relation to other global affairs:

It’s (the Robben Island Museum) importance and interest lies in its role in historical events or in the current state of socio-economic affairs. It has more meaning than a beach or nature reserve (British-American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 31 May 2016).

These interview quotes also revealed that some tourists were not merely content with fun at tourist destinations. They also looked for tourist sites that carried some significance. Sites that made them better people cognitively.

5.2.4 Places of reflection

After having been to the research sites, some tourists reflected upon a number of issues. These included reflecting upon: the similarities between the conditions of black
South Africans and black Americans in the USA; the failure to learn from previous mistakes; and inspiration from people like Nelson Mandela and Mahatma Gandhi:

*It surprises me how this feeling here* (the visitor was going through exhibitions at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum) *is similar to the feeling of African Americans, I think there are more similarities. I think it’s more upfront here, the government is more upfront here* (The visitor had heard President Zuma, cautioning the youth against substance abuse at the Orlando Stadium, Soweto, on the 16 June 2016, Youth Day). *It does not matter where in the world one is, but where the Europeans have been and have taken first control its bad news for black people without education, that’s for sure. I hope things will change and also change in the US too, and all around the world* (American citizen, interviewed, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 17 June, 2016).

The visitor seemed to suggest that African Americans and black South Africans bore some similarities. The interviewee also seemed to suggest that black people who had a poor education seemed to carry a heavier brunt of injustices.

The following interviewee reflected on the situation in the USA:

*…How many times has this happened in the world and what have people learned, like banning Moslems in the United States?* (American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 13 June 2016).

This respondent noted the contribution of Nelson Mandela and Ghandi:

*People like Mandela and Gandhi have fought for us* (Indian citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, on 13 June, 2016).
For some research participants, visiting the research sites made them to reflect on their own fortunate positions:

_I live in Australia; in my country we are lucky in many ways. Seeing a site like this and to know that not so long ago the world was a very different place, should make one more appreciative of what we have and value life more_ (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 15 June 2016).

Visits to the Dachau Nazi concentration camp in Germany offered space for reflective thinking about the atrocious conditions the victims would have gone through (Liyanage, 2015).

5.2.5 Enduring impressions and the research sites

Generally, there was a mixed bag of lasting impressions that visits to these research sites left on the visitors. Some visitors drew inspiration from the tenacity of the prisoners and their spirit of never stopping to try:

_I would have the view that where there is life, there is hope. Where there is life, there is hope. Never stop trying_ (American couple, interviewed, on the boat from Robben Island Museum, 27 May, 2016).

The next interviewee appreciated the educative value of the research sites:

_It increases my understanding, my knowledge of history_ (American citizen, interviewed at the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, 13 June 2016).

Another interviewee stated that:
…Maybe it educates me more, but it doesn’t change my outlook towards life. I don’t agree with apartheid, I did not agree with apartheid when I was growing up here so it won’t change my outlook towards life (South African-British citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 13 June, 2016).

The following visitor learned that violence was not the way to resolve problems, and they hoped to turn away from confrontational situations in the future:

No I would say that violence is not a cure for ills. The situation has turned me further from violence, and I would explore other avenues outside the square. I would explore like-minded people to deal with my foes rather than confront them (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

Another interviewee stated that:

…That (visit to the research sites) would be about attitude change. This respondent further added that: The fact that Nelson Mandela could live in such a cell for seventeen years could influence my life (American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 27 May 2016).

The next respondent branded the Robben Island Museum in this manner:

No, not in the sense of [a] natural disaster. It (the Robben Island prison) is a man-made disaster, it is a political disaster (Australian citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).
5.2.6 Special places, sites of freedom and shrine

Even though visitors interpreted the research sites as reflecting an unfortunate past, some visitors painted the Robben Island Museum in particular in glowing terms. Visitors understood the places as: special places; places of reverence; sites of freedom; places of hope; the Robben Island Museum was equated to a shrine, a religious place; and a place where future generations could learn. Responses were as follows:

*But going to the Robben Island [Museum] is not just part of the itinerary. No, no; it’s more special than that. The Robben Island [Museum] is the most visited tourist site in South Africa, so I think it’s much more than that. No. No. I would view it as a place of hope* (South African, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

Another response was:

*I don’t see it [as] gloomy or happy, it is the degree [of] reverence to it, and reverence would probably be the best* (American citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island, 2 June 2016).

Another respondent stated:

*I do not find this place sad because I know the end of the story. If the apartheid government was still in power, I would say it was gloomy. It is a story of victory* (American citizen, interviewed at the Apartheid Museum, 15 June 2016).

A British tourist stated:

*One is relaxing (beach); the other (the Robben Island) has a story; freedom. It’s not distressful, but it is fascinating. There are emotions, sadness, repression, but*
also freedom (British citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

The following response captured the deep sense of feelings that these interviewees had about Robben Island. The interviewees (a couple and a girl child) also expressed the high regard they had for South Africa:

_We came to Cape Town for a holiday, and when you come to Cape Town for a holiday, I think it is important for her (referring to their small girl child) to see the Robben Island [Museum]. We have been there before (to the Robben Island Museum). Have you been there? (Asking the interviewer) The place is like a shrine, it’s like a place of… Do you understand the word shrine? (Asking the interviewer) It’s like a religious place, people go to see places, they go to Jerusalem, and they go to Mecca. The world that appreciates diversity (South Africa), this is one of the best edifices to that. Visiting the Robben Island [Museum] is not about viewing suffering. It is more about the release. …It’s more, it’s almost religious. I will be bringing my parents-in-law as well_ (British citizen, interviewed at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum, 2 June 2016).

This couple was interviewed before they boarded the ferry to the Robben Island Museum. The researcher saw the couple on their way back from the Robben Island Museum, and the wife remarked that the Robben Island Museum experience “never disappointed”.
The above discussion focused on how the research participants interpreted the research sites. Phrases used to describe the sites ranged from educational sites to likening them to shrines, and there were also praises for South Africa for accepting diversity. One research participant hoped to pass on the knowledge and information about the research site to their child. This chapter further discusses what tourists wrote of the research sites.

5.3 TOURISTS’ NARRATIVES OF THE RESEARCH SITES

The analysis presented below is based on data from the visitors’ comments. The analysis of the tourists’ narratives showed how tourists understood and related to the research sites. Tourists’ accounts of the study sites could be classified into those which: praised the museums; commented on the cruelty that people could inflict on others; expressed emotions, for example, that it was a deeply moving and sad experience for them; voiced unhappiness about the research site; and those that compared the Apartheid Museum and the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum.

5.3.1 The Robben Island Museum

A comment from a tourist praised the Robben Island Museum experience, with the words: “the tour was exceptional” and they expressed appreciation for the fact that the tour guides “had great English and had depth of information” (Feedback Form, Robben Island Museum, American Tourist, date of comment, 4 May, 2016; accessed, 2 June 2016).
Also according to this visitor, the tour “offered [a] great visual presentation”. The fact that this tourist praised: the tour experience; the guides’ good English and their depth of knowledge; and the visual presentation, implied that this was what tourists expected from the Robben Island Museum tours. However, this narrative was the only one that the researcher was able to obtain which praised the Robben Island experience. The others that follow below did not have as much praise (These comments were captured as they were):

_I was so excited to do this trip. It was the most disappointing tour experience for me. The boats are sardine packed. The staff John in Sea Princes (name of the boat) treated us like prisoners. We can’t sit outside. The island tour was rushed and again in sardine packed buses. The tour guide on Bus number 1 was ‘so ignorant’. She said a Muslim was buried in the mosque. I saw later it was an Indonesian Prince imprisoned by the Dutch. The ex-prisoner guide was very good but in a hurry because another tour group was coming. We had no time to look, and to take pictures. What a waste of money. You should take smaller groups and be more clients friendly! Try Point Charley Museum in Belgium and Flanders Field Museum in Leper Belgium! The price is also over-rated. Children under six should not pay_ (Feedback Form, the Robben Island Museum, Namibian Tourist, date of comment, 3 May, 2016; accessed, 2 June 2016).

As a South African tourist guide, badge number 3958 GP, I would like to criticise Gateway Robben Island for not providing SA guides with complementary tickets to
the island (Feedback Form, the Robben Island Museum, South African Tour Guide, date of comment, 28 March, 2016; accessed, 2 June 2016).

Clients regularly complain that they can’t hear the guide in the prison; can you give him a speaker please? (Feedback Form, the Robben Island Museum, South African Tour Guide, date of comment, 05 April 2016; accessed on 2 June 2016).

We have just travelled back from Robben Island on, the Sea Princess, (name of the boat) at 2 p.m. We were made to move from the top deck due to our son being under 16 years old. I have been informed by the ticket office that it is free seating for all ages. Only the children were asked to move due to there being more than 23 passengers on the deck. Rydall (crew member) made us move while another member of staff mocked us. This is bullying (Feedback Form, the Robben Island Museum, British Tourist, date of comment, November 2015; accessed, 2 June 2016).

