

How to Submit for the World Heritage List: A Case of St. Pierre Church of Antakya Considering the Perceptions of Tourist Guides

Dr. Erkan Sezgin^{1*}, Melik Onur Güzel² (MSc)

¹Associate Professor Anadolu University, Turkey

²Candidate PhD, Anadolu University, Turkey

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Erkan Sezgin, Associate Professor Anadolu University, Turkey

Abstract: *The Cultural Heritage List, which has an important branding effect in the cultural tourism market, was presented to the world by UNESCO in 1972. The Cultural Heritage List consists of tangible and intangible heritage categories. The World Heritage List, which is also known as, has 10 criteria and candidates are expected to encounter at least one title to be included in the system.*

The subject of this particular study is Antakya St. Pierre Church. The application for The World Heritage Site was made in 2011 for citing two of the criteria (third and sixth criteria), and since then the church is in the tentative list of World Heritage. In this research, it is claimed that the second criterion of UNESCO should also have been added while submission.

The main objective of the present study is to identify whether St. Pierre Church of Antakya has already deserved to be listed in the World Heritage Site. It was also aimed in the study that St. Pierre Church could be a model for buildings with strong religion effect in any part of the world. Accordingly, out of the mentioned three criteria of the World Heritage List for Antakya St. Pierre Church, a scale was developed and applied to tourist guides. The results reveal significances when the perceptions of tourist guides are considered.

Keywords: *Antakya, St. Pierre Church, Tourism, World Heritage List, Tourist Guides*

1. INTRODUCTION

Cultural heritage can be expressed as an integral part of all the artistic or symbolic-financial indicators of all cultures, therefore all humanity. The cultural heritage which is a part of the process of affirmation and enrichment of cultural identities and a legacy to all humanity provides recognizable features to each location and contains human experience (Jokilehto, 2005:4). Considering the elements of inheritance stated here, tangible and intangible factors show up. While the historical sites, monuments, archaeological, architectural, scientific-technological artefacts that have been left as legacy by the past generations create concrete legacies, the handicrafts, local cuisine, oral traditions and narratives together with language create the intangible cultural heritage (Karaca et al, 2017; Okuyucu and Somuncu, 2012).

Conservation and promotion of cultural heritage that includes elements such as the rural areas, historical sites, artefacts and cultural expressions has lately become a central topic of international cultural policy. Within this scope, after the end of the Second World War, UNESCO has been a key organization in the adoption of a number of contracts, financial and administrative measures for the identification and protection of cultural heritage (Alivizatou-Barakou et al, 2017). UNESCO, which has a great impact on the preservation of archaeological sites and landscapes besides the world heritage, includes the oral and cultural margins in the World Cultural Heritage List which are endangered and need to be protected for future generations (Nas, 2002). The UNESCO World Cultural Heritage List has emerged as a list of highly acclaimed and prestigious elements that have the potential to become brands, as well as a list used to attract tourists to cultural heritage elements over time (Ryan and Silvalto, 2009). Within this scope, to be in UNESCO's Cultural Heritage List is a vital importance for; preservation of cultural elements, ensuring sustainability, branding and presenting as a touristic supply (Vecco and Srakar, 2018; Ryan and Silvalto, 2009; Nas, 2002; Frey and Steiner, 2011).

St. Pierre Church, an important cultural property of the Christian world and located in UNESCO's Temporary Cultural Heritage List since 2011, is one of the impressive nominees for UNESCO's Potential Cultural Heritage List since it bears an important historical value. However, the presence of St Pierre Church in the tentative list for a long time also reveals another research topic. The aim of this research is to reveal the perceptions of tourist guides (TGs) to examine the relationship between the Cultural Heritage List and St. Pierre Church which is an important determinant of brand recognition.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. World Cultural Heritage Factors

In academic discourse, “culture” is used as a general term for how we behave. Culture or civilization, embraced as its ethnographic meaning, is a complex integrity that includes knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, law, special and other abilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society (Buckland, 2013:3). Cultural heritage refers to concrete culture such as art objects, architecture and landscape forms that are used daily in a group or a society as well as it can be expressed as “values that benefit the intangible cultural heritage, such as language and human memory, dance performances, music, theatre and rituals, which are generally shared, protected, and left to future generations to benefit them” (Silverman and Ruggles, 2007; Tonta 2014). Although the concept of cultural heritage was only object-oriented at the beginning, it experienced a change covering the concrete and abstract values that were important for humanity in time. The consciousness of protecting of history and valuable cultural assets has carried on over the years under a state of change and development (Karapınar and Barakazi, 2017).

