

Sustainable Gastronomic Tourism in Gokceada (Imbros): Local and Authentic Perspectives

H. Ridvan YURTSEVEN, Ph.D.

Professor

Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University
Gokceada School of Applied Sciences
17760 Gokceada, Canakkale
TURKEY

Abstract

The main purpose of the paper is to measure Gokceada (Imbros) visitors' perceptions of key sustainable gastronomic tourism elements in terms of importance and satisfaction using visitor types based on local and authentic perspectives, and apply the results to the importance-satisfaction analysis to identify strengths and gaps of Gokceada as a sustainable gastronomic tourism destination for repositioning its strategy. The significant finding of this research is that Gokceada is an important sustainable gastronomic destination for sustainable gastronomic tourists. Therefore, the construction of Gokceada as a sustainable gastronomic tourism destination requires the strategic implementation.

Key words: Sustainable gastronomy, sustainable gastronomic tourism, local and authentic perspectives.

1. Introduction

The use of local and authentic food can directly or indirectly contribute to the various elements of sustainability in a particular area namely stimulating and supporting agricultural activity and food production, preventing authentic exploitation, enhancing destination attractiveness, empowerment of the community, generating pride, specifically regarding food, and reinforcing brand identity of the destination with the focus on food experiences in the area (Telfer & Wall, 1996). Local and authentic food holds great potential to contribute to sustainability in tourism by, among others, broadening and enhancing the local tourism resource base, adding value to the authenticity of the destination, strengthening the local economy (both from a tourism and agricultural perspective), and by providing for environmentally-friendly infrastructure (Barrera & Alvarado, 2008; Bessi re, 1998; Boyne, Williams, & Hall, 2001; Handszuh, 2000; Nummedal & Hall, 2006; Pratt, 2007).

Gastronomy is the vital driving force of differing cultures and the key to sustaining and developing tourism. For all tourists, though perhaps here for the new tourist in particular, where all facets of the holiday are crucial, gastronomy provides the opportunity for valued experiences to be internalized. In consuming the locally produced food and drink the local area is absorbed; intrinsic pleasures are embodied and savored, the tourist becomes one with the locality, if only for a brief period. Such involvement provides the memories, the lingering mementos so indelibly linked with the enjoyment of good food, good wine and equally good table companions (Westering, 1999). Interest in local and authentic food by tourist promotes local agricultural practices and foodways. Such connections between tourism and food production have been regarded as a mechanism to support sustainable agricultural practices (Nummedal & Hall, 2006). Sustainable tourism is therefore as much about sustaining rural culture and identity as it is the physical environment (Butler & Hall, 1998; Miele & Murdoch, 2002).

In other words, sustainable gastronomic tourism is tourism that is developed and managed in a way that supports local communities and local agriculture. The production and promotion of local and authentic food in tourism is not solely about increasing the economic and financial benefits. Tourist interest in and demand for locally produced food and local specialties can enhance individual and community pride as well as be beneficial for biodiversity (Nummedal & Hall, 2006). Outsider interest in local produce may serve to stimulate local awareness and interest, and assist not only in diversification, and maintenance of plant and animal variety, but may also encourage community pride and reinforcement of local identity and culture (Hall, 2002). Sustainable gastronomic tourism offers a memorable tourist experience: sensory, entertaining and traditional (Barrera & Alvarado, 2008). From the destination management, it is necessary to understand the demand. In other words, what are the tourists looking for? The development of destination strategies is dependent on identifying how customers perceive the destination's sustainable gastronomic tourism products and how these products are designed to satisfy the needs of the destination.