The boat we went on, Dias, (name of boat) was dirty and smelly! The exhaust fumes were so bad the ‘soot’ went over us and went on our clothes (photo-taken). You really had to watch where you sat owing to the tar and dirt on the surfaces. Loved Robben Island, but the boat was like a ‘cattle boat’, not one for visitors. A very bad experience – this must be improved!! (Feedback Form, Robben Island, Welsh, UK Tourist, date of comment, 1 April 2016; accessed, 2 June 2016).
We left Cape Town by ‘Jester’ (name of a boat) at 8.35 a.m. When we arrived on Robben Island, I was amongst the last to disembark the boat. We saw the last bus taking tourists for the Island tour leave; we were made to wait in a queue in the sun. After 55 minutes we were taken for a walking tour…The first man took us to enter the gate and we were split into groups, we first did the walking tour with Tom (tour guide). After the walking tour we were put on a bus. At the frame (where there is an Island café, and where the bus normally stops for pictures, and for views) the guide on the bus asked us to vote; we could stop at the view point and then not complete the whole tour, or we could do the whole tour. Most voted for the whole tour. I don’t think we enjoyed the tour as much as we should have (Feedback Form, Robben Island, Belgian Tour Guide, date of comment, 26 November 2015; accessed, 2 June 2016).

What one could read from these excerpts was that the Robben Island Museum visitors did not simply take their visits at superficial level; they were also analytical of their entire experiences. With the exception of a few visitors’ comments which praised the Robben Island experience, all of the others were critical and indicated unhappiness with the experience. Visitors complained about the poor organisation of the trips, the condition of the boats, the fact that the boats were overloaded, and the poor customer relations management. Visitors also evaluated the quality of the English used by the staff and how knowledgeable the tours guides were.
5.3.2 The Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum

Tourists’ narratives about the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum appeared to be positive for the most part, except that a visitor disapproved of the perimeter of the museum. Nonetheless, analysis of the comments revealed the following: visitors praised the educational and instructive value of the museum. At the same time visitors also expressed emotions of sorrow, and a visitor also remarked that Hector’s father had changed Hector’s surname from Pitso to a white surname, Pieterson. Some felt embarrassed by the issues which culminated in the events of 1976, and other visitors stated that they would have preferred exhibitions that promoted interactive rather than passive learning.

However, another visitor revealed a contrast in emotions and feelings, with the wording:

...very interesting and educational. From the violence and ashes ‘peace’ has come, more love and compassion (Visitors’ Book comment, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, date of comment, 15 May 2015, accessed on 15 June 2016).

It was interesting to note the use of the metaphor ‘ashes’. This visitor may have been suggesting that South Africa could easily have become a hopeless case. However, another other visitor revealed a contrast in emotions and feelings, with the wording:

Our experience was enlightening and sorrowful (Visitors’ Book comment, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, date of comment 22 June 2015, accessed 15 June 2016).

The next comment praised the museum:
An emotional part of South Africa’s history captured in art...and sheer finesse. The museum captures the Soweto uprising in a poetic and artistic way that helps tell a thousand words in under five minutes (Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, Visitors’ Book, French Tourist, date of comment, 1 April 2016; accessed, 17 June 2016).

The above comments praised the educational value of the museum, and visitors were also appreciative of the good that came out of the struggles that took place in 1976. Tourists also remarked on the inspirational value of the museum. The following account drew similarities between what had happened in Namibia and what had happened in South Africa, and this visitor also captured the inspirational value of the museum:

It was such a memorable moment to walk through this museum. As a contemporary youth of the times of struggle for liberation we in Namibia went through similar hardships and struggles as we were colonised by the brutal cold-blooded apartheid S.A., but thanks to the tireless efforts and struggles of heroism we are all free and are determining our own future. Forward ever, backward never. Let all Africans jealously guard the hard won freedom. Amandla! (Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, Visitors’ Book – Minister of Education, Arts and Culture in Namibia, date of comment, 5 May 2016; accessed 17 June 2016).

The visitor below (a South African) commented about the change of surname by Hector’s father.
I learned that Hector’s surname was Pitso, but the father changed it to Pieterson because he must be regarded as white (the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, Visitors’ Book, date of comment, 5 May 2016; accessed, 17 June 2016).

It was interesting to note that Hector Pieterson’s original surname was Pitso, and that his father had changed their surname from Pitso to Pieterson so that they would be regarded as white people. The irony was that Hector, whose father wanted him to be regarded as a white person, was one of the first youths to be killed in the 1976 Soweto Students’ Uprisings.

The next comment posed a challenge to the present crop of youths. It appeared that this visitor was doubtful of the character of the present youth:

Very impressive as a representation of a period in which I grew up. It would be good if our current youth showed the same (the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, Visitors’ Book, date of comment, 2 February 2016; accessed 17 June 2016).

The next comment addressed the current state of politics in South Africa:

I don’t think we are doing justice to the sacrifices of 1976. I don’t, all we do is cashing in and making our pockets fat. It is sad what we do as a government (the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, Visitors’ Book, date of comment, 2 January 2016; accessed 17 June 2016).
Even though they were Dutch people, the following visitors expressed a sense of guilt and seemed to take responsibility for the problems of the time. Dutch people sometimes felt guilty, for they felt that their language Afrikaans-Dutch had started the 1976 student uprisings.

*Feeling embarrassed that our language (Dutch) started all this* (the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, Visitors’ Book, Dutch Tourists, date of comment, 2 August 2015; accessed, 17 June 2016).

The following visitor expressed a wish for exhibitions that promoted interactive engagement with visitors.

...*in a very vivid neighbourhood! Wish they had more interactive things and not all just panels to read!...* (Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, Visitors’ Book, British Tourist, date of comment, 20 September 2015; accessed, 17 June 2016).

Another visitor, believing that the events of 1976 needed to be shared, raised issues about the policy of banning the taking of pictures inside the museum. The next comment was sympathetic to the people of Soweto, in that they had to pay entrance fees like everyone else. This visitor believed that private rights were taking precedence over the public’s rights:

*It is not right that the people living in the Soweto Township have to pay for this museum. As well, it is not clever stopping people taking photos and films in the name of copyright. This is a political museum in which community rights prevail above private rights, as a journalist/political activist against apartheid/racism...*
In the next excerpt, the visitor expressed disapproval at the state of the perimeters of the Memorial Museum:

*Museum good. Outside area shoddy, not neat, paper, mess, high uncut grass, very unneat! SHAME on you City Council. This is not a good picture for SA* (the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, Visitors' Book, Dutch Tourist, date of comment, 20 March 2016; accessed, 17 June 2016).

Most of the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum’s visitors were happy about their experience there, however, some were critical. A visitor remarked on the surname Pieterson instead of Pitso. Another visitor also questioned the character of today’s youth and the state of some elements of the present government. There were a few who raised issues such as the banning of picture taking and the lack of active engagement with the exhibitions. Panels displaying information rendered the visitors passive and some wished they had been more actively engaged.

5.3.3 The Apartheid Museum

The visitors’ comments below could be classified into: those which praised the museum; those which commented on the cruelty that people could inflict on others; those which voiced unhappiness; and those which drew a comparison between the Apartheid Museum and the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum:
We were planning just [to] stay a couple of hours, and finished spending the whole afternoon (Apartheid Museum, Feedback, date of comment, 11 March 2016; accessed on 17, June 2016).

Incredible museum, heart breaking and moving. Finishing with "FREEDOM" is a wonderful way to walk out. Was lucky enough to visit during the Mandela exhibit which was incredible (Apartheid Museum, Feedback, date of comment, 5 May 2016; accessed, 17 June 2016).

The above comments praised the Apartheid Museum, but one visitor preferred the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum and would have chosen that museum if they had to choose a favourite. In the next excerpts visitors seemed horrified at the cruelty that people could inflict on others:

…I can only say it was an overwhelming couple of hours. It is scary to see what men do to other men sometimes and for seemingly little reason... It's too hard to explain the exact experience… (Apartheid Museum, Feedback, date of comment, 11 March 2016; accessed, 17 June 2016).

Apartheid museum with all the images can only move you emotionally. Lots of photos and descriptions of what happened, [and] once again you do wonder how man could treat others like that, and the world and the white South Africans let it happen for decades (Apartheid Museum, Feedback, date of comment, 15 April 2016; accessed, 17 June 2016).
This place tells the story of South Africa in a very original and eye-opening way. A deeply moving, sad experience that shows in an interactive way all the horrors of the apartheid, finishing with a look to its end and the progress since then (Apartheid Museum, Feedback, date of comment, 21 April 2016; accessed, 17 June 2016).

The last three comments were critical and analytical of the museum. A visitor commented that some “displays and messages…are not very objective”. In this, the visitor suggested that the Apartheid Museum promoted a particular viewpoint. One visitor had issues about the flow of the exhibitions, and the last was unhappy about the banning of picture taking:

The Apartheid Museum is a clever and modern museum which makes you ‘feel’ apartheid with a clever layout. The displays and messages they get across are not very objective, but for someone who didn't grow up in the apartheid era it won't be very noticeable. The modern architecture is aesthetically pleasing but if I had to choose between apartheid-type museums, I would rather go to the Hector Pieterson Museum in Soweto (the Apartheid Museum, Feedback, date of comment, 6 May 2016; accessed, 17 June 2016).

I must say, not very well laid out. It seems to chop and change with periods and for me [it] didn't flow, but still enjoyed it and gave it 4 stars (Apartheid Museum, Feedback, date of comment, 6 May 2016; accessed on 17, June 2016).
Another point, not sure why you can’t take photos when a huge part of the museum is just photos with descriptions? (Apartheid Museum, Feedback, date of comment, 2 February 2016; accessed, 17 June 2016).

The above excerpts showed that visitors praised the museums, but were also critical of them. Comments about the layout and flow of the exhibitions at the museums said something about the nature of the visitors. In general terms, while some visitors were emotional about the museums, others remained objective. The next part of the chapter explores the perspectives of the curators of the museums.