In the period after the Second World War, where the consciousness of cultural heritage was still object-oriented, major destruction took place in European cities. Due to these demolitions, a situation which requires the renewal of city centres to meet the needs of people has arisen. In order to eliminate the traces of destruction and to meet the new requirements of the people, large scale of urban transformation was carried out (Aksoy et al, 2012). Due to the need of the building and construction especially for the growing population and the service sector after 1960s, the destruction of valuable and historical buildings has caused a great deal of damage to the historical fabric (Enlil, 1992).The results of the transformation have led to serious reactions and it has been understood that ordinary civil structures are cultural assets worthy of protection (Aksoy et al, 2012). For the first time in 1964, that the ordinary houses were cultural assets were expressed with the “The Venice Charter” and the scope of the immovable cultural assets expanded. With these developments, the Venice Charter has shown the features of a cornerstone in terms of changing the definition of cultural heritage and expanding the scope of protection (Vecco 2010; BGSPA, 2014).

On the protection of cultural heritage, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has prepared a protocol for the reduction of the effects of the Second World War on cultural assets and values in 1954 (Agreement and Protocol on the Protection of Cultural Heritage in the case of Armed Conflict). The content of this agreement is the protection of the objects which are valuable in terms of history and art. On the other hand, in the 1970s, UNESCO published the Convention on the Measures to be taken for the Prevention and Prohibition of Unlawful Import, Export and Property Transfer of the Cultural Heritage, which is the second important document in order to protect the objects and prevent the smuggling of historical artefacts (Oğuz, 2013; Silverman and Ruggles, 2007).

In addition to the agreements in 1954 and 1970, UNESCO published the agreement on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage for the protection of cultural values in 1972. With this Convention, also referred to as the World Heritage Convention, it is aimed to put the signing states under the liability of define, identify, protect, restore, present and transfer both the cultural and natural heritage to the next generations. In addition to the object-oriented cultural heritage, it has been extended to include non-material heritage, such as customs, beliefs, music, eating-drinking cultures, life practices, and so on (Aksoy et al, 2012; Jokilehto, 2005).

Considering all developments and processes, the researches on cultural heritage throughout the world are carried out by UNESCO mostly. According to the 2018 data on the World Cultural and Natural Heritage List which was established under the agreement prepared by the organization in 1972, there

are 1092 cultural heritage factors throughout the world. 845 of these are cultural, while 209 of them are natural and 38 of them are mixed (natural and cultural) heritage (UNESCO, 2018a). In addition to these legacies, which are included in the UNESCO World Heritage List by the World Heritage Committee, there is also a Temporary List is composed of legacies which are proposed to be in the list but candidacy was yet to be completed. The Temporary List is a national inventory for the Member States and the areas to be referred to the main list are selected from this list. UNESCO's World Heritage Temporary List includes 1701 legacies of 177 States Parties (UNESCO, 2018b).

2.2. Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage Elements in Turkey

Anatolia and Thrace have been hosted many cultures and civilizations throughout history and contains the cultural heritage which is the meeting point of these civilizations and many nations left behind. With this cosmopolitan structure in which Turkey has, the roots of the heritage include ancient Anatolian cultures (such as Hittite, Lycia, Caria, Phrygian), Mediterranean and Aegean cultures (such as Mycenaean, Hellenic, Roman, Byzantine), Central Asian, Persian and Arabian influences and as well as Seljuk and Ottoman sources (Özdemir Dağistan, 2005:20).

Cultural heritage management studies which has started in Turkey on the 19th century focused on protecting, has been developed among the areas such as archeology, architecture and urbanism through 20th century (Aksoy et al, 2012:34). For many years, a great efforts have shown to protect cultural heritage factors and during this period, the main goal has been to protect the movable cultural heritage in the Ottoman period. In the Republic Period, the protection of both movable and immovable cultural assets has become the main topic. Within the framework of this understanding, in addition to the preservation of the physical structure of cultural assets, the transition to integrated protection which requires the preservation of the socio-cultural structure has been made (Çelik and Yazgan, 2007:5).

Developments at the global level have been factors which facilitates the adoption of the integrated protection approach. With the Venice Charter which was adopted in 1964, the agreement on the Protection of the World Natural and Cultural Heritage of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (1972), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), Protection of Cultural Heritage and Restoration Work International Center (ICCROM) Turkey has been involved in this process (Özdemir Dağistan, 2005:22; Kurtarand Somuncu, 2013:36; Aksoy et al, 2012:37). This process has emerged in legal and administrative changes related to the protection of cultural heritage in Turkey. Turkey has been a party to some of the international documents published on the cultural heritage and has implemented these documents legally (Şimşek, 2014: 69).