Therefore, analysis of customers' perception can help in identifying factors contributing to the success or failure of a destination strategy, and consequently allow the destination to improve its product image. The analysis of these attributes, integrated with personal variables such as the type of tourism needs sought, can help in identifying the relative strengths and weaknesses of the destination and can also contribute to identifying potential niche markets that could be used in developing the destination's positioning strategy (Ibrahim & Gill, 2005; Kivela & Crofts, 2006; Rand & Heath, 2006; Roininen, Arvola, & Lahteenmaki, 2005). Gokceada (Imbros) is the largest island of Turkey having an important tourism potential with its own specific geographical and environmental conditions and protected, untouched natural resources. Tourism and agriculture are the sectors that should be focused on and alternative sources of income in Gokceada. Almost all of the agricultural activities in the island are organic farming, that's why Gokceada is a candidate for becoming a major center for sustainable agriculture. Such eco-organic farming practices and specific activities to the island could not be turned to account within the scope of tourism related activities and alternative sources of tourism income. Apiculture, olive growing, and viticulture are the basic organic farming activities in the island. Organic products being grown as a result of these activities cannot be put on the market in a sufficient manner.

Taking into consideration unproductive use of the resources of the island and the low added value derived from the tourism and agricultural activities, there is a need for a repositioning destination strategy. Gokceada has an important potential for development of sustainable gastronomic tourism. Sustainable gastronomic tourism provides opportunities for tourists to get in close touch in with the people and agricultural areas in the region, agricultural activities, local products, and traditional cuisines. The main objective of the island is to turn into a sustainable gastronomic destination (Yurtseven, 2007). This study uses the functional and psychological dimensions of customers' perceptions and satisfaction as the basis for formulating a destination's positioning or repositioning strategy. Specifically, the study measures customers' images of sustainable gastronomic tourism products of Gokceada and the attributes that influence tourists' satisfaction, in order to identify specific niche markets that can be used in the development of the destination's positioning strategy.

2. Local and Authentic Food

Local and authentic food is defined in terms of meeting criteria related to enhancing the health and welfare of people and animals, the environment, enriching society and promoting equity (Hall & Wilson, 2009). On a more specific level, local and authentic food (sustainable gastronomy) is about producing food that is environmentally sensitive, and preparing and eating it so that it nourishes both mind and body. This assumption has a vast number of implications (Scarpato, 2002): the survival of local food production, outlets and fresh markets; the viability of home cooking; the transmission of culinary knowledge and children's education to taste; the right to pleasure and diversity; the impact of tourism on gastronomic authenticity and community well-being. Local producers, processing facilities and distributing networks can be described as a local food system, which are systems, usually consciously formed, which are characterized by a close producer consumer relationship. The range of economic benefits claimed for local production of food includes employment, business survival, support for local services and increased retention of income within the local community. A local food system can also have positive effects on community development, including the development of social capital. It helps support local small to medium sized farms and businesses and fosters a sense of place, culture, and history.

The sense of place is being important for tourism as well as the local people and their sense of identity. Local food systems can provide links between people and community. They bring the consumer (including end consumers such as visitors and intermediate consumers such as hotels and restaurants) and the producer closer together. Farmers markets can become a time for socialization in communities as well as providing a local event for visitors. Local food systems are based on relatively small farms that use fewer off-farm inputs, they integrate animal and plant production where appropriate, maintain a higher biodiversity and make transitions to renewable forms of energy. Local and authentic production enhances the viability of traditional farming systems that are perceived as environmentally friendly (Hall & Wilson, 2009). By contrast, local and authentic food (sustainable gastronomy) advocates a reconnection, in very different ways, between production and consumption, or producers and consumers. This reconnection is conceived in terms of an opposition between, first, a personalized set of economic relations as opposed to the impersonality of the market, and, second, in terms of a contrast between food that is artificial or adulterated, and the genuine or authentic (Pratt, 2007). Culturally, this reconnection takes place in a kind of pre-set discursive field, that of the natural, the organic, the local, the rooted, the distinctive, the authentic (Pratt, 2007).

