



The Contribution of Geographical Indications in Gastronomy to Tourism and Regional Development: A Comparison of Turkey and the EU

Özge ÜNAL *1

¹ Mersin University, Department of Gastronomy and Culinary Arts, Türkiye, ozgeceunal@gmail.com

Cite this study: Ünal, Ö. (2024). The Contribution of Geographical Indications in Gastronomy to Tourism and Regional Development: A Comparison of Turkey and the EU. WATERRA, 1(1), 55-66.

<https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17244299>

Keywords

Geographical indications
Gastronomic tourism
Regional development
Comparative policy analysis

Article

Received: 26 September 2024
Revised: 22 October 2024
Accepted: 28 October 2024
Published: 31 December 2024

Abstract

This study offers a comparative analysis of how geographically indicated (GI) gastronomic products contribute to tourism and regional development in Türkiye and the European Union (EU). Using a qualitative design that blends comparative policy analysis with multiple case methods, it examines two emblematic products: Gaziantep Baklava (Antep Baklavası) in Türkiye and Parmigiano Reggiano in Italy's Emilia-Romagna. Data sources include EU and Turkish GI registries (eAmbrosia, TÜRK PATENT), tourism and economic statistics (Eurostat, TÜİK), and a systematic review of academic and policy literature. Comparative content analysis reveals clear cause-effect links between institutional capacity and economic and socio-cultural outcomes. Findings show that the EU's long-standing PDO/PGI framework—underpinned by strong producer consortia and multilayer inspection—builds consumer trust and destination brands, directly boosting gastronomic tourism and regional development. Türkiye aligned legislation with EU standards in 2017 and secured early international recognition for Gaziantep Baklava with a 2013 PGI, yet weak post-registration control and fragmented producer organization continue to constrain long-term brand value and revenue growth. The study concludes that institutional strength and collective producer governance are decisive for translating GI cultural capital into sustained tourism revenues and regional development. Policy recommendations include strengthening inspections, supporting cooperatives, and coordinating national marketing and digital promotion strategies effectively.

1. Introduction

Geographical indications (GIs) are intellectual property rights that certify the origin, quality standards, and traditional production methods of products closely associated with a specific territory (Belletti et al., 2017). Over the past decade, the rapid rise of gastronomic tourism has positioned GIs as critical not only for food safety and the safeguarding of cultural heritage, but also for enhancing destination brand value and supporting regional development (Bérard & Marchenay, 2006; Tregear, 2011).

The European Union (EU) has progressively consolidated its GI regime through the PDO (Protected Designation of Origin) and PGI (Protected Geographical Indication) schemes in force since 1992, thereby building a robust institutional architecture (European Commission, n.d.). This architecture supports producer consortia, relies on multi-layered and stringent control mechanisms, and promotes global marketing and branding via shared logos and international promotion funds. In Türkiye, the GI registration system launched in 1995 was aligned with the

EU framework by the 2017 Industrial Property Code (Law No. 6769); nevertheless, post-registration control and marketing strategies remain in a developmental stage (Turkish Patent and Trademark, n.d.; Tekelioğlu, 2019; Karademir, 2024).

These institutional differences between Türkiye and the EU provide a fertile basis for comparison when examining how GIs contribute to gastronomy, tourism, and regional development. The EU's established and integrated legal infrastructure, strong producer organization, and high consumer awareness yield outcomes that differ markedly from those of Türkiye's comparatively young and fragmented system. The contrast also underscores Türkiye's scope to strengthen tourism integration and branding strategies (Barham, 2003; Josling, 2006; Tekelioğlu, 2019; Karademir, 2024; Polat, 2017).

The present study therefore conducts a comparative analysis of the two systems, guided by four research questions: (1) Through which mechanisms do GIs support regional development and gastronomic tourism? (2) What are the key differences between Türkiye and the EU in registration, control, and marketing processes? (3) What lessons can Türkiye draw from successful GI practices within the EU? (4) What measures are needed to enhance the tourism and development potential of GI products in Türkiye (e.g., Gaziantep Baklava/Antep Baklavası)?

To address these questions, the study undertakes in-depth case analyses of Gaziantep Baklava (Antep Baklavası) in Türkiye and Parmigiano Reggiano in the EU, elucidating the mechanisms through which GIs shape tourism and regional development. In doing so, it aims to make an original contribution to policy and strategy debates, an area still underexplored in the Türkiye-EU comparative literature.

2. Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

2.1 Legal and Institutional Foundations of Geographical Indications

Geographical indications (GIs) are intellectual property instruments that safeguard the origin and production methods of products closely tied to a specific region, thereby offering consumers a guarantee of authenticity and granting producers a market premium (Belletti et al., 2017; Rangnekar, 2004). The European Union (EU) first introduced the PDO (Protected Designation of Origin) and PGI (Protected Geographical Indication) schemes in 1992 and later updated them through Regulation (EU) No. 1151/2012, creating a harmonized and legally binding framework across all member states (European Commission, n.d.; Barham, 2003). These schemes are notable for their detailed production protocols and rigorous multi-layered control mechanisms (Josling, 2006).

Türkiye initiated GI registration under Decree Law No. 555 in 1995 and aligned its framework with the EU through the Industrial Property Code (Law No. 6769) in 2017 (Turkish Patent and Trademark Office, n.d.). Nevertheless, the literature frequently highlights that post-registration inspection remains insufficiently institutionalized and that producer organization is weaker compared with the EU (Tekelioğlu, 2019; Polat, 2017). Despite the rapid growth in registrations, the lack of institutional support for inspection and marketing strategies continues to limit the potential contribution of GIs to tourism and regional development (Karademir, 2024).

2.2 Theories of Tourism and Regional Development

The literature on sustainable tourism and regional development provides the primary theoretical framework for understanding the economic and socio-cultural impacts of GIs. The sustainable tourism approach aims to preserve natural and cultural heritage while fostering local economic diversification and long-term prosperity

(UNWTO, 2022; Bramwell & Lane, 2011). Place-branding theory likewise posits that distinctive local products play a strategic role in shaping a region's tourist image and competitive advantage (Baker & Cameron, 2008; Kavaratzis & Hatch, 2013).

Within regional development theory, GIs are expected to increase local producers' income, create employment, and stimulate economic vitality in rural areas (Fonte & Papadopoulos, 2010; Bowen, 2010). In particular, the concept of "endogenous development" underscores the importance of local knowledge and resources in driving growth; in this context, GIs function as a mechanism for transforming local actors' cultural and knowledge capital into economic value (Ray, 1998).

2.3 Gastronomy Tourism and Local Identity

Gastronomy tourism is driven by travelers' motivation to experience local cuisine and unique products (Hjalager & Richards, 2002; Ellis et al., 2018). GI products reinforce this motivation by supporting a destination's authentic image and contributing to the preservation of cultural heritage (Bérard & Marchenay, 2006; Tregear et al., 2007). For example, Italy's Parmigiano Reggiano cheese and Türkiye's Gaziantep Baklava (Antep Baklavası) enhance tourist appeal not only through their culinary qualities but also as symbols of regional identity (Ciani et al., 2019).

Moreover, the integration of GI products into tourism is strengthened through experiential settings such as gastronomy festivals, museums, and visitor centers. These initiatives shape tourists' perceptions of the destination and lengthen their stay, thereby generating direct economic benefits (Okumus et al., 2013; Everett & Aitchison, 2008). In this way, GIs position tourism as not merely an act of consumption but also a process of cultural learning (Hall & Gössling, 2016).

2.4 International Comparisons and Research Gap

The differences between the EU and Türkiye in the implementation of GIs create fertile ground for comparative analysis. While the EU benefits from strong producer consortia and multi-layered inspection mechanisms (Barham, 2003; Josling, 2006), Türkiye's system remains in a developmental phase, with significant shortcomings in post-registration control and marketing strategies (Karademir, 2024; Polat, 2017). Existing studies on Turkey tend to focus on individual products and seldom offer a comprehensive comparison with successful EU practices (Tekelioğlu, 2019).

This study seeks to fill that gap by examining the cases of Gaziantep Baklava (Antep Baklavası) and Parmigiano Reggiano, providing strategic insights for policymakers and local producers and contributing to a more nuanced understanding of how GIs foster tourism and regional development across different institutional contexts.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Approach

This study employs a qualitative research design that integrates comparative policy analysis and a multiple-case study strategy. This approach was chosen because the impact of geographical indications (GIs) on tourism and regional development cannot be fully captured through quantitative indicators alone; it also requires comparison of legal, institutional, and cultural contexts. Yin's (2018) multiple-case framework allows for an in-

depth examination of two cases that differ in institutional and cultural settings—Gaziantep Baklava (Antep Baklavası) in Türkiye and Parmigiano Reggiano in Italy—revealing both similarities and divergences.