When the scope of the agreements that Turkey accepted to protect the natural and cultural heritage is examined, the agreement on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage dates of 1972 stands out. UNESCO (Smith, 2006), which determines the plans, policies and laws related to cultural heritage in many western countries and other countries, examines the cultural heritage to be protected under the relevant contract under two headings as cultural and natural heritage. In the agreement, "the monuments, building communities and sites 'are examined under the title of cultural heritage. Natural monuments, geological physiographic formations, areas where animal and plant species grow and natural sites which are formed with physical and biological formations or such formation communities are located under the title of "natural heritage" (Metin Basat, 2013:62-63; Akipek, 2001). When the entire text is examined, it is noteworthy that only concrete areas of culture are emphasized, and cultural transfers around these concrete areas are not mentioned. The only material approach to the concept of culture which constitutes an integrity with its material and spiritual aspects in the agreement does not fully reflect the integrated conservation approach and it shows that the protection approach and socio-cultural dynamics are ignored. In order to ensure integrated protection, following the 1972 Convention, UNESCO, in 2003 and 2005, established the Agreement on the Protection and Development of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. In this context, protection forms for the intangible cultural heritage have been proposed (Metin Basat, 2013:62-63). This new memory created by UNESCO in the area of intangible cultural heritage has added many discussing areas to the discipline in recent years, such as conservation, international conventions, sustainability, cultural heritage recreation, and intangible cultural heritage museum. Turkey, becoming a party in the agreement on 2006 has become an active country that represents

these new discussing areas in both academic and applicational area in previous years (Yıldız, 2014:190).

In order to ensure sustainability of cultural heritage elements and transfer them to future generations, Turkey, after the agreements which it became a part in order to provide the sustainability of cultural heritage and transfer them to later generations, has been attempting with expert authorities to put its cultural heritage to heritage list. According to the list examined in terms of concrete cultural and natural heritage, Turkey has 18 heritages of which 16 of them are cultural and 2 of them are karma (UNESCO, 2018c).

On the other hand, Turkey has become a party on 2006 to make the cultural heritage more visible, to raise awareness of its importance, and to promote dialogue in respect of cultural diversity. As a party to the agreement, Turkey has 16 Intangible Cultural heritage in total of which 15 of them are on the list of intangible cultural heritage of humanity and 1 of them is a cultural heritage which requires emergency protection (UNESCO, 2018d).

After emphasizing the factors of Turkey's tangible and intangible cultural heritage, another subject to be expressed is the UNESCO's Temporary List. Except for the heritages of Turkey which are not located in the tangible and intangible cultural heritage, the heritances that are proposed to this list but have not been completed yet are also included in the Temporary List. Turkey has 77 heritances of which 72 of them are cultural, 3 of them are karma and 2 of them natural in the temporary list which the first one presented on 1994 and upgraded in 2018 (UNESCO, 2018e).

2.3. Importance and Features of St. Pierre which is in the Temporary List of Tangible Cultural Heritage of Turkey

Jesus Christ chose the apostles to set up his own community and spread the teachings of himself, and appointed them with various missions (Altındal, 1993:58). On the other hand, those who believed in him were also involved in these missionary activities (Poyraz, 2014:58). In this context, the way of these people who went to various regions to tell the Prophet Jesus' teachings was directed to Antakya. St. Peter (Simon), Paul (Saul) and Barnabas performed this task in Antakya (Altındal, 1993: 58; Bingöl, 2004:131; Yıldız, 2012). St. Peter who was the first apostle of Jesus Christ and the person who claimed that Jesus Christ was the son of God and who witnessed of Jesus to leave his tomb and the first person that acknowledging the Messiah of Jesus Christ was the first bishop of Rome and the first person who was called as "Pope". St. Peter made his first speech with Barnabas in Antakya (Küçük, 2017:32; Renan, 1945: 97).

Jesus gave Simon the name of Petrus which means "Rock" and by relating Petrus with rock, he said "I will build the church on this rock; the gates of the land of the dead will not defeat him. I will give him the key to the kingdom of heaven". Peter, who was described as the first Pope for these words of Jesus Christ, in 29 BC, he gave his first sermons in a cave carved into a rock in Antakya. The St. Pierre Church which was called "kenise" where people gather secretly but then accepted as a church after the roman empire adopted Christianity as the formal religion in 395 A.C. and took its name after St Peter, in this respect, is expressed as the most important and first church in the world (Olgunlu, 2016; Bingöl, 2004). Although some sources indicate it as the second church (Bingöl, 2004), the majority refers to the St. Pierre as the first church (Küçük, 2017; Güzel, 2010; Yıldız, 2014). When the cause of this situation is revealed, two different ideas show up because of the beliefs of different traditions. However, since St. Peter made his first sermon in this church and he is accepted as the first Pope, St. Pierre Church is considered to be the origin of the Catholic organization (UNESCO, 2018f).