The field is established in opposition to modernity; it opposes quality to quantity, diversity to singularity, favors metaphors of the timeless, of the circular and recycling to those of innovation and progress (Pratt, 2007). Because the field is pre-set, the terms can become synonymous, or at least immediately evoke each other “the local is authentic” (Pratt, 2007). There are several components to a local and authentic food and tourism strategy (Hall & Wilson, 2009): reduce economic leakage by using local renewable resources rather than external sources; recycle financial resources within the systems by buying local goods and services; add value to local produce before it is exported; connect up local stakeholders, people and institutions to create trust, new linkages and more efficient exchanges; attract external resources, especially finance, skills and technology where appropriate; emphasize local identity and authenticity in branding and promotional strategies; sell direct to consumers via farm shops, direct mailing, farmers' and produce markets, local events and food and wine festivals; create a relationship between the consumer and the producer.

3. Sustainable Gastronomic Tourism

Considering local and authentic natures, gastronomy can truly be held to be resources for tourism and not just attractions to encourage it. If the tourist industry is organized in an appropriate way, food not only can increase the value of a destination, but also increase their own value: local identity is expressed by land and by food (Barrera & Alvarado, 2008; Haven-Tang, 2005; Yiakoumaki, 2006; Yurtseven, 2007). The local and the authentic, concepts that provide a conceptual link between consumption and production, are strategically important for sustainable gastronomic tourism. Concern with the local is a central theme in sustainable gastronomy, and one of the ways of reconnecting producers and consumers (Pratt, 2007). Sustainable gastronomy promotes local produce for environmental and socio-cultural reasons. Localized gastronomic systems promote environmental sustainability, social justice, and fair trade. Creating markets for local specialties, gastronomic centers, old farming and culinary system, wine routes or eco-museums create local development. Localized gastronomy benefits farmers, but also gives value-added to consumers. Consumers clearly value direct contact with farmers who produce their food. Authenticity is a quality attributed to a range of foods and cuisines. Authenticity consists of two main themes. First, there is food specific to a location; second, these food products are the result of a craft process. These two themes are normally found together and both rest on an appeal to tradition: this food is the product of a continuous and collective endeavor, it pre-dates industrialized food systems and its value derives from opposition. These linkages between place, people, knowledge and food build into full-blown conception of a bounded local culture (Pratt, 2007).

The main aim of trans-disciplinary gastronomy studies is to work for a sustainable gastronomy incorporating the traditional principles of sustainable development. Sustainable gastronomy implies that communities can evolve socially and economically whilst keeping an eco-nutritional commitment to environmental sustainability and the optimal health of members of the community (Scarpato, 2002). Sustainable gastronomic tourism does not represent a new breed of gastro-attractions within established tourist destinations. It enhances the local tourism on offer by promoting local agriculture and gastronomic heritage. Sustainable gastronomic tourism also represents opportunities for new tourism, which has been described as a large scale packaging of non-standardized leisure services at competitive prices to suit the demands of tourists as well as the economic and socio-environmental needs of destination (Poon, 1993). It encourages tourists to visit local food producers, such as farms where make cheese, and wineries, to buy directly from the producers (Swarbrooke, 1999; Yurtseven, 2007). Sustainable gastronomic tourism reflects the sustainability issues of general tourism. At the same time, however, it represents a challenging issue for gastronomy studies. This new approach implies that gastronomic tourism becomes a research topic of a gastronomy studies (Scarpato, 2002). Insofar as tourists are constant local and authentic perspectives, sustainable gastronomic tourism represents a viable route towards increasing biodiversity and the sustainable gastronomic possibilities open to the people of the world.

4. Methodology

The focus of this research is to determine which of the sustainable gastronomic tourism elements are important to Gokceada visitors and to what degree the sustainable gastronomic tourism services offered to them meet their level of satisfaction. In this research, importance and satisfaction of sustainable gastronomic tourism elements are examined at overall level. That's why; visitor satisfaction is related to visitor's attitude towards sustainable gastronomic tourism elements of Gokceada and results to quality experience. The research tool was a questionnaire consisting of four sections. The first section included closed-ended personal questions that explored the profile of Gokceada visitors.