5.4 UNDERSTANDING OF THE RESEARCH SITES – CURATORS

This study assumed that the concept the curators had of the museums and the meanings they attached to them would have impacted in some way on their organisations. Hence this study presented a number of questions to the curators of the research sites, in order to get to know their understanding of and the meaning they (the curators) attached to the research sites. The themes presented below emerged from the interview questions.

5.4.1 Target market of the study areas

The museums did have target markets, albeit in some cases they were not clearly defined, as the responses below showed:

*The target audience is everyone in South Africa and around the world* (Curator, the Apartheid Museum, Written response, date 17 June, 2016).
It was interesting to note that the target market of the Robben Island Museum was basically South Africans:

*Our target market is South Africans. But in the course of the year we have different target markets and different visitors. Like in December which is our peak season, we have mostly South African visitors visiting the Robben Island Museum. Up until just before the end of June we normally have international visitors, and during the month of September we have schools visiting. We call this period a mini-peak season* (Curator, the Robben Island Museum, interviewed, 2 June 2016).

Another curator stated:

*The target market of the museum is everybody in South Africa and internationally who has [an] interest [in] the museum* (Curator, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, interviewed telephonically, 19 December, 2016).

The above excerpts showed that all of these museums had broader rather than focused target markets. The Apartheid Museum targeted everyone, both international and local visitors; the museum thus had a broader visitor focus. The Robben Island Museum focused mainly on South Africans and thus had a more local market focus, moreover, it divided the year into different visitor seasons, that is, during the festive season (December to January) it is mostly South Africans who toured; from February up to June it is mostly international visitors who visited; and, during September it is mostly schools that went to see the museum. Finally, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum had a broader visitor focus, similarly to the Apartheid Museum.
5.4.2 Commercial agenda of the study sites

All the research sites appeared not to have had a commercial agenda and were presented as sites for the learning of the country’s history and heritage. Entrance fees charged at the Hector Pieterson Memorial were meant to cover the operating costs and not to generate profit. The Robben Island Museum was meant to be easily accessible to every South African and moreover, the Robben Island Museum was presented as a place where people had suffered, and not as a place of enjoyment.

Related to the commercial aspect of the museums, this study found that the Apartheid Museum was:

More of a heritage site focusing on learning about South African history. Also: the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum is a Municipal Museum which is operated on a non-profit basis and charges at the entrance are meant to sustain the museum (Curator, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, interviewed telephonically, 19 December 2016).

This study found the following about the Robben Island Museum:

Not really (If the reason for the Robben Island Museum was to generate money), it’s not the primary reason - to generate money. We are not and we will never, even now as from today (2 June 2016) we have increased our ticket (rates to the Robben Island Museum) by R20. We cannot go more than that because…our primary visitors are South Africans and we know the background of South Africans. We need to make sure that everybody is able to go to the Robben Island Museum. And besides, at the Nelson Mandela Getaway (where the interview took
place) as well as at Jetty One (located at the V&A Waterfront) we house our exhibitions. They are free of charge because we want to make sure that people can go in there without paying anything. And in some places you cannot have exhibitions where people can go without paying any money. History is a very important reason to go to the Robben Island Museum. The reason for the Robben Island Museum is not actually for enjoyment, because even if you are there you can see space that shows that people suffered on the Robben Island Museum (Curator, the Robben Island Museum, interviewed, 2 June 2016).

From the last excerpt one could also read that some emotions were at play in the understanding of the site by the curator. The curator used phrases like “we know the background of South Africans”, and “the Robben Island Museum is not actually for enjoyment, because even if you are there you can see space that shows that people suffered”, to demonstrate that this emotion drove and dominated the Robben Island Museum concept.

5.4.3 Marketing and promotion of the research sites

In order to further explore the question of commercialisation of the research sites, this study established if the research sites were marketed and or promoted in any fashion. The responses ranged from the use of websites, to affiliations, and to using publications in order to market or promote the research sites. About the Robben Island Museum, the interviewee (the curator) stated that:
...To market the Robben Island Museum, we use the website. We are also associated with different associations, like we are members of the Big Six, and South African Tourism (Curator, the Robben Island Museum, interviewed, 2 June 2016).

For the Apartheid Museum, the curator stated that they used:

*Social media, trade shows (local and international), school adverts in teacher publications, and some adverts in local publications* (Curator, the Apartheid Museum, Written response, date 17 June, 2016).

And regarding the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, this study found that:

...The museum belongs to the City of Johannesburg, and falls under the Community Development Department in the Arts, Culture and Heritage Directorate, which takes care of all marketing activities (Curator, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, interviewed telephonically, 19 December 2016).

On the basis of the above responses a conclusion could be reached that none of the research sites followed a profit-making business model. Instead, the entry fees charged were only meant to sustain their operating costs.

### 5.4.4 Impression and image of the research sites to visitors

An earlier chapter of this study made reference to the changing role of museums within the context of postmodernity. This implied a need to cater for the diversity of customers
and for creating a sense of museum ‘spectacle’ (van Aalst and Boogaarts, 2002; Button and Scott, 2003; Jonas, 2011). Against this backdrop, this study sought to determine the lasting impression and image the museums hoped to leave on the minds of visitors once they were back home. This study found that the Apartheid Museum hoped to leave an impression with:

*Lessons about the pitfalls of racism, bias, and prejudice that must never be repeated* (Curator, the Apartheid Museum, Written response, date 17 June, 2016).

This study found the following regarding the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum:

*The museum would wish to be remembered for having covered a good basic understanding of all events of and until June 16, 1976, and also the history of apartheid and its effects. The Memorial Museum would also wish to have touched visitors, emotionally and spiritually. Finally the Memorial Museum would hope that visitors would have appreciated the distance that has been covered to the present day South Africa* (Curator, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, interviewed telephonically, 19 December, 2016).

And about the Robben Island Museum:

*…It is important that people suffered on Robben Island. We hope they (visitors) will remember it and then inform other people how the Robben Island Museum is like. We expect them (people who have been to Robben Island) to share. If I understand your question correctly, we expect them to share what we have on Robben Island because the Robben Island Museum is a World Heritage site.*
People suffered on Robben Island, but it does not only stop there. Now we have got a project where we take schools to the Robben Island so that they must know the future after the suffering. We expect them to inform other people what Robben Island was for and what it hopes to be (Curator, the Robben Island Museum, interviewed, 2 June 2016).

From the excerpts above it could be determined that all the study sites tended to be rooted in and reflective of their pasts. The Apartheid Museum wished to be remembered as a place of learning and where people learned lessons about racism. The Robben Island Museum wished to be remembered as a place of learning and also as a place where people suffered. An interviewee used the phrase "people suffered" several times, which showed the importance of looking at the site from this perspective. There was also an emotional tone to the conceptualisation of the Robben Island Museum, and this museum was basically meant for South Africans. The Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum wished to touch visitors emotionally, spiritually, and intellectually. Both museums and the memorial museum were also engaged in projects to pass their histories on to the younger generations.

5.4.5 The museums, multiple voices and plural interpretations

The highly globalised world sometimes dictated that places gradually moved away from stressing their particularities and embraced some characters and forms of ‘other’ far off places (Jonas, 2011). Todays’ museums reflect the co-existence of cultures (Stanish, 2008), and with this as a background, this study enquired if presentations at the
research sites reflected in one way or another the different voices of the visitors, and if these museums provided space for plural interpretations. One response was:

> Not to the extent we would like it to; future planning includes this (Curator, the Apartheid Museum, Written response, date 17 June, 2016).

Another response to this question was:

> Exhibitions and videos at the museum are presented in English, which is taken as a lingua-franca in South Africa. English makes the museum to be accessible to everybody who visits. Visitors would be expected to have developed visually, intellectually and emotionally when they leave the museum. The museum also has its in-house tour guides in case visitors need assistance. International visitors normally come with their tour operators or tour guides who assist and who would be expected to be able to communicate in the language of [these] international visitors (Curator, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, interviewed telephonically, 19 December 2016).

From the interview with the curator of the Robben Island Museum, it became apparent that this museum had not thought about internationalising its presentations. The status of this museum as a World Heritage Site could have been the reason why it would not consider major re-organisation of its presentations, as it wished to maintain its cosmopolitan feel.
**5.4.6 Interactive learning and visitor engagement**

In an earlier chapter the changing nature of the packaging of todays’ museums was highlighted. Todays’ museums promote personal value and they have evolved to allow opportunities for visitor participation and interactivity (Mancino, 2015). Museums now emphasise three themes: experiential learning, personalised experiences, and visitors as experiential consumers (Mayer, 2005). In view of this, this study found out if these research sites accommodated and promoted active engagement with the displays as opposed to the passive reception of information. The interview with the curator of the Apartheid Museum obtained the following response:

*Not altogether, we would like to bring in more international displays* (Curator, the Apartheid Museum, Written response, date 17 June, 2016).

Another response to this question was:

*The museum engages visitors through the visitors’ book. The museum also has a booklet with allows interactions with the local people. Since the museum belongs to the Department of Community Development in the City of Johannesburg, it runs numerous programmes and activities for which are educational in and around Soweto. Some of the activities that the museum initiates include inter-generational dialogues, workshops, holiday games, and activities that promote human rights. Recently we had a program called ‘Wise Corner’, an initiative to create awareness about gender based violence* (Curator, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, interviewed telephonically, 19 December 2016).
When asked about interactive engagement with the displays, the curator of the Robben Island Museum responded that there was a “visitors’ experience” planned; which had not started by the time this study was conducted. Even though no time frame had been set for the introduction of the visitors’ experience, it had definitely been planned for the future.