Rationale for this approach

- The influence of GIs on tourism and development must be assessed not only through statistical data but also in light of stakeholder strategies, local organization, and policy processes (Ciani et al., 2019).
- A multiple-case design makes it possible to observe how different socio-economic contexts shape outcomes, enabling causal explanations to questions such as: “Why do strong producer consortia in the EU foster deeper tourism integration?” or “Why does weak post-registration control in Türkiye limit the contribution of GIs to regional development?”

3.2 Data Sources

Three complementary data sets provide multiple perspectives and allow for causal linkages:

1. Official Registration and Legal Documents

- EU eAmbrosia database of PDO/PGI registrations (European Commission, n.d.).
- Turkish Patent and Trademark Office (TÜRKPATENT) list of GI registrations (Turkish Patent and Trademark Office, n.d.).

These sources illuminate the legal roots of institutional differences—such as the EU’s early integrated system—and enable analysis of their consequences for tourism and development outcomes.

2. Academic and Policy Literature

- Peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and policy reports (Belletti et al., 2017; Hall & Gössling, 2016; Bowen, 2010).

These works explain the mechanisms through which GIs influence economic development and place branding, helping to interpret observed differences within a theoretical framework.

3. Tourism and Economic Statistics

- Data from the Turkish Statistical Institute (TÜİK, n.d.) and Eurostat (2023).

Tourism revenues, visitor numbers, and regional economic indicators demonstrate the measurable economic effects of legal and institutional differences. For instance, these data show how strong control and marketing strategies in the EU translate into higher tourism revenues.

3.3 Data Collection Process

Between 2022 and 2024 a systematic literature search was conducted in Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar using the keywords “geographical indications,” “gastronomy tourism,” “regional development,” “Turkey,” “European Union,” “Parmigiano Reggiano,” and “Antep Baklavası.” Turkish-language sources were identified through the National Thesis Center and TR Dizin databases. This systematic review clarified the strengths and gaps in existing knowledge in both the Turkish and EU contexts and strengthened the causal arguments to be developed in the comparative analysis.

3.4 Analytical Procedure

The research applied comparative content analysis (Bowen, 2009) in four stages:

1. Coding and Thematic Categorization:

Core themes—legal framework, producer organization, control mechanisms, marketing and branding, tourism integration, and consumer awareness—were identified and data coded accordingly.

- Causal linkage: For example, the relationship between the “rigor of control mechanisms” and the “rise in consumer trust” was explicitly traced (Josling, 2006).

2. Within-Case Analysis:

Each case (Gaziantep Baklava and Parmigiano Reggiano) was examined in its own context.

- Causal linkage: Weak post-registration control for Gaziantep Baklava limits potential tourism revenue growth; strong consortium organization in the Parmigiano Reggiano case facilitates integration into tourism routes.

3. Cross-Case Analysis:

The two cases were compared to identify commonalities and differences (Yin, 2018).

- Causal linkage: Early development of strong consortia in the EU → stringent control → high consumer confidence → measurable increases in tourism and regional development.
- In Türkiye, delayed legislation and weak control → low level of producer organization → limited international marketing capacity → underutilized tourism and development potential.

4. Theoretical Matching

Findings were aligned with theories of sustainable tourism and place branding to strengthen theoretical contribution (Baker & Cameron, 2008; UNWTO, 2022). This step went beyond reporting observations to explain why these outcomes emerged.

3.5 Contribution of the Method

This methodological framework makes it possible to analyze the multi-dimensional impacts of GIs, which arise not only from economic outcomes but also from the interaction of institutional structures, policy practices, and cultural factors. Drawing on the contrasting examples of the EU and Türkiye, the study explains the role of GIs in tourism and regional development through clearly articulated cause-effect relationships, thereby providing a robust analytical basis for practical strategies and policy recommendations aimed at policymakers and local producers.

4. Findings

This section first outlines the overall profile and tourism linkages of geographical indication (GI) gastronomic products in Türkiye and the EU and then provides a detailed comparison of the two selected cases—Gaziantep Baklava (Antep Baklavası) and Parmigiano Reggiano—by tracing explicit cause-effect relationships. The analysis synthesizes both qualitative and quantitative evidence from official data and the reviewed literature.