While the missionary activities in the St. Pierre Church goes on, St. Paul was one of the most important figures in this process. St Paul whose contribution to today's Christianity is very high (Poyraz, 2014; Başer and Başçı, 2012), collected those who believe in Jesus Christ into St. Pierre Church with Barnabas and used the "Christian" Word for the first time (Ulutürk, 2005; Eykay et al, 2015; Küçük, 2017; Tümbek, 2009; Kaypak, 2010a). St. Pierre Church, bearing a major importance on religious, historical and cultural aspects has become a catholic church by the Crusaders on 12th and 13th centuries (Bingöl, 2004) and declared as the pilgrimage place of Christians by the Paul VI, The Pope on 1963. St. Pierre Day celebrations are made with the participation of clerics and community on 29th June which is thought to be the day St. Petrus died (Kaypak, 2010b; Yıldız, 2014; Eykay et al, 2015; Bingöl 2004).

St. Pierre church is located at the foot of Habib-I Neccar Mountain, Reyhanlı road on 2 km northeast of Antakya in Mediterranean region (Yıldız, 2014:71; Ege, 2015:167). The church which is a natural place formed with limestone caused by hydrological power of water, melting in karstic areas, dissolution, physical and chemical decomposition (Ege, 2015:171), has been turned into a gothic style church with the contributions of the crusaders on 12th and 13th centuries and with some restorations on 1863, and 1931-1932 (Küçük, 2017; Bingöl, 2004). On the other hand, various environmental arrangements were also made in the church in 2000 due to the birthday anniversary of Jesus Christ (Kaypak, 2010b).

On the ceiling of the St. Pierre church which has three different door entry and formed of 9,5 meters wideness, 13 meters of length and 7 meters of height, there are destroyed mosaic remains from 4th and 5th centuries and various frescos (Bingöl, 2004; HatayValiliği, 2018; Küçük 2017; UNESCO, 2018f). On the apse of the church there is an altar with white stones. In the area around this altar with a number of graves and baths, there a niche in which there is an St. Peter statue made of White marble. On the right side of the niche there is a pool where the water which are leaked from the rocks and believed to be sacred are collected and in this pool, baptism ceremonies are made. It is stated that this water was drunk by those who visit the church for healing and taken for those who are sick. On the left side of the niche, there is a tunnel with stalactites and stalagmites which was blocked after a part and used for escape in the past (Küçük, 2017; Ege, 2015; Bingöl, 2004; HatayValiliği, 2018; Ulutürk, 2005). This church is used by Christians for rituals, marriage, baptism and various ceremonies and it is served as a monument museum (Yıldız, 2014; Küçük, 2017).

As being a party of the agreement on protecting world cultural and natural heritage, Turkey, which is obliged to protect the heritage factors containing architectural, esthetic and cultural, economic, social, symbolic and philosophic features, has taken several steps to protect many of its heritage. In this context, Antakya St. Pierre Church has been registered as “Cultural Property to Protect” on 30.06.2005 with the board decision of Adana cultural and natural heritage protection with the number of 799. On the other hand, the regular committee of Turkey has submitted the related petitions to UNESCO to put St. Pierre Church to the World Heritage List on 15.04.2011 (UNESCO, 2018f). As of the presentation date, St. Pierre Church is on the temporary list of World Heritage of UNESCO (UNESCO, 2018e).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample

The subject of the present study is St. Pierre Church of Antakya city. The sample of the study is 205 Turkish TGs who agreed participating the survey. Descriptive profiles of all TGs were demonstrated in Table 1. As can be seen from the table, the majority of TGs are male participants (73.2 %). When the ages of TGs considered, 41-50 group with 43.9 percent is in the lead and is followed by 21-30 with 26.8 percent. On the other hand, the participants TGs are more graduates with 58.5 percent.

Table1. *Descriptive Profile of Participant TGs*

N=205	N	f(%)
Age		
<i>21-30</i>	55	26.8
<i>31-40</i>	90	43.9
<i>41-50</i>	40	19.5
<i>51-60</i>	15	7.3
<i>60-<</i>	5	2.4
Gender		
<i>Male</i>	150	73.2
<i>Female</i>	55	26.8
Education		
<i>Vocational H. School</i>	10	4.9
<i>Graduate</i>	120	58.5
<i>Post-Graduate</i>	75	36.6

3.2. Measurement and Data Analysis

The questionnaire used in the present study, was composed of two sections. In the first section, three demographic questions were located to inquiry about respondents’ gender, age and educational status. In the second section, 24 items measuring the perceptions of TGs on St. Pierre Church of Antakya were placed. Respondents were asked to fill the questionnaire with a seven-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree & 7=strongly agree) since the three or five-point Likert-type scale might leave some judgements out of range (Leclerc and Martin, 2004: 190).

The scale was improved by “the criteria for selection” list of World Heritage (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria/>). The application for The World Heritage Site was made in 2011 for citing two of the criteria (third and sixth criteria), and since then the St. Pierre Church is in the temporary World Heritage Site. We believe the second criterion of the World Heritage List should also have been cited. Finally, the 24 items generated from the mentioned three criteria as well as four brand image related items.