The museums had thus not integrated the concept of visitor engagement programs in their exhibitions; the aim of which would be to promote interactivity and experiential learning.

5.4.7 Visual displays and historical depth

Presentations at museums normally appeared in pictorial form, and theory has suggested that visual displays at museums could inadvertently compromise their historical depth and balance (Cook, 2001; Al-Siyami, 2013; Liu and Le, 2013). Within the context of this theory, this study questioned how the museums maintained the balance between visual displays and historical depth. On the one hand, the Apartheid Museum seemed to be assured that their “displays [had] enough depth for the intended storyline”.

The Robben Island Museum curator, on the other hand, believed that “ex-political prisoners, who [had] first-hand experience to engage tourists, and not pictures” provided enough depth and substance to the storyline, adding that it was “former political
prisoners as people and not objects in pictures who engage[d] visitors”. The direct response was:

…the Robben Island is not like other, other museums which are sort of open museums. It is not like other museums where you see objects. The ex-political prisoners themselves are the ones that are sharing the stories of what the situation was like, so that’s why it is not like other museums where people when they go to museums they will see pictures and so on. But now on the Robben Island visitors are engaged with the people who were in prison on the Robben Island, so that’s why they will say they want to see pictures, because they are used to museums where they just see objects (Curator, the Robben Island Museum, interviewed, 2 June 2016).

It could be interpreted that the Robben Island Museum curator understood the Museum to be reflective of people (ex-political prisoners) and not just of objects (displays and pictures).

This has shown how the curators understood the research sites. Several points came out of the interviews: the target market of the sites and their commercial agenda, which showed that even though the museums were not profit driven, they did engage in marketing and promotional activities. Second was the impression that museums wished to leave in the minds of their visitors. The findings showed that visitors’ impressions varied; from sites of suffering, to sites that impacted knowledge about prejudice, and to sites that hoped to have touched visitors emotionally and spiritually. Finally, this section
has concluded that historical depth was not really compromised in the visual presentations. The following section concludes this chapter.

5.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter analysed how visitors interpreted the research sites. Analysis of the interviews showed that some tourists visited the research sites, more because of rational decisions than for emotional purposes. Visitors acknowledged the educational value of the sites and they wanted to learn more about their history. Tourists also described these research sites as places of empowerment. Some visitors viewed the Robben Island Museum as a place that demonstrated the resilience of those who had led the struggle against apartheid. They appreciated that some former prisoners served as tour guides.

The analysis of the tourists' narratives and their accounts revealed that they could be classified into categories that: praised the museums; commented on the cruelty inflicted by some on others; and that expressed their emotions, for example, that visits to the sites were deeply moving and sad experiences. Even though visitors generally praised the Apartheid Museum, there was a visitor who questioned the flow of information in the presentation of the exhibitions. One visitor praised the Robben Island Museum; however, most comments questioned the organisation of the trips to this site and the tourism experience as a whole.
From the museum curators’ perspectives, the research sites were interpreted as sites of learning; sites of history and suffering; and as sites that touched visitors emotionally and intellectually. This study noted that it was not only the status of the Robben Island Museum as a World Heritage Site that gave it its character. Emotions were found to be an important factor in shaping the visitors’ visits to this Museum.

Visitors suggested that there was room for incorporating the concept of interactive or experiential learning, which some of them preferred, and it was believed that interactive learning would help engage younger visitors. The final chapter presents the evaluation, recommendations and conclusion to this study.
CHAPTER SIX
EVALUATION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This study explored the motivations to engage in dark tourism in South Africa. The first reference to the dark tourism concept appears to have emanated from MacCannell’s (1976) negative sightseeing concept. However, dark tourism scholarship only emerged in the 1990s as a brand in a contested and a maturing discipline of tourism studies (Sharpley, 2011; Stone, 2013). As dark tourism emerged as a field of study it was theorised in terms of post-modernity (Rojek, 1991). This framework was informed by a notable increase in interest in what came to be called black spots in the early 1990s, which were commercial developments of grave sites and sites in which celebrities or large numbers of people had met with sudden and violent death (Rojek, 1991). Foley and Lennon (1996) and Lennon and Foley (2000) further extended the post-modernity framework. They viewed it as an intimation of post-modernity, which involved dark tourism developments that were commercially driven rather than possibly being motivated by historical or educative missions (Lennon and Foley, 2000).

Concurrent with the development of the post-modern understanding of dark tourism was the emergence of the *thanatopsis* conception of dark tourism (Seaton, 1996). *Thanatopsis* hypothesises dark tourism as the contemplation of death (Seaton, 1996; Sharpely, 2005; Stone and Sharpely, 2008). Over the past couple of years, there has been a dramatic growth in dark tourism research. Post-modernity and *thanatopsis*
explanations of dark tourism seemed to suggest that visitors were thrilled by dark attractions. However, later research has tended to move away from conceptualising dark tourism in terms of a fascination with dark occurrences. This apparent uncertainty about what dark tourism actually was brought about this study, which investigated the motivations to visit places that were associated with dark events.

This study comprised of six chapters. The first chapter introduced this study. It explained that some form of dark tourism dated back to the Middle Ages. Since the last quarter of the twentieth century there had been increased interest in visiting places associated with death, pain and suffering. Moreover, there had been a growth in interest in dark tourism as an academic field of study since the 1990s. The chapter further justified why this study was important. A literature search showed that there had not been many studies of dark tourism in South Africa, which made this present study an appropriate and relevant undertaking. The chapter also discussed the question of dark tourism and ethical issues.

Chapter Two of this study reviewed the literature. The chapter opened by exploring the development of dark tourism in the Medieval times. The next part presented the contemporary theories of dark tourism, namely: thanatopsis; a shift from industrial to post-industrial modes of production and consumption; relational tourism; reality authenticity; tourist gaze and utility of meaning; and the questioning of the dark in dark tourism. Chapter Three explained that this study had adopted a qualitative research approach to answer the research questions. The qualitative research approach enabled
the deeper and broader understanding of the meanings of events, activities, situations and actions of the research participants. It was best suited to research this phenomenon about which not much was known. Chapter Four presented the findings of this study on the motivations to have engaged in dark tourism. It concluded that, the desire to learn and to pay homage to the victims of difficult pasts motivated dark tourism. In South Africa the wish to pay homage to Nelson Mandela, and a desire to know about what went on in the townships motivated such visits. Chapter Five dealt with the findings on how visitors and curators understood and conceptualised the research sites.

This chapter concludes this study. It has been organised into an evaluation of the study findings, recommendations, and a final conclusion. The evaluation links the objectives of this study with the theory of dark tourism. Following this evaluation, the chapter presents the recommendations of this study in terms of policy for the management of dark tourism sites; and in terms of areas for further research. The final part concludes this study.

6.2 EVALUATING THE STUDY FINDINGS

This section evaluates the findings of the present study in relation to the existing theory of dark tourism. The overall picture that emerged from this study was that visitors to the research sites originated from all over the world. Tourists were predominantly from the United States of America, Europe, United Kingdom, India, China, and Australia. Most of the international visitors who had visited other dark tourism sites elsewhere in the world
had been to: the Nazi concentration camps in Germany, Poland, and the Netherlands; the killing fields of Cambodia; Hiroshima in Japan; the Holocaust Museum in Washington DC, USA; the Jewish Museum in Berlin, Germany; and Alcatraz Prison Island, USA. In general there were diverse motivations for having toured dark tourism sites, as explained below.

Chapter one presented the objectives of this study and these are restated below. After repeating them, the discussion proceeds to critically evaluating them in relation to the theory of dark tourism. The objectives of this study were to:

- Understand why international and South African tourists visited places associated with death, pain and suffering;
- Investigate the reasons for visitors to have toured places associated with poverty and slums, internationally and in South Africa;
- Investigate the role of modern communication media, marketing, and other intermediaries in dark tourism;
- Analyse how international and South African tourists understood dark tourism sites; and,
- Evaluate how curators understood the museums which were the locations of this study.
6.2.1 Motivations to have visited tourism sites associated with death, pain and suffering

Regarding this objective, theory suggested that people toured dark tourism sites as an act of contemplating death (Seaton, 1996; Lee, 2004; Sharpley, 2005; Stone, 2005; Stone and Sharpley, 2009; Stone, 2011b). With regards to the findings on this objective, this study divided the reasons to have visited dark tourism attractions into those of the international visitors, and those of South Africans or former South African visitors. This was done in order to facilitate understanding. The discussion started with the motivations of the international visitors.

Most international tourists visited dark tourism attractions, firstly, because they wanted to learn about history: they wanted to remember what had actually happened; and wanted to take lessons from the past dark events so that they were not repeated. The second important reason was to pay homage to the victims of difficult pasts and atrocities. For example, visitors wished to pay homage to the victims of: the Nazi concentration camps in Germany, Poland and the Netherlands; the killings fields of Cambodia; and of Hiroshima in Japan. Most research participants visited sites associated with a difficult past in South Africa because of Nelson Mandela, whom they admired, and this also explained the popularity of the Robben Island Museum.