The closed-ended questions that were adapted from Scarpato (2002) in the second section determined the visitor types based on local and authentic perspectives. In the third and the fourth sections of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rate eleven key sustainable gastronomic tourism elements of Gokceada that were adapted Miele (2008), and Rand & Heath (2003) in terms of importance and satisfaction. A five point Likert scale questions ranging from very important-very good (5) to very unimportant-very bad (1) was used to investigate the importance-satisfaction levels of each element. The questionnaire was translated from English into Bulgarian, Greek and Turkish as these languages were most commonly used by Gokceada visitors. The population of the research was Gokceada visitors in June, July and August 2009-2010. As the sample of the research, 384 Gokceada visitors were drawn from this population by using the formula of sample size ($n = t^2 pq/d^2$; $\alpha = 0.05$, $t = 1.96$, $p = 0.5$, $q = 0.5$, $d = 0.5$). The questionnaire was pre-tested with 10 randomly selected visitors. Self-completion questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 384 tourists visiting Gokceada during the June-July-August peak-time season in 2009-2010. The research was conducted when the 384 questionnaire replying to all of the questions were collected. The questionnaires were collated and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Program. Differences between the visitor types' importance and satisfaction of eleven elements were investigated by using T-Tests. A reliability test was performed using Cronbach's Alpha. The results of this test were 0,821 for 5-item the visitor types based on local and authentic perspectives scale, 0,714 for 11-item importance scale and 0,928 for 11-item satisfaction scale.

5. Analysis Findings

5.1 Visitor Types based on Local and Authentic Perspectives

The core elements of sustainable gastronomy (Scarpato, 2002) were used to cluster analysis the sample to determine visitor types based on local and authentic perspectives of Gokceada. A k-means clustering approach was used and two, three and four cluster solutions were examined. The two cluster solution was chosen because it offered both the most even spread of respondents and the clearest interpretation. The largest visitor type based on local and authentic perspectives of Gokceada identified (81,25%) had high mean scores (4,75) for all sustainable gastronomic elements. This visitor type was labeled **the sustainable gastronomic tourist (SGT)**. The other visitor type of Gokceada (18,75%) that had low mean scores (3,50) for all items was labeled **the interested sustainable gastronomic tourist (ISGT)**. Table 1 shows the mean scores for each of the two clusters for the five elements of sustainable gastronomy.

5.2 Profile of Gokceada Visitors

The profile of the sample is outlined in Table 2. There are more male (62,80%), married (69,50) and middle age (61,00% of the sample is 30-49 years old) visitors than female (37,20%), single-separated-widowed-divorced (30,50%) and young (14,10% is 18-29 years old) or old (25,00% is 50 and older years old). Level of education is skewed toward the high end of the continuum, with 70,00% reported having graduated from college-university or higher. Level of annual household income is less widely distributed. 87,70% reported an annual household income of less than € 50.000. There are more family (45,30%) and first time (62,50%) visitors. Almost three-quarters of Gokceada visitors is skilled workers (31,50%), owner (18,80%) and professional-technical (16,10%).

5.3 Importance-Satisfaction Analysis

The average importance of the key elements of sustainable gastronomic tourism and the average level of satisfaction with these elements of the Gokceada experience were calculated for all visitors. The placement of each element on an importance-satisfaction scale is accomplished by using the means of importance and performance as the coordinates. Once these calculations had been performed, they were plotted on a two-dimensional grid. Each element on the grid can then be analyzed by locating the appropriate quadrant in which it falls. Elements in Grid I are rated very important and the above average level of satisfaction. Elements in Grid II are rated very important, but the level of satisfaction is rated below average. Elements in Grid III are considered less important and satisfaction level is below average. Elements in Grid IV are rated above average on satisfaction, but are rated below average on importance. Table 3 shows the overall ratings of all visitors' perceptions of Gokceada about elements of sustainable gastronomic tourism. Local produced food products, natural shopping centers, traditional life culture, and organic farming and products are located in Grid I (High Importance-High Satisfaction). Traditional food production and saving traditional production are considered above average for importance, but below average for satisfaction (Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction). Special cuisine/food routes, food festivals, special food event, and typical and historical shops are rated below average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction).