Table2 demonstrates descriptive statistics of the data. Cronbach’s α coefficients of all eight items are found highly reliable (0.94) (Hair et al., 1995).Kolmogorov-Smirnov’s normality test is recommended for larger samples (> 300) whereas Shapiro-Wilk is recommended for smaller samples (Wuensch, 2016).The assumption of normality in the observations ($\rho > .05$) with Levene’s test were met for only “historical importance” factor. Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices ($\rho < 0,001$) also considered unacceptable. Among others, tests of the significance of skewness and kurtosis are not considered appropriate with large samples, as very small standard errors will always produce significant results (Linley et al, 2009). According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2011), the skewness and kurtosis values between -1.5 and +1.5 are considered acceptable in order to prove normal univariate distribution. That said, as shown in Table 2, the values of skewness and kurtosis for the first and the fourth factors the acceptable range of -1.5 to 1.5 were not met. Hence, the data is accepted appropriate for nonparametric tests in the present study.

Table2. Descriptive Statistics, Including Skewness and Kurtosis

	Universal Represent- ative of a Religion	Exceptional and Unique Building	Historically Important	Pioneer Representative of a Religion
Cronbach’s α	0,88	0,82	0,78	0,78
Test of Normality (Shapiro-Wilk)	$\rho < 0,001$	$\rho < 0,001$	$\rho < 0,001$	$\rho < 0,001$
Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices	Box’s M = 125,017 F = 12,201 $\rho < 0,001$			
Levene’s test	F = 19,746 $\rho < 0,001$	F = 3,910 $\rho = 0,049$	F = ,563 $\rho = 0,454$	F = 30,734 $\rho < 0,001$
Skewness-Kurtosis	Skew.= -2,184 St.Er = ,170 Kurt. = 6,079 St.Er = ,338	Skew.= -,772 St.Er = ,170 Kurt. = -,388 St.Er = ,338	Skew.= -1,198 St.Er = ,170 Kurt. = 1,088 St.Er = ,338	Skew.= -1,554 St.Er = ,170 Kurt. = 2,405 St.Er = ,338

4. FINDINGS

St. Pierre Church of Antakya city which is in the tentative list of World Heritage is examined in this particular study. As mentioned before, the original scale consisted three demographic questions and 24 seven-point Likert items. On the other hand, final version consists 17 items and four factors after employing exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to the scale. SPSS 22.0 version is used for both dimension reduction and nonparametric analysis stages.

Table 3 demonstrates the EFA results consisting “universal representative of a religion (F1)”, “exceptional and unique building (F2)”, “historically important (F3)” and “pioneer representative of a religion (F4)” dimensions. As can be seen from the table, F1 factor loadings are between 0.90-0.59 and cronbach alpha is 0.88. F2 factor loadings are between 0.82-0.60 and cronbach alpha is 0.82. F3 factor loadings are between 0.73-0.64 and cronbach alpha is 0.78. Finally, F4 factor loadings are between 0.77-0.61 and cronbach alpha is 0.78. Including factor loadings and Cronbach alphas, the statistical results of EFA are in acceptable range as shown in Table 3.

Table3. EFA of the Dimensions of Perceptions on St. Pierre Church of Antakya

	Eigen value	Variance Explained	Cronbach's Alpha	Factor Loadings	Communalities
F1 Universal Representative of a Religion	7.05	41.49	0.88		
Directly related with universally important religion				0.90	0.84
Directly a monument of a universal religion				0.87	0.83
One of the most important Christian buildings in history				0.71	0.81
Universally important building for Christians				0.70	0.69
The building is the centre of where Christianity born				0.59	0.67
F2 Exceptional and Unique Building	2.27	13.37	0.82		
An exceptional example of Christian history				0.82	0.75
A unique example of an important religion				0.76	0.70
A unique example for architecture				0.76	0.74
An exceptional tangible representative of existing religion				0.61	0.63
F3 Historically Important	1.92	11.31	0.78		
People visit every year to become pilgrims				0.73	0.74
The architecture of the building is exceptional				0.71	0.62
It was built by important figures of Christianity				0.70	0.66
An architectural representative accepted by many civilizations				0.64	0.50
F4 Pioneer Representative of a Religion	1.02	6.05	0.78		
Building has a monumental value for humanity				0.77	0.80
Building witnesses people's exchanging value				0.76	0.85
One of the buildings of which believers called as first Christians				0.67	0.67
An exceptional building of an important part of human history				0.61	0.69
KMO: .722 Bartlett's Sphericity Test: .000					

Table5 demonstrates the Kruskal-Wallis test results of the four dimensions on three different education types. Apart from F1 factor, the results reveal significances. There is no significance on the Church's representation universally when mean ranks of all educational levels are considered for F1. However, only ten respondents from vocational high schools may have affected the results since at least 30 respondents for each dependent variable would be healthier in such comparisons.