Thirdly, international visitors did not visit South Africa for a single reason only. They toured South Africa as part of a bigger trip which included visiting: nature reserves to see animals; Sun City in the North West province; Victoria Falls in Zimbabwe; post-
apartheid South Africa; and the legacies of Nelson Mandela and Mahatma Gandhi. It was mostly Indian visitors who cited Mahatma Gandhi as important in their visits. Fourthly, some tourists, visits to the research sites had only occurred by chance, and these visits had come about because these tourists were either in close proximity to the dark attraction or they did not have anything else to do. This study found curiosity and the desire to know more about the site and its history to be the alternate and the fifth reason to have visited the dark tourism sites. Some visitors just wanted to see the footprints of apartheid and its aftermath. Internationally, tourists travelled to places like the Jewish Museum in Washington DC just because of curiosity.

Further to this, the findings showed the importance for some visitors to have appreciated those who had contributed to the liberation of Africa. For example, visitors from other countries of Africa toured places like the Robben Island Museum because they appreciated the contribution of people like Nelson Mandela to Africa’s political development. Similarly, some Indian visitors appreciated the role of Mahatma Gandhi – who was inspired in South Africa in the liberation of India. The seventh reason that this study found to have motivated dark tourism was that certain visitors felt obliged to undertake their visits. In these situations, the visitors were either young, and their tours were part of their family’s heritage, or they were on school tours. Linked to this reason was that touring to dark attractions had occurred because these sites had global implications. Visitors felt that they needed to visit some dark tourism sites because they had played a pivotal role in shaping the global political environment.
This study found open-mindedness as the eighth reason to have motivated visits to dark tourism sites. Some visitors referred to themselves as liberals; hence they found it easy to visit dark attractions. Authentication was found to be the ninth reason to have motivated these tours. Research participants wanted to have a first-hand experience of what they might have heard of or seen through communication and mass media. The authenticity of the exhibits was also found to be important, as a research participant had pointed out that he hoped Nelson Mandela’s cell on Robben Island was authentic and had not been reorganised for money-making purposes. The final reason this study found to have motivated visits was the desire to see places of corrective justice. This involved visiting places where people were compelled to comply with the law.

Hence, the conclusion was that the desire to learn and to pay respects to the victims of the past atrocities motivates international visitors to tour places associated with death, pain and suffering. As was indicated above, this study has divided the responses of the research participants into those of the international participants and those of the South African and former South African participants.

With regards to the motivations of the South Africans and former South Africans, most of the former South African participants had visited the research sites because they had felt driven by the desire to know more about the sites and their history. This reason was combined with curiosity, as some of the research participants had just wanted to see the Apartheid Museum as they had heard of it. Some former South Africans had returned for a visit because they had grown up in the country. Secondly, South Africans had
visited the research sites because the visit had served as an act of connecting with their past, which they felt some people were forgetting. Furthermore, they wanted to learn history and learn about South Africa’s negotiated democratic settlement. Thirdly, some tourists visited the research sites because they were obliging. A white South African had visited the Apartheid Museum solely because she had accompanied her visiting son who lived in the USA and had wanted to go there. A former South African had gone to Alcatraz Prison Island because his father had wanted to see the prison. Visiting by chance was recorded as the final reason to have motivated their visits.

If one compared the motivations of the international visitors with those of the South African and former South African visitors, one would notice that the international visitors were driven by the desire to learn and to pay homage; whereas the former South Africans and South African visitors tended to be driven by their affinity with South Africa. They had visited the research sites because they had grown up in the country, or because they had wanted to connect with what they described as a history of struggle.

Evaluation of the findings of the present study against the results of previous research showed some consistencies, but there were also some conclusions which other studies had not identified. For example, this study found the desire to be educated about the associated history to be one of the drivers of dark tourism, and the education experience was previously determined to be one of the most significant factors of dark tourism by Yan et al., (2016); Yoshida et al., (2016); and Zhang et al., (2016a). Wanting to learn was also an important prompting factor of dark tourism, according to Isaak and
Çakmak (2014), as was the need to learn history, according to Bigley et al., (2010). This study showed that some tourists had visited the Jewish Cemetery in Pretoria and some had been to Qunu (Nelson Mandela’s burial place) in Mthatha. The desire to pay homage motivated graveyard visits (Brown, 2015b). The findings of this study also corroborated Stone’s (2015) view that heritage sites that interpreted death and the causes of mass deaths often existed for memorialisation or educative purposes.

This study further found that proximity also served as a motivating factor for dark tourism, as had Liyanage et al., (2015). Some tourists had visited a particular research site because they had no alternate tourist sites to visit. Poria et al., (2006) found leisure to be another motivating factor, and curiosity was yet another factor of dark tourism (Bigley et al., 2010; Isaak and Çakmak 2014; Yong 2014; Yan et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2016a). Appreciating what participants considered their heroes was consistent with Brown (2015b). According to Brown (2015b), dark tourism visitors felt that being in places where their heroes and or heroines were buried brought them closer to them. Authenticity of experience was also identified as a reason to have visited dark tourism sites (Cohen, 1988; Naoi, 2003; Lisle, 2007; Nate-Chei et al., 2011).

The foregoing discussion evaluated the findings of the present study in relation to the findings of other similar studies on motivations to visit places associated with a difficult past. The present study, however, also had some new discoveries; that is, findings which no other studies had reported. This study found that some visited dark attractions in order to learn from the past, so as not to repeat the mistakes of the past. Further,
some tourists visited the research sites because they considered themselves to be liberals. No other study was found to have arrived at these conclusions.

6.2.2 Reasons for visits to places associated with poverty and slums

The second objective of this study sought to establish why visitors toured places associated with poverty and slums. This was commonly known as township tourism in South Africa. The theoretical basis of this objective was located in the Tourist Gaze framework. The Tourist Gaze framework suggested that when tourists visited a particular situation they were guided by the anticipation of pleasure directed towards the objects of the situation; which could include an ethnic group, a landscape, or a cultural performance (Urry, 1990; Prins and Webster, 2010; Urry and Larsen, 2011). With this theory as the backdrop, conclusions were then drawn about the international visitors’ motives for having visited places of poverty and slums, and also for having undertaken township tours.

International tourists visited places associated with poverty and slums because of travel companies and tour guides. Overseas travel companies packaged and promoted township tours in South Africa, and tour guides facilitated these tours. Further to this, curiosity propelled visitors to undertake these tours. Curious tourists visited townships on weekends when everybody was around, and the tour guides gave tourists opportunities to do walkabouts and mingle with the township people. Secondly, some tourists visited places of poverty and slums because of service work and the desire to give back. This form of tourism has been defined as ‘poverty tourism’ or ‘poorism’
(Rolfes, 2010, p. 422). Some visitors were involved in community development and in the process hoped to help bridge the gap between rich and poor. The third reason for international visitors to have visited places associated with poverty and slums was that they wished to see the true and broader picture of the world: some visitors wanted to get away from the bubble of the rich western world and get a proper perspective of the world.

The popularity of places like Soweto also drew some visitors to the township. Tourists wished to be exposed to the culture of the place, and wished to see how people lived there. Other visitors toured places associated with poverty and slums because they considered themselves as progressives. Related to this motivation was the sixth motive for township tourism: some tourists visited these places for humanitarian and social justice reasons. These visitors were interested in social justice, humanity and the human endeavour/human spirit. Some tourists’ reasons for having gone to a township served to show that they empathised with the township residents. This could be interpreted to mean a show of solidarity with township people. The seventh and the final motivation to have toured townships was that visitors had gone there as part of a bigger tour.

As to the conclusions on why South Africans and former South Africans visited places of poverty and slums; only two reasons were identified. The first was their desire to know about these areas. Some of them, especially the white South Africans and former South Africans, wanted to visit places like townships because during apartheid they had
never had the opportunity to visit them. They now toured because they desired to see what they ‘looked like’. Lastly, some visited township because they considered themselves to be liberals.

This study identified travel companies as one of the important factors in township or slum tours. Travel companies operated and marketed most of the tours to disadvantaged parts of cities of developing or emerging nations (Rolfes, 2009). This study also found that township tours could be part of volunteer tourism, vacation volunteering or poverty tourism. Tourists undertook these forms of tourism in order to help the residents of these areas (Stoddart and Rogerson, 2004; Wymer et al., 2010; Koleth, 2014).

Steinbrink (2012), however, suggested another perspective to the phenomenon of township or slum tourism. The view was that it arose out of the need to see the unknown ‘other’. The question was; could township tours in South Africa be understood as part of ‘othering’? It was difficult to give a categorical answer to this question, however, tour companies and tour guides organised these townships tours over the weekends when everybody was around and the tourists got the opportunity to mingle with the township people. Another perspective on township tourism was that township tours in South Africa were attributed to struggle junkies (Frenzel, 2012). These trips had originated as a way to pledge solidarity with the oppressed during apartheid (Frenzel, 2012). This could still be true even today post-apartheid because this study also found that some tourists visited the townships because they wanted to appreciate
human spirit and human endeavour. Social justice issues also drove some of the tourists to the townships. However, slum tours of the *favelas* in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and the Kibera Slums in Nairobi, Kenya arose as part of the United Nations’ multilateral initiatives, for example, global cities and poverty programmes (Frenzel, 2012).

This study was also able to establish some new motives for visiting areas of poverty and slums, which no study was found to have concluded before. These motives were: liberalism; the desire to get a broader picture of the world; as well as the belief in social justice. These were therefore new findings about the motivations for dark tourism.