Gokceada visitors perceive special restaurants higher than average on satisfaction, but below average on importance (Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction). Importance-satisfaction means were calculated for each of two visitor types based on local and authentic perspectives: the sustainable gastronomic tourist (SGT) and the interested sustainable gastronomic tourist (ISGT). Table 4 and Table 5 summarize these means. The importance-satisfaction grid positions for each type were based on the importance and satisfaction grand means. The importance-satisfaction grids of visitor types are represented in Table 6. Sustainable gastronomic tourists (SGT) rate special restaurants, local produced food products, natural shopping centers, traditional life culture, and organic farming and products as above average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid I: High Importance-High Satisfaction). This visitors perceive special cuisine/food routes, typical and historical shops, traditional food production, and saving traditional production as above average for importance, but below average for satisfaction (Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction). Food festivals and special food event are regarded as below average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction). Interested sustainable gastronomic tourists (ISGT) rate special cuisine/food routes, food festivals, and special food event as below average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction). Other elements of sustainable gastronomic tourism are attributes that sustainable gastronomic tourists rated as below average for importance, but above average for satisfaction (Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction). Except for food festivals and special food event, the quadrant locations are not the same for the ten elements of sustainable gastronomic tourism.

6. Discussion

T-tests were used to analyze importance and satisfaction means of sustainable gastronomic tourism elements for visitor types based on local and authentic perspectives. The purpose of T-tests is to determine whether the two means differ significantly from each other. Except for natural shopping centers, traditional life culture, and saving traditional production, there were statistically significant differences between the importance means of visitor types. The importance means of sustainable gastronomic tourists were higher than the importance means of interested sustainable gastronomic tourists. There were no considerable differences based on satisfaction means of visitor types. Important elements of sustainable gastronomic tourism for all Gokceada visitors are: local produced food products, natural shopping centers, traditional life culture, organic farming and products, traditional food production, and saving traditional production. All visitors were satisfied with special restaurants, local produced food products, natural shopping centers, traditional life culture, and organic farming and products. Except for traditional food production and saving traditional production, other importance elements of sustainable gastronomic tourism were perceived to be present.

Except for food festivals and special food events, other elements are important for sustainable gastronomic tourists. Special restaurants, local produced food products, natural shopping centers, traditional life culture, and organic farming and products were perceived to be present. There were no importance elements of sustainable gastronomic tourism for interested sustainable gastronomic tourists. Gokceada is an important sustainable gastronomic destination for sustainable gastronomic tourists. Special restaurants, local produced food products, natural shopping centers, traditional life culture, and organic farming and products are rated high in importance and high in satisfaction by sustainable gastronomic tourists. Destination keep up the good work and that continued resources should be directed toward these elements. In contrast, food festivals and special food event have a low importance rating and a low satisfaction rating. Investing scarce resources on these elements may have little strategic advantage. Special cuisine/food routes, typical and historical shops, traditional food production, and saving traditional production are rated high in importance and low in satisfaction. Destination should pay particular attention to investing the greatest amount of resources to improving the performance of these elements.

7. Conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to measure Gokceada visitors' perceptions of key sustainable gastronomic tourism in terms of importance and satisfaction by visitor types based on local and authentic perspectives. Gokceada visitors were categorized into two different types: sustainable gastronomic tourists and interested sustainable gastronomic tourists. The significant finding of this research was that Gokceada was an important sustainable gastronomic destination for sustainable gastronomic tourists. Sustainable gastronomic tourists were perceived to be present special restaurant, local produced food products, natural shopping centers, traditional life culture, and organic farming and products. There were no high importance elements of sustainable gastronomic tourism for interested sustainable gastronomic tourists.