Table5. Kruskal Wallis Test Results of TGs' Perceptions on St. Pierre Church

Factors	Respondents (N=205)	n	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	Significance
Universal Representative of a Religion	Vocational H. School	10	134,25	3,622	2	,164
	Graduate	120	98,73			
	Post Graduate	75	105,67			
Exceptional and Unique Building	Vocational H. School	10	125,50	7,616	2	,022*
	Graduate	120	110,08			
	Post Graduate	75	88,67			
Historically Important	Vocational H. School	10	38,00	14,050	2	,001*
	Graduate	120	110,19			
	Post Graduate	75	100,17			
Pioneer Representative of a Religion	Vocational H. School	10	95,50	14,109	2	,001*
	Graduate	120	115,81			
	Post Graduate	75	83,50			

* Significant at 0.05

5. CONCLUSION

Tangible World Heritage candidates (the ones in tentative list already) in specific St. Pierre Church of Antakya city is examined in this particular study. Taking UNESCO's 10 criteria for selection into consideration, candidates submit at least from one title, to be listed in the World Heritage. The submission for the subject church of this study by permanent Turkish delegation was consisting the two criteria (third and sixth) of UNESCO. However, it is claimed in this research that the second

criterion (to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;) of UNESCO considered should have been added while submission. Basically, taking the contents of three criteria and developing a scale out of them, the perceptions of professional tourist guides were investigated in the present study.

5.1. Implications for Theory

The present study has some certain contributions to the literature. There have been previous studies focusing on either cultural heritage-heritage list (Jokilehto, 2005; Frey and Steiner, 2011; Buckland, 2013; Alivizatou-Barakou, 2017) or St. Pierre Church of Antakya (Ege, 2015). However, this study rather investigates if submission process for candidates held properly besides the adequacy of promotions in the progress of tentative world heritage list.

The study also contributes to the literature for confirming the content of the UNESCO's criteria by developing a scale with unique dimensions.

5.2. Implications for Practitioners

The results of this study achieved some applications for practitioners namely governors, mayors and/or delegations of submitting property. As mentioned in the methodology, the second criterion of UNESCO was also involved in the scale although it was not, during the submission process to the World Heritage List. As far as Table 4 concerns, results reveal some significances including the second criterion of UNESCO.

5.3. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This particular study has some limitations which could be considered suggestions for future research at the same time. The first limitation is about the sample group of the study. Although, tourist guides are easily accepted as the experts of historical properties such as St. Pierre Church, their objectivity could be limited when the candidate is from the same country. Future research considering also Christian tourists as sample and comparison of both groups' responses would contribute better to the literature.

The second limitation is also related with the sample group. Scale development process requires a confirmation of a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). However, the quantity and the type of participants did not allow employment of CFA to the study. Therefore, the future research consisting CFA would be more persuasive.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akipek, S. (2001). Dünya Kültürelve Doğal Mirasının Korunmasına Dair Sözleşmenin Değerlendirilmesi. *AÜ Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, 50(4), pp. 13-40.
- [2] Aksoy A., Enlil Z., Ünsal D., Pulhan G., Dinçer İ., Zeren G. N., Ahunbay Z. &Köksal, G. (2012). *Kültürel Miras Yönetimi*, Ana dolu Üniversitesi Yayın No:2573, Eskişehir.
- [3] Alivizatou-Barakou, M., Kitsikidis, A., Tsalakanidou, F., Dimitropoulos, K., Giannis, C., Nikolopoulos, S., &Pillot-Loiseau, C. (2017). *Intangible cultural heritage and new technologies: challenges and opportunities for cultural preservation and development*. In *Mixed Reality and Gamification for Cultural Heritage* (pp. 129-158). Springer, Cham.
- [4] Altındal, A. (1993). *Üç İsa*. AnahtarKitaplarYayınevi, İstanbul.
- [5] Başer, F. &Başçı A. (2012). İnançTurizmiKapsamında Aziz Pavlus Evinin Öneme Tanıtım Faaliyetlerine İlişkin Ziyaretçi Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(19), pp. 423-443.
- [6] BGSPA- Beyaz Gemi Sosyal Proje Ajansı (2014). *Kültürel Mirasın Korunması*. İSMEP Rehber Kitaplar, İstanbul.
- [7] Bingöl, Z. (2004). Akdeniz Bölgesinin Kültürveİnanç Turizmi Potansiyeli Açısından Değerlen dirilm esi. *Bilgi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(1), pp. 125-137.
- [8] Buckland, M. K. (2013). *Cultural Heritage (Patrimony): An Introduction*.pp 11-25 in: Records, Archives and Memory: Selected Papers from the Conference and School on Records, Archives and Memory Studies, University of Zadar, Hırvatistan.
- [9] Çelik, D.&Yazgan, M. E. (2007). Kentsel Peyzaj Tasarımı Kapsamında Tarihi Çevre Korumaya Yönelik Yasave Yönetmeliklerinİrdelenmesi. *Bartın Orman FakültesiDergisi*, 9(11).
- [10] Ege, İ. (2015). Saint Pierre (Kilisesi) Mağarası (Antakya/Hatay). *AkademikSosyalAraştırmalarDergisi*, 3(16), pp. 165-188.