6.2.3 The roles of modern communication media, marketing and intermediaries

Dark tourism was then theorised in terms of globalisation and interconnectedness. In relation to this conceptualisation, this study established that the following elements promoted tours to the research sites. Firstly; television, the internet and social media (particularly Facebook) played an important role in visits to dark tourism visit. Linked to the internet and social media was the role of TripAdvisor and websites: visitors learned from TripAdvisor about areas to visit. Tourists’ attractions were also rated on TripAdvisor. Secondly, tour operators and word-of-mouth played a part: in America and Britain tour operators packaged tours to South Africa which included trips to the research sites. Visitors then talked to their friends back home about their experiences. This factor was linked to the role of acquaintances in dark tourism. In addition, some tour guides communicated with tourists who had been to local sites to get feedback on their experiences.
Thirdly, published material in books and other publications also played a role. Nelson Mandela’s *Long Walk to Freedom* and travel books and guides also played a prominent role. Fourthly, educational projects were identified. In the USA, for example, educational institutions required students to do academic projects abroad and some institutions chose to bring their students to South Africa. The fifth factor was the action of women spouses initiating tours to South Africa. This study found that it was mostly female spouses who through their membership of charity organisations or other organisations to which they were affiliated had advanced visits to South Africa and to the research sites.

This study was also able to make findings on the tourists’ consumption behaviours. While older people could spend as much as three hours at the museums, younger people become bored easily. They preferred displays that promoted interaction rather than the passive reception of information. These findings on the differences in the information consumption patterns at the museums between younger people and older people could have implications on the organisation of exhibitions. Additionally, younger visitors were also found to be adventurous. Some engaged in bungee jumping at places like the Oppenheimer Towers in Soweto.

Similar to the findings of this study, some scholars had established that modern communication media played an important role in furthering dark tourism (Foley and Lennon, 2000; Lisle, 2007; Dale and Robinson, 2011; Scott, 2012; Biran and Hyde,
Travel companies were also identified as performing an important function in the promotion of dark tourism (Rolfes, 2009).

Moreover, this study found that female spouses had played a major role in initiating the tours. This finding suggested that there was a gender dimension towards tourism.

### 6.2.4 Visitors’ interpretations and narratives of the research sites

The researcher then assessed the visitors’ interpretations of the research sites. Some theorists suggested that visits to sites associated with death, pain, and suffering were emotionally laden (Miles, 2002; Isaac and Budryte-Ausijiene, 2015). Ashworth and Isaac (2015) identified eight primary emotions to be associated with dark tourism: joy, sadness, acceptance, disgust, fear, anger, surprise, and anticipation. With regards to the above, this study concluded that research participants understood the study sites in terms of both positive and negative attributes. In terms of positives attributes, this study concluded that tourists interpreted the research sites and other dark tourism sites internationally as educational, learning and cultural places. Visitors used descriptive phrases such as: places of inspiration and empowerment; sites that made one a better person; sites that showed that confrontation was not always a solution; and also, places of freedom. A visitor to the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum commented that they had learned that Hector’s real surname was Pitso and that his father had changed surname to Pieterson so that the Pitsos would be regarded as the white racial group in the apartheid South Africa. This was before the 1976 Soweto Students' Uprisings. The paradox in this was that Hector Pieterson, who was considered to be one of the first
victims of the 1976 Soweto Students’ Uprisings, was son to a man who wanted him to be viewed as a white person. There were also suggestions that Hastings Ndlovu, and not Hector Pieterson, could have been the first student to be shot during the during the 1976 Soweto Students’ Uprisings. On the 16 June 2016, Minister in the Presidency, Jeff Radebe, oversaw the renaming ceremony of Pila and Thabede Streets to Hastings Ndlovu Street in Orlando West in Soweto. This was a tribute to Hastings Ndlovu, reportedly the first student to lose his life in the 1976 Students’ Uprisings on June 16.

Secondly, some visitors reflected on the positives that were emerging in people. Tourists appreciated the ingenuity of political prisoners; some of the former prisoners worked as tour guides at the Robben Island Museum during this study. Visitors explained that they would draw inspiration from the tenacity of these former prisoners. The third conclusion about the interpretation of the research sites was that some visitors understood them as special places and as places where future generations could learn from the past. Visitors described the Robben Island Museum as: a shrine; a place of reverence; a religious place; a place of hope; and a place of healing and closure. Fourthly, the tourists viewed the research sites as places that reflected reality, in that visiting dark tourism sites took them away from the cocoon of the developed world to a place where they could see what the world was really like elsewhere.

In terms of the negative attributes of the research sites, the interviewees understood them as: sad, gloomy and emotional places. They were seen as places of duress and also as places of reflection. Visitors reflected about the history of the painful pasts.
Lastly, the research sites were viewed as places that reflected inhumanity. They were places of suffering and man-made political disasters. Even though their tourism experiences at the research sites would make some of the visitors see things differently, they did not consider these tourism experiences to be life changing.

Research suggested that dark tourism could evoke some negative emotional experiences (Poria et al., 2006; Budrtye-Ausijiene, 2015; Zhang et al., 2016b), while other studies concluded that dark tourists felt emotions of shock, grief, sadness, and some had self-reflective thoughts at dark tourism sites (Leyanage et al., 2015; Isaak and Çakmak, 2016). The present study, however, suggested that visiting the research sites did not primarily evoke negative emotional experiences. Instead, visitors tended to see the positives in the research sites. While dark tourism could also be motivated by the desire to resolve grief (Braithwaite and Lee, 2006); the findings of the present study did not show this as a motive to have toured the research sites. Dark tourism sites could also provide the space for critical reflection on the state of the world today (Brown, 2015b; Liyanage et al., 2015; Isaak and Çakmak, 2016), and this study showed that tourists reflected on inhumanity and also on the histories of a painful past.

This study also explored what tourists wrote about the research sites. Analysis of what tourists recorded about the research sites showed that tourists did not just accept the services or products on offer at superficial level. Rather, they viewed whatever service or product was offered to them critically. Visitors praised the Apartheid Museum’s captivating exhibitions and the good layout, however, one visitor remarked about the
lack of flow in the exhibitions. Tourists observed the educational and inspirational value of the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, and this was a good reflection on the museum because one of its core themes was to uphold the youths’ achievements and their potential. Even though some tourists praised the Robben Island Museum experience, several of them expressed unhappiness about the organisation of the trips to the Museum. All in all, the research sites evoked some emotions but at the same time tourists generally praised their educational significance.

6.2.5 Curators’ understanding of the research sites

The *Commodification* of culture and heritage theory underpinned the theorisation of this section. *Commodification* was a process by which things (and activities) came to be evaluated primarily in terms of their exchange and profit value, within the context of trade (Cohen, 1988). The idea was to understand if the research sites had been *commodified* for the purposes of income generation. In terms of marketing, this study firstly found that all research sites had broader concepts of their target markets. The Robben Island Museum focused on local people; the Apartheid Museum targeted everyone, internationally and locally; and the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum also had both a local and international focus. Secondly, regarding the commercial mandate of the research sites; this study concluded that the sites were not commercially driven but they did charge entrance fees. These charges were merely meant to cover the running costs, and they were meant to be kept low. No entrance fees were charged for the exhibitions at the Gateway to Robben Island Museum and at Jetty One at the V and A Waterfront in Cape Town. The final issue regarding commercialisation of the
museums was that they were not necessarily commercialised; entrance rates served to meet their day to day expenses.

Thirdly, the impressions that the research sites wished to make on the visitors varied. The Apartheid Museum hoped to leave an impression of the lessons and pitfalls of racism, bias and prejudice, so that they were never repeated. The Robben Island Museum wished to be remembered as a place of learning and also as a place where people had suffered. One interviewee used the phrase “people suffered” several times during their interview. This showed the importance of looking at the site from this perspective, and it could be interpreted as emotional. The Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum wished to touch visitors emotionally, spiritually, and intellectually. All the Museums and the Memorial Museum were engaged in projects to pass their history on to younger generations.

Fourthly, none of the study sites had integrated the concept of plural interpretations or cosmopolitanism in their product offerings, however, the Apartheid Museum had plans for space to enable visitors to interpret the exhibitions in the way in which they understood them. Tour operators and tour guides who sent visitors to the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum would be expected to understand the languages of the tourists, otherwise in-house tour guides would assist in this regard. Linked to the above point was the concept of experiential learning and visitor engagement. This study made the conclusion that the study sites had not adopted the concept of interactive learning
whereby tourists engaged with the displays; however, the museums interacted with their surrounding communities through local community building and capacitation projects.

Literature suggested that contemporary museums were undergoing transformation. They did this partly to appeal to a diversity of people and to younger generations. Globalisation had brought about cosmopolitanism, and younger people had grown immersed in technology. Internationally museums had moved to accommodate these contemporary developments, with initiatives such as the integration of experiential learning in displays (Herreman, 1998; van Aalst and Boogaarts, 2002; Sodaro, 2013; Gibson, 2016). Despite the limitations, all of the museums (research sites) appeared to have an impact on their communities (Munley and Roberts, 2006; Nolan, 2010). Finally, even though the museums marketed their activities, this could not be interpreted along the lines of sanitising places of suffering and past conflict into consumable heritage for tourists (Thompson, 1999; Cochrane, 2015). This was because this study found that the study sites existed for a bigger purpose, namely to educate the public.

The above section linked the objectives of this study with the existing research on dark tourism. The section below continues to review the various concepts and theories of dark tourism in relation to the findings of this study.

6.3 THEORETICAL REFLECTIONS

Dark tourism could be conceptualised from a diversity of theories: thanatopsis; an industrial to post-industrial shift; relational tourism; reality and authenticity; tourist gaze;
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and critique of the dark tourism construct. This section reflects on these interpretations of dark tourism in relation to the findings of the present study.