Understanding characteristics of visitor types is important for destination management strategies. Destinations monitor visitors' perceptions to identify strengths and gaps. Visitor oriented destinations focus on the importance of specific visitor types and work to maximize satisfaction with the service being offered. Importance-satisfaction analysis provides understanding of how the visitor types define destination, and how elements may aid the development of visitors' satisfaction.

Based on the sections of analysis findings and discussion, the following are suggestions that can be considered for Gokceada as a sustainable gastronomic tourism destination:

- Be sensitive to local and authentic conditions- use local produced food products, organic farming and products, traditional life culture, traditional food production,
- An attractive, unusual, unknown cuisine can be regarded as a resource of a destination and needs to be considered as a destination branding item,
- Gastronomy routes can promote a destination and can contribute to sustainable gastronomic tourism projects,
- Special restaurants, natural shopping centers, and typical and historical shops can be developed to assist with the promotion of the special cuisine of a destination.

The suggestions can furthermore contribute to the preservation of sustainable gastronomic tourism resources, sustainable gastronomic tourism development, development of sustainable gastronomic tourism destination and a high level of sustainable gastronomic tourism satisfaction, benefiting all members of community.

References

- Barrera, E., & Alvarado, O. B. (2008). Food Trails: Tourist Architectures Built on Food Identity. *Gastronomic Sciences: Food for Thought*, 3 (8), 56-63.
- Bessi re, J. (1998). Local Development and Heritage: Traditional Food and Cuisine as Tourist Attractions in Rural Areas. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38 (1), 21-34.
- Boyne, S., Williams, F., & Hall, D. (2001). Rural Tourism and Food Production: Opportunities for Sustainable Development. [Online] Available: http://www.rics.org/site/scripts/download_info.aspx?fileID=2651 (September 2, 2011).
- Butler, R. W., & Hall, C. M. (1998). Conclusion: The sustainability of tourism and recreation in rural areas. In R. Butler, C. M. Hall, & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Hall, C. M. (2002). Local initiative for local regional development: The role of food, wine and tourism. In E. Ahola (Edt.), *The 2nd Tourism Industry & Education Symposium: Tourism and Well-Being*. Jyvaskyla, Finland: Jyvaskyla Polytechnic.
- Hall, C. M., & Wilson, S. (2009). Scoping Paper: Local food, Tourism and Sustainability. [Online] Available: www.vestforks.no (August 1, 2009).
- Handszuh, H. (2000). Local Food in Tourism Policies. International Conference on Local Food and Tourism. Larnaka, Cyprus.
- Haven-Tang, C. (2005). Using Local Food and Drink to Differentiate Tourism Destinations Through a Sense of Place: A Story from Wales-Dining at Monmouthshire's Great Table. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, 4 (4), 69-86.
- Ibrahim, E. E., & Gill, J. (2005). A positioning strategy for a tourist destination, based on analysis of customers' perceptions and satisfactions. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 23 (2), 172-188.
- Kivela, J., & Crotts, J. C. (2006). Tourism and Gastronomy: Gastronomy's Influence on How Tourists Experience a Destination. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 30 (3): 354-377.
- Miele, M. (2008). Citt Slow: Producing Slowness againsts the Fast Life. *Space and Policy*, 12 (1): 135-156.
- Miele, M., & Murdoch, J. (2002). The Practical Aesthetics of Traditional Cuisines: Slow Food in Tuscany. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 42 (4), 312-328.
- Nummedal, M., & Hall, C. M. (2006). Local Food in Tourism: An Investigation of The New Zealand South Island's Bed and Breakfast Sector's Use and Perception of Local Food. *Tourism Review International*, 9, 365-378.
- Rand, G. E., & Heath, E. (2003). The Contribution of Local and Regional Food Tourism to Sustainable Tourism in South Africa. 2nd International Conference-Sustainable Tourism Development. Chios-Greece: University of the Aegean.