- [11] Enlil, Z. (1992). *TarihiBir ÇevreyiYaşatmak: Paris VeBologna'da Bütüncül Koruma Yaklaşımları*. YtÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayını, İstanbul, T 199-201.
- [12] Eykay, İ., Dalgın, T.&Çeken H. (2015). İnançTurizmiPotansiyeliAçısındanAntakya'nınDeğerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Life Economics*, 2(2), pp. 59-74.
- [13] Frey, B. S., & Steiner, L. (2011). World Heritage List: does it make sense?. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(5),pp. 555-573.
- [14] Güzel, F. Ö. (2010). Turistik Ürün Çeşitlendirmesi Kapsamında YeniBir Dinamik: İnançTurizmi, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi VizyonerDergisi*, 2(2),pp. 87-100.
- [15] Hair, J. F., R. E. Anderson, R. L. Tatham, & W. C. Black. (1995). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Prentice-Hall International.
- [16] HatayValiliği, (2018). St. Pierre Kilisesi. <http://www.hatay.gov.tr/st-pierre-kilisesi-icerik>(Accessed at: 03.04.2018).
- [17] Jokilehto, J. (2005). *Definition of cultural heritage: References to documents in history*. ICCROM Working Group 'Heritage and Society, 4-8.
- [18] Karaca, Ş., Akkuş, G., Şahbudak, E., &İşkın, M. KültürelMirasFarkındalığı: Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Öğrencilerine Yönelik Bir Uygulama Çalışması. *Akademik Araştırmalarve Çalışmalar Dergisi (AKAD)*, 9(16), pp. 86-100.
- [19] Karapınar, E.&Barakazi, M. (2017). Kültürel Miras Turizminin Sürdürülebilir Turizm Açısından Değerlendirilmesi: Göbeklitepe Ören Yeri. *Güncel Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1(1), pp. 5-18.
- [20] Kaypak, Ş. (2010a). Antakya'nın Kent Kimliği Açısındanİrdelenmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler EnstitüsüDergisi*, 7(14), pp. 373-392.
- [21] Kaypak, Ş. (2010b). KültürelTurizmPotansiyelinde Kent Markalaşması: HatayÖrneği. I. Disiplinlerarası Turizm Araştırmaları Kongresi, Nevşehir.
- [22] Kurtar, C. veSomuncu, M. (2013). Kentsel Kültürel Mirasın Korunmasıve Sürdürülebilirliği: Ankara Hamamönü Örneği. *Ankara AraştırmalarıDergisi*, 1(2), pp. 35-47.
- [23] Küçük, M. A. (2017). MitolojidenİkonografiyeTürkiye'ninTuristik Dini Mekanları: "Mağaralar" .*Gazi Üniversitesi Turizm Fakültesi Dergisi*, (2), pp. 16-57.
- [24] Leclerc, D., and J. N. Martin. (2004). Tour Guide Communication Competence: French, German and American Tourists' Perceptions." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 28 (3) pp. 181-200.
- [25] Linley, P. A., J. Maltby, A. M. Wood, G. Osborne, and R. Hurling. (2009). Measuring Happiness: The Higher Order Factor Structure of Subjective and Psychological Well-Being Measures. *Personality and Individual Differences* 47 (8) pp. 878-884.
- [26] MetinBasat, E. (2013) SomutveSomutOlmayanKültürelMirasıBirlikteKoruyabilmek. *MilliFolklor, UluslararasıKültürAraştırmalarıDergisi*, 25(100).
- [27] Nas, P. M. (2002). Masterpieces of oral and intangible culture: Reflections on the UNESCO World Heritage List. *Current Anthropology*, 43(1),pp. 139-148.
- [28] Oğuz, M. Ö. (2013). TerimOlarakSomutOlmayanKültürelMiras. *MilliFolklor*, 25(100), pp. 5-13.
- [29] Okuyucu, A., &Somuncu, M. (2012). Kültürel Mirasın Korunmasıve Turizm Amaçlı Kullanılmasında Yerel Halkın Algıve Tutumlarının Belirlenmesi: Osmanelililçe MerkeziÖrneği. *Ankara Üniversitesi Çevrebilimleri Dergisi*, 4(1), pp. 37-51.
- [30] Olgunlu, A. C. (2016). *Ana Tanrıça'danMevlana'ya*. Öteki Adam Yayınları, İstanbul.
- [31] Özdemir Dağıstan, M. Z. (2005). Türkiye'de Kültürel Mirasın Korunmasına Kısa Bir Bakış. *TMMOB Planlama Dergisi*, 1, pp. 20-25.
- [32] Poyraz, E. (2014). *İsa veHavarileri*. TanyeriKitapYayıncılık, Ankara.
- [33] Renan, E. (1945). *İsa'nınHayatı*. MilliEğitimBasımevi, Ankara.
- [34] Ryan, J., &Silvanto, S. (2009). The World Heritage List: The making and management of a brand. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 5(4), pp. 290-300.
- [35] Silverman, H. veRuggles, D. F. (2007). *Cultural Heritage and Human Rights*. H. Silverman ve D.F. Ruggles (Eds.).Cultural Heritage and Human Rights in (ss.3-22). USA.:Springer
- [36] Smith, L. (2006). *The Uses of Heritage*,Londrave New York: Routledge.
- [37] Şimşek, G. (2014). Kültürel Mirasve Yeni Biçimlenme Süreci Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. *21. Yüzyılda Eğitimve Toplum Eğitim Bilimlerive Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(8), pp. 68-92
- [38] Tabachnick, B. G., and L. S. Fidell. 2011. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 6th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- [39] Tonta, Y. (2014) KültürelMirasınGeleceği. Uluslararası Kültürel Mirasınve Kültürel Bellek Kurumlarının Yönetimi Kongresi (pp. 17-20).