6.3.1 Thanatopsis

The thanatopsis construct postulated that people engaged in dark tourism as an act of contemplating death (Seaton, 1996). Mellor and Shilling (1993); Lee (2004); Stone (2005); Sharpley (2005); Stone and Sharpley (2009); and Stone (2009) further understood dark tourism as arising out of the de-sequestration of death. Their view was that modernity sequestered death from the public domain, and in this way death became a private matter of the morgues and other private agencies who took over the handling of the dead and dying. However, the period of post-modernity has seen de-sequestrated death. For example, Stone (2011b) viewed Gunther von Hagen's Body Worlds exhibition as a medium whereby absent death was rendered present. The Gunther von Hagen’s Body Worlds was a global touring exhibition of preserved real human bodies and parts. Professor Gunther von Hagen’s whose real name is Gunther Gerhard Liebchen is a German anatomist who created the exhibition (Stone, 2011b; Martinez, 2012).

The findings of this study seemed to negate this thesis. Tourists seemed to be more appreciative of what each research site represented and symbolised, rather than being concerned with death and dying, so visits to the sites of this study could not be explained on the basis of thanatopsis theory. This study explained the research sites in
terms of what they represented and what they symbolised, which was victory and freedom.

**6.3.2 Industrial to post-industrial shift**

Dark tourism became embedded and could be explained with a shift from an industrial to a post-industrial mode of production and consumption (Rojek, 1991; Foley and Lennon, 1996; Lennon and Foley, 2000; Dürr and Jaffe, 2012). In the capitalist economic system aspects of society such as heritage became packaged for tourism consumption (Jansen-Verbeke, 1999; Abad, 2016; Kruczek and Kruczek, 2016), and with the move from an industrial to a post-industrial society, dark tourism and heritage were turned into a major tourism industry (Yuill, 2003). In the process, dark tourism was identified as an emerging market niche (Best, 2007), became a focus for mainstream tourism providers and has been marketed as such (Stone, 2013).

This study however found that the research sites were not necessarily commodified as they were not profit generating. They operated on the basis of recovering their running costs; however, the research sites represented apparatuses of the commodification of culture and heritage. They were meant to be catalysts for economic development in their neighbourhoods. The Robben Island Museum was designed with the intention of maximising the economic, tourism and educational potential of the Island, and hence encouraged its multi-purpose usage (Corsane, 2006; Marschall, 2006). Similarly, the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum was developed to attract the burgeoning cultural
tourist (Marschall, 2006; Baines, 2007), so the concept of the commodification of culture and heritage had somehow influenced the establishment of the study sites.

6.3.3 Relational tourism

Tourism was a relational phenomenon. It promoted communication and mobility, and was conversely enhanced where there was good communication media. Owing to tourism, places – rather than remaining discrete materialities or entities – became embedded within networks of flows and connections (Jones, 2011; Binnie, 2014; Spence, 2014). Relational tourism reflected a departure from territorial boundedness to the connectivity of social relations and networks across time and space (Mosedale and Albrecht, 2011; Jönsson, 2016). Likewise, the 21st century museum aspired to embrace the representation of diverse identities and points of view, within the context of a highly globalised world (Loukaitou-Sideris and Grodach, 2004).

Global interconnectedness was one of the factors driving tourism and culture and heritage consumption. The findings of this study showed that relationality, which related to a concern with flows across national boundaries, played a major role in advancing tourism. This study showed that tourists come from all over the world, and modern communication media had made this possible. Tourists understood that they needed to get out of the “rich western world cocoon”, visualise and perhaps experience how people lived in different parts of the world. Somehow, the world had become a network of neighbours, with tourism as a relational development (Kong, Gibson, Khoo, and
Semple, 2006; Mosedale and Albrecht, 2011; Sanz-Ibáñez and Clavé; 2014; Briassoulis, 2017).

6.3.4 Reality and authenticity

The quest for reality and authenticity as it applied to tourism was attributed to McCannell (1973, 1976), but this concept had its roots in cultural authenticity (Nate-Chei, 2011; Croes et al., 2013). The reality and authenticity theory was a modern construct whose emergence was closely related to the impact of modernity on social existence. Modernity was alienating and as a consequence individuals had lost sense of reality. Individuals had been left with no option but to burrow into themselves in search of the real, which had to be in opposition to any external (modern) social formation (Berger, 1973). The alienated modern tourists set out to look for the real and authentic, the pristine, the primitive and natural, that which was as yet untouched by modernity. Modern individuals hoped to find it in other times and other places, since it was absent from their own world (Cohen, 1988). Therefore, dark tourism entailed the fulfilment of the desire for authentically scarring experiences, where fatal and disastrous events became the banal or ordinary (Burroughs, 2014, p. 320).

Tourists in this study were interested in the authenticity of their experiences; however, the authenticity of the displays did not necessarily appear to be a major motivating factor in dark tourism. Also, the notion that people engaged in dark tourism as an expression of individual existence freedom and choice did not define their drive to visit the study sites; rather, tourists were mostly motivated by the desire to learn.
6.3.5 Tourist gaze

The tourist gaze theory hypothesised that the desire to ‘gaze’ or gawk, and the need to experience the unknown ‘other’ was behind tourism (Urry 1990; Urry and Larsen, 2011). The concept of gaze denoted staring, gaping, gawking, or looking steadily and intently at something, especially something which excited admiration, curiosity or interest (Thompson, 1995). This theory further explained that tourist destinations arose out of contradictions between the extra-ordinary (unfamiliar, unknown ‘other’) and a home away from home feeling (Prins and Webster, 2010; Urry and Larsen, 2011; Witz et al., 2017).

A related but different theory, however, explained dark tourism (military tourism or battlefields tourism) in terms of utility of meaning. The meaning people had of words, events and phenomena reflected and created a subjective view of the world. This meant that people did not understand words and phenomena in the same way as everyone else (Enfield, 2015). Tourism concepts like tourists gaze and the quest for reality and authenticity implied that discrete forces or monolithic perspectives drove dark tourism, whereas meaning systems that people produced socially impelled dark tourism (Seaton, 2000). The concepts of gaze and ‘othering’ therefore did not necessarily account for dark tourism (Seaton, 2000).

In so far as this study was concerned, tour operators and tour guides who had inside knowledge of the different places marketed and organised trips to these places. Other tourists who visited townships tended to do so out of a desire to know about them; or to
observe the human spirit; or out of concern for social justice. Despite the nature of the organisation of township tours, it would be difficult to conclusively declare that township tours constituted a desire to observe the unknown ‘other’. However, beyond gazing and searching for the unknown ‘other’, most tourists in this study were interested in the meaning that the research sites represented. In addition, this study did not conclude on the theory that tourist destinations came into being as a result of contradictions between the extra-ordinary (unfamiliar) and a home away from home feeling (Urry and Larsen, 2011; Witz et al., 2017). It was, however, interesting to note that some visitors from other parts of Africa (for example, Nigeria) had visited the Robben Island Museum without having visited similar sites in neighbouring countries. Countries of Western Africa, such as Ghana and Senegal, had slave ports which were categorised as dark tourism attractions.

6.3.6 Critique of the dark tourism construct

The dark tourism construct which was predicated on the assumption that there were tourists who had a fascination with visiting places associated with death, suffering, tragedy and atrocity (Yankholmes and Akyeampong, 2010; Young and Light, 2016), has come under critical scrutiny (Bowman and Pezzullo, 2010; Biran and Poria, 2012; Potts, 2012; Miles, 2014; Connell, 2015; Ashworth and Isaac, 2015; Golańska, 2015). The understanding was that heritage sites that interpreted death and the causes of such dying, whether untimely or in violent or calamitous circumstances often existed for memorialisation or educative purposes (Stone, 2015). In this way there was scepticism about the dark tourism construct (Stone, 2015).
The findings in this study have shown that tourists were not necessarily motivated by the need to experience something dark. Rather, tourism to the research sites was driven by: the desire to learn and know more about the sites and the events that had taken place there; the desire to pay homage to Nelson Mandela and to the victims of the past atrocities; the desire to observe human spirit and human endeavours; and the desire to pledge solidarity for the course of social justice. Tour companies and tour guides also played a prominent role in township tours.

6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, this study makes the following recommendations. These are expected to inform policy and the management of dark tourism sites in South Africa. The recommendations are directed to the Government and to the three sites of this study.

6.4.1 Recommendations to the Government

Firstly, this study found that wildlife such as animals and nature attracted many international visitors. Therefore, this study recommends the protection and conservation of wildlife, especially Rhinos and Elephants, from widespread poaching. Secondly, international visitors combined wildlife trips or safaris (as they called these tours) to South Africa with visits to Victoria Falls in Zimbabwe. Since this was the case, this study recommends that the South African government work with the government of Zimbabwe on matters of nature and wildlife tourism. Thirdly, a visitor praised South Africa for being a model for the tolerance of racial diversity. This study, therefore,
recommends that the government maintains the spirit of the Rainbow Nation. Allied with this is the need for the Government to ensure that South Africa is kept alive in the international news and in the global agendas. This means that the country must not be forgotten from the international scene. Fourthly, visitors did not perceive Soweto as dangerous, and neither did they observe it to be poor, as some of them had been made to believe. Strategies should therefore be introduced to dispel the sometimes negative image that visitors have of places like Soweto. Fifthly, tours to townships and to the research sites served many purposes, including the fascination with culture. Therefore, the local municipalities of the research sites, together with the relevant museums might consider showing authentic township life. This study found Soweto to be very popular. Finally, visitors valued architecture and authentic experiences; hence this study recommends the incorporation of unique elements of indigenous architecture in the design of buildings and other structures to attract tourists.