- Rand, G. E., & Heath, E. (2006). Towards a Framework for Food Tourism as an Element of Destination Marketing. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9 (3), 206-234.
- Roininen, K., Arvola, A., & Lahteenmaki, L. (2005). Exploring consumers' perceptions of local food with two different qualitative techniques: Laddering and word association. *Food Quality and Preference*, 17, 20-30.
- Pratt, J. (2007). Food Values: The Local and the Authentic. *Critique of Anthropology*, 27 (3), 285-300.
- Poon, A. (1993). *Tourism, Technology and Competitive Strategies*. Oxford: CAB.
- Scarpato, R. (2002). Sustainable Gastronomy as a Tourist Products. In A. Hjalager & G. Richards, G. (Eds.), *Tourism and Gastronomy*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Swarbrooke, J. (1999). *Sustainable Tourism Management*. Wallingford: CAB International.
- Telfer, D., & Wall, G. (1996). Linkages Between Tourism and Food Production. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (3), 635-653.
- Westering, J. (1999). Heritage and Gastronomy: the pursuits of the new tourist. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 5 (2), 75-81.
- Yiakoumaki, V. (2006). Local, Ethnic, and Rural Food: On the Emergence of Cultural Diversity in Post-EU-Accession Greece. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 24, 415-445.
- Yurtseven, H. R. (2007). *Slow Food ve Gokceada: Yonetsel Bir Yaklasim*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Table 1: Visitor Types based on Local and Authentic Perspectives

The Core Elements of Sustainable Gastronomy	SGT (n=312, 81,25%)	ISGT (n=72, 18,75%)
The survival of local food production, outlets and fresh markets	4,76	4,03
The viability of home cooking	4,81	4,1
The transmission of culinary knowledge and children's education to taste	4,79	4
The right to pleasure and diversity	4,67	2,96
The impact of tourism on gastronomic authenticity and community well-being	4,7	2,4
Overall	4,75	3,5

Table 2: Visitor Profile

Components	SGT		ISGT		Total	
	N	%	N	%	n	%
Sex						
Male	194	50,5	47	12,2	241	62,8
Female	118	30,7	25	6,5	143	37,2
Marital Status						
Married	229	59,6	38	9,9	267	69,5
Single/separated/widowed/divorced	83	21,6	34	8,9	117	30,5
Level of Education						
High school or less	103	26,8	12	3,1	115	29,9
College or university	156	40,6	45	11,7	201	52,3
Master or doctorate	53	13,8	15	3,9	68	17,7
Age						
18-29	41	10,7	13	3,4	54	14,1
30-39	92	24,0	28	7,3	120	31,3
40-49	94	24,5	20	5,2	114	29,7
50-59	61	15,9	6	1,6	67	17,4
60 and older	24	6,3	5	1,3	29	7,6
Annual Household Income						
Less than € 25.000	186	48,4	36	9,4	222	57,8
€ 25.000 - € 49.999	87	22,7	28	7,3	115	29,9
€ 50.000 - € 74.999	29	7,6	7	1,8	36	9,4
€ 75.000 - € 99.999	6	1,6	1	0,3	7	1,8
€ 100.000 and higher	4	1,0	0	0	4	1,0
Visitor Types						
Family	146	38,0	28	7,3	174	45,3
Family and friends	50	13,0	16	4,2	66	17,2
Friends	41	10,7	19	4,9	60	15,6
Individual	43	11,2	2	0,5	45	11,7
Others	32	8,3	7	1,8	39	10,2
Number of Visiting						
First visiting	189	49,2	51	13,3	240	62,5
Second visiting	49	12,8	11	2,9	60	15,6
Third visiting	17	4,4	3	0,8	20	5,2
More than three visiting	57	14,8	7	1,8	64	16,7
Occupation						
Owner	59	15,4	13	3,4	72	18,8
Manager/executive	23	6,0	9	2,3	32	8,3
Professional/technical	50	13,0	12	3,1	62	16,1
Clerical sale	9	2,3	3	0,8	12	3,1
Skilled worker	95	24,7	26	6,8	121	31,5
Unskilled worker	5	1,3	1	0,3	6	1,6
Farming/fishing/forestry	3	0,8	0	0	3	0,8
Student	16	4,2	5	1,3	21	5,5
Retired	30	7,8	2	0,5	32	8,3
Housewife	22	5,7	1	0,3	23	6,0