4.1 Profile of GI Gastronomic Products in Türkiye

As of 2024, more than 1,500 products have been registered as GIs in Türkiye, roughly one-third of which are directly related to gastronomy (Turkish Patent and Trademark Office, n.d.). Many of these products are concentrated in the Southeastern Anatolia, Aegean, and Black Sea regions (Gökovalı, 2007). Notable examples include sweets and pastries from Southeastern Anatolia (e.g., Gaziantep Baklava) and the olive oils and cheeses of

the Aegean region, all of which feature prominently in both domestic tourism and gastronomy-driven international visitor flows.

However, weak post-registration inspection and limited international promotion mean that this potential has not been fully translated into tourism revenue. The literature notes that inadequate control mechanisms constrain consumer trust and thereby depress the perceived market value of Turkish GI products relative to EU counterparts (Tekelioğlu, 2019; Karademir, 2024). This hampers the ability of gastronomic tourism to gain a competitive advantage in global markets.

4.2 Profile of GI Gastronomic Products in the EU

Since 1992 the EU has steadily refined its PDO/PGI system and, by 2023, had registered over 3,400 products, a significant share of which are food and beverage items (European Commission, n.d.). Italy, France, and Spain are among the most active participants in this system.

EU GI products have earned high levels of international trust and brand value thanks to multi-layered inspection mechanisms and strong producer consortia (Barham, 2003; Josling, 2006). For instance, the Parmigiano Reggiano Consortium certifies every stage of production, reinforcing consumer confidence and contributing directly to destination tourism (Ciani et al., 2019). Moreover, GI products are integrated into the tourism infrastructure through gastronomy routes, themed museums, and annual festivals, making them a cornerstone of regional development (Everett & Aitchison, 2008; Hall & Gössling, 2016).

4.3 Case Study: Gaziantep Baklava (Antep Baklavası)

Product and Registration: Gaziantep Baklava became the first Turkish product to receive an EU PGI designation in 2013 (European Commission, n.d.). The registration is based on traditional production techniques, the distinctive qualities of locally grown pistachios, and the expertise of regional artisans.

Tourism and Development Effects

- **Cause:** The PGI status provides international consumers with a guarantee of quality and authenticity.
- **Effect:** Since 2013, Gaziantep's gastronomic tourism has grown markedly; together with its designation as a UNESCO Creative City of Gastronomy, the city has become an attractive destination for both domestic and foreign visitors (Taş et al., 2023).

Limitations

- **Cause:** Weak post-registration inspection and fragmented producer organization.
- **Effect:** The international marketing potential of Gaziantep Baklava remains limited compared with EU counterparts (Tekelioğlu, 2019). Issues such as counterfeiting and inconsistent quality standards hinder the sustainable growth of tourism revenue.

4.4 Case Study: Parmigiano Reggiano

Product and Registration: Protected as a PDO product since 1996, Parmigiano Reggiano has been produced for centuries in Italy's Emilia-Romagna region and is globally renowned (Ciani et al., 2019).

Tourism and Development Effects

- **Cause:** The consortium enforces strict inspection protocols and sophisticated branding strategies.

- **Effect:** The cheese has become a key driver not only in the food market but also in regional tourism through “cheese routes,” factory tours, and annual festivals (Everett & Aitchison, 2008). Visitors to production facilities generate direct income for local accommodation and food-service sectors (Bowen, 2010).

Table 1. Comparative Assessment: Cause–Effect Chains

Dimension	Gaziantep Baklava (Türkiye)	Parmigiano Reggiano (EU)	Cause–Effect Interpretation
Legal and Institutional Framework	EU PGI status in 2013; Turkish legislation strengthened after 2017 but inspections remain weak	PDO since 1996; strong and long-standing consortium	Early and robust institutionalization increases tourism integration and international brand value.
Producer Organization	Fragmented; dominated by individual producers	Strong consortium with collective marketing	Collective organization ensures consistent quality and creates effective tourism routes.
Tourism Integration	UNESCO “Creative City of Gastronomy” title boosts appeal, but marketing strategies remain local	Well-established international tourism integration through museums, festivals, and routes	Professional tourism infrastructure directly raises visitor numbers and regional revenues.

In Table 1 shows comparison highlights that institutional strength and inspection capacity are decisive in determining how GIs contribute to tourism and regional development. Early establishment of strong control mechanisms and producer organization (cause) leads to high consumer confidence and international recognition (effect), which in turn increases regional tourism revenues. In Türkiye, by contrast, even with legislative alignment, weaknesses in inspection and marketing (cause) limit the potential for international tourism and revenue growth (effect).