6.4.2 Recommendations to the three sites of the study

Most visitors undertook tours to the research sites with the intention of learning history and paying homage, especially to Nelson Mandela. Starting with the intention to learn history, this study recommends that tour guides be as informed and knowledgeable about the history they impart as possible. A visitor to the Robben Island Museum raised the issue that a tour guide was ignorant and had the wrong facts about who was buried in the mosque (on the Island), however, another visitor praised the tour guides for being very knowledgeable. This showed that visitors expected the tour guides to be knowledgeable on South African history. This study got the impression that visitors to
the research sites were quite discerning people. Further, with regards to learning; this study established that unlike older visitors, younger visitors got bored easily, especially at the Apartheid Museum. Therefore, this study recommends that the Apartheid Museum incorporate interactive learning media in order to sustain the levels of interest. This applies to the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum as well. A visitor remarked that exhibition panels at the Memorial Museum only promoted passive learning.

Secondly, since Nelson Mandela was the main attraction, at the Robben Island Museum in particular; this study recommends that he be explored from different innovative but authentic angles. This will have to be done so that visitors always have something new to learn about him. Thirdly, a number of tourists raised issues with the conditions of the boats to the Robben Island Museum, and sometimes with the crews of the boats; while other visitors commented on the organisation of the bus transport around the Island, and on the general Island tour experience. In view of this, this study recommends that the Robben Island Museum revisit the concept and impression they wish to create in the minds of the visitors.

Fourthly, in relation to the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum, this study recommends the following for the purposes of accurate history: firstly, Hector Pieterson’s real surname appears to have been Pitso, this study recommends that the Memorial Museum facilitate research into Hector Pieterson’s real surname. The Pitso surname, if correct, might need to feature more in the Memorial Museum presentations and exhibitions. Secondly, since Hastings Ndlovu might have been the first student to be
shot during the 16 June 1976 Uprisings, this study recommends that the Memorial Museum also facilitates further research into this subject. Once more, the purpose would be to give the proper recognition to all the students who were victims in the 1976 Students’ Uprisings.

Finally, if the research sites are to attract more tourists, they might consider doing the following: working with tour operators; and making use of social media (Facebook) and websites such as TripAdvisor for the purposes of attracting younger people.

6.5 AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Several areas for further research into dark tourism have emanated from this study and they are as follows. Firstly, some international tourists had indicated that they wished to learn from the research sites so that the mistakes of the past were not repeated. Some of them were also concerned about issues of social justice, and this raised issues of moral and social justice in tourism. There is thus a need for further research to explore the concepts of morals/conscience and justice in tourism. Secondly, related to the above, some research participants visited dark tourism sites because they subscribed to the values of open-mindedness or progressiveness. There is thus a need to explore if liberal values influence tourism. Further still, there is a need to research the form and nature of the humanitarian reasons as motivations to visit places associated with poverty and slums. Some visitors indicated that they undertook township tours because they wanted to witness human spirit/human endeavour. Thirdly, tourists visiting the research sites did not indicate that they had been to other similar dark tourism sites in
Africa, for example, the slave ports in Ghana, Nigeria and Senegal. Further research should explore why visitors visit dark tourism sites in South Africa and not similar dark tourism sites in other parts of Africa. Fourthly, given the importance attached to virtual tourism and virtual museums, these concepts should be researched so as to determine what they hold for tourism, and, especially for visits to museums. Finally, this study identified the role of women spouses in initiating and organising tours to South Africa, and this requires further investigation.

In summary this study recommends that research sites still be maintained as sites of gaining knowledge. The concept of interactive learning needs to be integrated into the exhibitions as this could help keep younger visitors captivated by the museum experiences. Wildlife needs to be protected as it is very important for tourism in South Africa. In South Africa mediating factors such as social media, the internet, word-of-mouth, tour operators, and international educational institutions are very important in the tourism marketing mix. Lastly, it is important to pay attention to the organisation of trips to the research sites, especially the Robben Island Museum. Proper organisation of tourism visits is important, not only for the Island, but also for all the other tourist destinations in South Africa.

### 6.6 CONCLUSION

Tourism began developing rapidly worldwide and it will continue to expand into the future as well. As mass tourism expanded there were concerns about its impact on the environment and tourists have generally become disenchanted with traditional sea, sun
and sand tourist destinations. They began pursuing tourism encounters that offered more authentic experiences in the realm of dark tourism, which has become popular since the 1990s. As dark tourism became widespread, it attracted critical attention from quarters who were concerned with ethical issues. They questioned the ethics of consuming mortality, death and representations of the dead. The presupposition was that people engaged in dark tourism because of the thrill that such pursuits offered. The controversy which surrounded this assumption and the fact that the dark tourism field seemed not to be theoretically grounded led to this study, and this research investigated the motivations to visit dark tourism sites. This study hoped to contribute to a better understanding of this phenomenon, and it identified and utilised three dark tourism sites in South Africa, namely the Robben Island Museum, the Apartheid Museum, and the Hector Pieterson Memorial Museum. The overall conclusion of this study was that visitors patronised the two Museums, the Memorial Museum and other similar museums internationally, primarily because they were driven by the desire to learn and to pay homage to those who had suffered. This implied that policy and the management of dark tourism sites needed to create an environment that facilitated the attainment of these motivations.
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INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR VISITORS TO HECTOR PIETERSON MEMORIAL
AND MUSEUM, ROBBEN ISLAND MUSEUM, AND APARTHEID MUSEUM

Researcher : SS Nhlabathi
Supervisor : Prof Maharaj
School/Programme : PhD, Geography
University : University of KwaZulu-Natal

Note to participants/respondents:

- We need your help to understand motivations to engage in dark tourism in South Africa.
- Although we would like you to help us, you are not compelled to take part in this research
- Your identity might be known to the researcher only, and so information will not be shared with anyone.

How to respond to the interview?
Please answer the questions as truthfully as you can.

If you do not feel comfortable answering a question, you can indicate that you do not want to answer. For questions that you answer, your responses will be kept confidential.

*Thanking you in advance for your time and participation*
Title of this study: Motivations to engage in dark tourism: the case of selected sites in South Africa.

1. How would you describe your nationality?


2. Have you visited tourist sites similar to this one elsewhere? If, yes, which one?


3. Could you say that people are more than before interested in touring sites of this nature?


4. Would you say that you view this site differently, for example, to a visit to sun baked beach? If, yes, how would you characterise the difference?


5. Would you say that there are other reasons for visiting this site other than just touring? If, so, what is the other reason?
6. Are you at this site intentionally or you are here by accident since you were in this locality? If intentionally, what would be the intention?

7. Would you describe this site as a gloomy or sad site to visit or it just one of those places of interest to tourists, there is nothing gloomy about the site?

8. Could you say that a visit to a site like this one presents an opportunity for releasing some emotions and thereby attaining inner peace?

9. Would you say that sites commemorating people’s inhumanity can cause not only reflection and sorrow, but also grief, in visitors without a personal loss commemorated by the site?
10. Would you say that your visit is motivated by a desire to remember those who would have suffered in this site (landscape of memory)?

11. Would you say that a visit to this site evokes emotional/effective experience, hope, sadness, or identify with its history /circumstances?

12. Would you characterise a visit to this site as an adventure, just like a visit to earthquakes, or tracking tornadoes, is?

13. Would you say that a visit to this site has changed your outlook towards life? If, so, how?
14. Did marketing play a role in your decision to visit this site? If, so, how?

15. Would you say that modern communication technology played a role in your decision to visit this site? If so, how?

16. Would you say that a visit like this one in some way is motivated by the need to gain authentic (first hand) experience of the situation?

17. Would you say that you are fascinated by the something different in visiting a site of this nature?
18. Would you say that visits to sites of this nature are motivated by the desire for novelty, adventure, something that cannot be experienced in other places?

..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

19. Would you characterise a visit to a tourist site as this one as constituting freedom/self-expression in an unconstrained environment?

..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

Once more thank you
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR CURATORS

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE CURATORS OF APARTHEID MUSEUM,
HECTOR PIETERSON MEMORIAL AND MUSEUM, AND ROBBEN ISLAND
MUSEUM

Researcher : SS Nhlabathi
Supervisor : Prof Maharaj
School/Programme : PhD, Geography
University : University of KwaZulu-Natal

Note to participants/respondents:

- We need your help to understand motivations to engage in dark tourism in South Africa.
- Although we would like you to help us, you are not compelled to take part in this research
- Your identity might be known to the researcher only and information will not be shared to reveal your name.
How to respond to the interview?

• Please answer the questions as truthfully as you can
• If you do not feel comfortable answering a question, you can indicate that you do not want to answer. For questions that you answer, your responses will be kept confidential

_Thanking you in advance for your time and participation_
Title of this study: *Motivations to engage in dark tourism: the case of selected sites in South Africa.*

1. Is there an audience that this site is targeting? If so, who is that audience?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

2. Do you view this site as having more of an economic agenda than as for example being a site of heritage?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

3. Do you promote and market this site? If, so what media do you use?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

4. How do you hope visitors will remember this site when they get back home?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
5. Would you say that this museum/memorial allows multiple voices to be heard and encourages plural interpretations?

..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................

6. Would you say that design and display of artefacts in the site is such that it facilitates social interaction/engagement with visitors?

..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................

7. Would you say that displays in this site privilege experiential and visual over the need for historical depth?

..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................

Once More Thank You.