- [40] Tümbek, A. N. (2009). Bütünleşik Pazarlama Faaliyetleriyle İnanç Turizmi Geliştirerek Yabancı Yatırımın Çekilmesine Antakya Örneği. Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi, İstanbul.
- [41] Ulutürk, M. (2005). Hıristiyanlık'ta Havarilik. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Felsefe Din Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi, Konya
- [42] UNESCO (2018a). World Heritage List. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/> (Accessed at: 05.11.2018).
- [43] UNESCO (2018b). Tentative List. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/> (Accessed at: 05.11.2018).
- [44] UNESCO (2018c). World Heritage List. Turkey. http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/?search=&id_sites=&id_states=tr&id_search_region=&id_search_by_synergy_protection=&id_search_by_synergy_element=&search_year_inscribed=&themes=&criteria_restriction=&id_keywords=&type=&media=&order=country&description= (Accessed at: 05.11.2018).
- [45] UNESCO (2018d). Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Turkey. [https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists?text=&country\[\]=00228&multinational=3&display1=inscriptionID#tabs](https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists?text=&country[]=00228&multinational=3&display1=inscriptionID#tabs) (Accessed at: 05.11.2018).
- [46] UNESCO (2018e). Tentative List, Turkey. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/state=tr> (Accessed at: 05.11.2018).
- [47] UNESCO (2018f). Hatay, St. Pierre Church. <https://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/5613/> (Accessed at: 02.04.2018).
- [48] Vecco, M. (2010). A Definition of Cultural Heritage: From the Tangible to the Intangible. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 11(3), pp. 321-324.
- [49] Vecco, M., & Srakar, A. (2018). The unbearable sustainability of cultural heritage: An attempt to create an index of cultural heritage sustainability in conflict and war regions. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 33, pp. 293-302.
- [50] Yıldız, S. B. (2014). Hatay İlinin İnanç Turizmi Potansiyelive Yerel Halkın İnanç Turizmine Bakışı. Coğrafyacılar Derneği Uluslararası Kongresi, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Muğla.
- [51] Yıldız, T. (2014). Somut Olmayan Kültürel Mirasın Geleceği Türkiye Deneyimi. *Milli Folklor, Uluslararası Kültür Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 26(102).
- [52] Wuensch, K.L. (2016). Skewness, kurtosis and the normal curve, (online) Available at: <<http://core.ecu.edu/psyc/wuenschk/docs30/Skew-Kurt.docx>> (Accessed at: 22.12.2016).

AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHY



Dr. Erkan Sezgin holds a PhD in Tourism Management. He is presently, Director of Tourism Research & Application Unit and Academic Member of Tourism Management Department, Tourism Faculty, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey. Associate professor Sezgin published his refereed papers in various areas such as tourism management and travel companies, tour guiding, transportation, branding and Info-communication technologies in tourism.



Melik Onur Güzel graduated as bachelor from the Department of High School Tourism and Hospitality Management, Tourism and Hotel Management at Mustafa Kemal University in 2011. Also Department of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Public Administration at Anadolu University in 2015. He graduated as master from the Department of Tourism Management at Gaziantep University in 2016. He is currently a PhD student in Tourism Management program in Anadolu University. He has working experiences in tourism and health sector since

2008.

Citation: Dr. Erkan Sezgin, Melik Onur Güzel (MSc). "How to Submit for the World Heritage List: A Case of St. Pierre Church of Antakya Considering the Perceptions of Tourist Guides". *International Journal of Research in Tourism and Hospitality (IJRTH)*, vol 4, no. 4, 2018, pp. 12-21. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2455-0043.0404002>.

Copyright: © 2018 Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.