5. Discussion

This section examines how the findings relate to the existing literature, their implications for policy and institutional frameworks, and their broader cultural and economic significance. In doing so, it evaluates the cause–effect chains of geographical indications (GIs) in tourism and regional development within a wider context for both Türkiye and the EU.

5.1 Comparison with the Literature

The findings clearly demonstrate that the EU’s early institutionalization of the GI system has generated significant positive effects on tourism and regional development. This outcome supports Ciani et al., (2019) assertion that strong producer consortia and stringent inspection mechanisms build high consumer trust and enhance destination branding. Similarly, Bowen (2010) highlights GIs as an important instrument of rural development from an “endogenous development” perspective; the case of Parmigiano Reggiano provides concrete evidence for this thesis.

For Türkiye, Polat (2017) Tekelioğlu (2019), Karademir (2024) and Taş et al (2023) note that shortcomings in post-registration control and weaknesses in producer organization constrain tourism potential. The case of Gaziantep Baklava confirms these observations: despite its designation as a UNESCO Creative City of Gastronomy, international marketing and revenue growth remain more limited than in EU examples. This persistent weakness in post-registration control, despite the 2017 legislative alignment, likely stems from a combination of factors,

including insufficient funding for inspection bodies, a lack of institutional capacity, and challenges in coordinating among various local stakeholders.

This comparison further supports [Josling's \(2006\)](#) argument in transatlantic trade debates that there is a direct correlation between the strength of control mechanisms and market value. Essentially, a clear causal pathway is evident in the European Union: robust institutional capacity and producer organization lead to stringent inspections, which in turn foster high consumer trust and culminate in increased tourism and regional development. Conversely, in Türkiye, deficiencies in the foundational stages of this sequence directly impede the realization of these ultimate economic outcomes.

5.2 Policy Implications

The findings provide concrete lessons for policy design in both contexts:

- **EU Perspective:** The PDO/PGI system, backed by strong producer consortia and collective marketing strategies, has not only created economic value but also made gastronomic tourism a central driver of regional development ([Everett & Aitchison, 2008](#); [Hall & Gössling, 2016](#)). This experience can serve as a structural model for emerging GI systems such as Türkiye's.
- **Türkiye Perspective:** Despite the 2017 legislative alignment with the EU, weak post-registration inspection continues to limit long-term tourism and brand value. Strengthening inspection capacity and encouraging producer organization through cooperatives or consortia would enhance the impact of GIs on regional development ([Gökövalı, 2007](#)). In addition, a nationally coordinated marketing and promotion fund could significantly increase the international visibility of products such as Gaziantep Baklava.

5.3 Cultural and Economic Dimensions

GIs are not merely economic instruments but also key to preserving cultural heritage and sustaining local identity. [Bérard & Marchenay \(2006\)](#) argue that GIs help keep local knowledge and production practices alive, transmitting traditional know-how to future generations. The centuries-old production tradition of Parmigiano Reggiano, as well as the artisanal expertise behind Gaziantep Baklava, transforms gastronomy tourism into a cultural experience that reinforces not only visitor spending but also local identity and community cohesion.

From an economic perspective, [Hall & Gössling \(2016\)](#) and [Bowen \(2010\)](#) demonstrate that GIs contribute directly to regional GDP through tourism expenditures. This study similarly shows that a strong institutional infrastructure and effective marketing strategies amplify this contribution.

5.4. Summary of Cause–Effect Relationships

The findings highlight two main causal chains:

1. The first causal pathway identified begins with institutional capacity and early legislative alignment. These foundational elements enable the formation of strong producer consortia and rigorous inspection mechanisms. The resulting increase in consumer trust and global brand value directly translates into higher tourism revenues and sustained regional development. This chain is prominently observed in the EU, whereas in Türkiye, initial weaknesses in these institutional and organizational structures disrupt the sequence and limit the final outcomes.

2. The second causal linkage is the process by which local cultural capital is transformed into economic value. This transformation acts as a catalyst for gastronomy tourism and effective destination branding, which in turn reinforces local identity and enhances social cohesion. Although this dynamic is evident in both cases studied, its economic and socio-cultural outcomes are more enduring in the European Union, a result attributed to a more strategic and professional integration with the tourism industry.

5.5 Directions for Future Research

Because the long-term economic and tourism impacts of Türkiye's GI system are still emerging, future research should explore:

- The medium- and long-term effects of strengthening inspection mechanisms on tourism revenues and consumer trust;
- The contribution of digital marketing and e-commerce platforms to the international visibility of GI products;
- The role of GIs in reducing rural out-migration across different regions.

These lines of inquiry would broaden understanding of GIs beyond their economic significance to include their role in social and cultural sustainability, and would help inform more comprehensive policy recommendations.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has conducted a comparative analysis of the contribution of geographically indicated (GI) gastronomic products to tourism and regional development in Türkiye and the European Union (EU), focusing on the cases of Gaziantep Baklava (Antep Baklavası) and Parmigiano Reggiano. The analysis highlights the cause-effect relationships between institutional structures, policy practices, and economic outcomes.

6.1 Summary of Key Findings

1. Decisive Role of Institutional Infrastructure:

Since the early 1990s the EU's PDO/PGI system has created high consumer trust through strong producer consortia and multi-layered inspection mechanisms (Ciani et al., 2019; Josling, 2006). This framework has directly supported gastronomic tourism and fostered regional economic growth; in the case of Parmigiano Reggiano, museums, food routes, and festivals have significantly increased tourism revenues (Everett & Aitchison, 2008).

2. Emerging but Limited Impact in Türkiye:

Although Türkiye aligned its legislation with EU standards through the 2017 Industrial Property Code (Law No. 6769), post-registration control and producer organization remain weak (Tekelioğlu, 2019; Karademir, 2024). The 2013 EU PGI registration of Gaziantep Baklava and the city's UNESCO Creative City of Gastronomy status boosted local tourism, yet long-term international brand value and revenue growth have not reached EU levels.

3. Cause-Effect Chain:

In the EU: early institutionalization → strong producer consortia and rigorous inspection → high consumer trust and global brand value → growth in tourism revenues and regional development.

In Türkiye: legislative alignment without strong enforcement → weak producer organization → limited international recognition → unrealized tourism and development potential.

6.2 Policy Recommendations

For Türkiye

- **Strengthen Inspection Capacity:**

Establish independent, multi-layered inspection mechanisms to combat counterfeiting and ensure quality standardization.

Expected outcome: Greater consumer confidence and higher product value in international markets.

- **Promote Producer Organization:**

Encourage cooperatives or consortium-style structures similar to the Parmigiano Reggiano model.

Expected outcome: Stronger collective marketing power and more effective integration into tourism networks.

- **Develop a National Marketing and Promotion Strategy:**

Create state-supported national funds and international promotional campaigns for UNESCO Creative Cities of Gastronomy and GI-registered products.

Expected outcome: Increased visibility of GI products in international gastronomy tourism.

- **Leverage Digital Platforms and E-Commerce:**

Ensure GI logos and origin information are prominently displayed on e-commerce and tourism platforms, making product narratives easily accessible.

Expected outcome: Direct connection with global consumers and higher revenue generation.

For the EU

- **Policy Sharing and Cooperation:**

Share successful consortium models and inspection practices with candidate and neighboring countries such as Türkiye.

Expected outcome: Stronger regional cooperation and the creation of a more integrated Mediterranean gastronomic tourism hub.

6.3 Academic and Practical Contributions

This article fills an important gap in the literature by providing a comprehensive comparative analysis of GI systems in Türkiye and the EU. While existing studies often focus on single products, this research integrates both legal and tourism-based perspectives through two detailed case studies. Practically, it offers actionable insights for policymakers, local producers, and the tourism sector on building institutional capacity and developing marketing strategies.

6.4 Directions for Future Research

Because the long-term impacts of Türkiye's GI system are still unfolding, future studies could:

- Quantitatively assess the medium- and long-term effects of stronger inspection mechanisms on tourism revenues and consumer trust;
- Examine the contribution of digital marketing and e-commerce to the international visibility and profitability of GI products;

- Investigate the role of GIs in reducing rural out-migration across different regions;
- Analyze consumer perceptions and gastronomy tourists' spending behavior to complement the qualitative findings of this study.

Such investigations would broaden the understanding of GIs beyond their economic value, highlighting their role in social and cultural sustainability and supporting more comprehensive policy development.

Acknowledgement

The author declares no acknowledgement.

Conflicts of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

- Baker, M. J., & Cameron, E. (2008). Critical success factors in destination marketing. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8(2), 79–97.
- Barham, E. (2003). Translating terroir: The global challenge of French AOC labeling. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19(1), 127–138.
- Belletti, G., Marescotti, A., & Touzard, J. M. (2017). Geographical indications, public goods, and sustainable development: The roles of actors' strategies and public policies. *World Development*, 98, 45–57.
- Bérard, L., & Marchenay, P. (2006). Local products and geographical indications: Taking account of local knowledge and biodiversity. *International Social Science Journal*, 58(187), 109–116.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.
- Bowen, S. (2010). Embedding local places in global spaces: Geographical indications as a territorial development strategy. *Rural Sociology*, 75(2), 209–243.
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4-5), 411–421.
- Ciani, S., Mason, M. C., & Moretti, A. (2019). Geographical indications and tourism destinations: An overview. *The Routledge handbook of gastronomic tourism*, 527–537.
- Ellis, A., Park, E., Kim, S., & Yeoman, I. (2018). What is food tourism? *Tourism Management*, 68, 250–263.
- European Commission (n.d.). Geographical indications. Retrieved from https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/farming/geographical-indications-and-quality-schemes/geographical-indications-and-quality-schemes-explained_en
- Eurostat (2023). Tourism Statistics. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Tourism_statistics
- Everett, S., & Aitchison, C. (2008). The role of food tourism in sustaining regional identity: A case study of Cornwall, South West England. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(2), 150–167.
- Fonte, M., & Papadopoulos, A. G. (2010). Naming food after places: Food relocalisation and knowledge dynamics in rural development. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 50(2), 97–112.
- Gökovalı, U. (2007). Coğrafi işaretler ve ekonomik etkileri: Türkiye örneği. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(2), 141–160.
- Hall, C. M., & Gössling, S. (2016). *Food tourism and regional development: Networks, products and trajectories*. Routledge.
- Hjalager, A. M., & Richards, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Tourism and gastronomy*. London: Routledge.
- Josling, T. (2006). The war on terroir: Geographical indications as a transatlantic trade conflict. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 57(3), 337–363.
- Karademir, N. (2024). Türkiye'de Avrupa Birliği Tescilli Coğrafi İşaretli Ürünlerin Ekonomik Kalkınma Kapsamında Değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Social, Humanities and Administrative Sciences (Joshas)*, 7(41), 1164–1183.
- Kavaratzis, M., & Hatch, M. J. (2013). The dynamics of place brands: An identity-based approach to place branding theory. *Marketing Theory*, 13(1), 69–86.
- Okumus, B., Okumus, F., & McKercher, B. (2007). Incorporating local and international cuisines in the marketing of tourism destinations: The cases of Hong Kong and Turkey. *Tourism management*, 28(1), 253–261.
- Polat, E. (2017). Turizm ve coğrafi işaretleme: Balıkesir örneği. *Meriç Uluslararası Sosyal ve Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 1(1), 17–31.
- Rangnekar, D. (2004). The socio-economics of geographical indications. *UNCTAD-ICTSD Project on IPRs and Sustainable Development, Issue Paper*, 8, 13–15.

- Ray, C. (1998). Culture, intellectual property and territorial rural development. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38(1), 3–20.
- Taş, N., Düzgün, M., & Olcay, A. (2023). Coğrafi işaret ile tescil edilmiş Antep baklavasının turistik destinasyon tanıtımına yönelik etkisi. *Seyahat ve Otel İşletmeciliği Dergisi*, 20(3), 406-426.
- Tekelioğlu, Y. (2019). Coğrafi işaretler ve Türkiye uygulamaları. *Ufuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8(15), 47-75.
- Tregear, A. (2011). Progressing knowledge in alternative and local food networks: Critical reflections and a research agenda. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(4), 419–430.
- Tregear, A., Arfini, F., Belletti, G., & Marescotti, A. (2007). Regional foods and rural development: The role of product qualification. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 23(1), 12–22.
- TÜİK. (n.d.). Turizm istatistikleri. Retrieved from <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/>
- Turkish Patent and Trademark Office. (n.d.). Geographical indications and traditional product names. Retrieved from <https://www.turkpatent.gov.tr/en/geographical-indication>
- UNWTO. (2022). Tourism and sustainable development goals. Retrieved from <https://www.unwto.org/sustainable-development>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). Sage Publications.



© Author(s) 2024. This work is distributed under <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>