Table 3: Means of Importance and Satisfaction of Gokceada Visitors (n=384)

Elements of Sustainable Gastronomic Tourism	Mean of Importance	Mean of Satisfaction	Grid
Special Restaurants	4,26	2,76	IV
Local Produced Food Products	4,47	2,75	I
Special Cuisine/Food Routes	4,28	2,49	III
Food Festivals	3,94	2,48	III
Special Food Event	3,99	2,54	III
Natural Shopping Centers	4,37	2,76	I
Typical and Historical Shops	4,26	2,57	III
Traditional Life Culture	4,53	2,66	I
Organic Farming and Products	4,63	2,86	I
Traditional Food Production	4,53	2,61	II
Saving Traditional Production	4,54	2,54	II

- Grid I: High Importance-High Satisfaction, Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction, Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction, Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction.
- The grand mean for importance ($X=4,35$; $SD=0,9545$) and the grand mean of satisfaction ($X=2,64$; $SD=1,2147$).

Table 4: Comparison of Importance Means of Visitor Types

Elements of Sustainable Gastronomic Tourism	SGT (n=312)	ISGT (n=72)	T-tests Sig.
Special Restaurants	4,38	3,76	.000*
Local Produced Food Products	4,55	4,11	.000*
Special Cuisine/Food Routes	4,36	3,93	.035*
Food Festivals	4,05	3,47	.002*
Special Food Event	4,12	3,44	.000*
Natural Shopping Centers	4,44	4,06	.075
Typical and Historical Shops	4,38	3,74	.000*
Traditional Life Culture	4,61	4,22	.982
Organic Farming and Products	4,7	4,33	.000*
Traditional Food Production	4,59	4,26	.016*
Saving Traditional Production	4,61	4,25	.099

- The importance meaning is based on a five-point scale where 5 is very important and 1 is very unimportant.
- (*) Significant at < 0.05

Table 5: Comparison of Satisfaction Means of Visitor Types

Elements of Sustainable Gastronomic Tourism	SGT (n=312)	ISGT (n=72)	T-tests Sig.
Special Restaurants	2,77	2,72	.437
Local Produced Food Products	2,76	2,68	.638
Special Cuisine/Food Routes	2,53	2,31	.225
Food Festivals	2,5	2,4	.099
Special Food Event	2,58	2,36	.101
Natural Shopping Centers	2,73	2,88	.589
Typical and Historical Shops	2,54	2,67	.312
Traditional Life Culture	2,64	2,76	.275
Organic Farming and Products	2,81	3,04	.340
Traditional Food Production	2,58	2,74	.082
Saving Traditional Production	2,5	2,69	.152

- Satisfaction scores show meaning of visitors' perceptions of satisfaction based on a five-point scale where 5 is very good and 1 is very bad.
- Significant at < 0.05

Table 6: Comparison of Grids of Visitors' Perceptions by Visitor Types

Elements of Sustainable Gastronomic Tourism	SGT	ISGT
Special Restaurants	I	IV
Local Produced Food Products	I	IV
Special Cuisine/Food Routes	II	III
Food Festivals	III	III
Special Food Event	III	III
Natural Shopping Centers	I	IV
Typical and Historical Shops	II	IV
Traditional Life Culture	I	IV
Organic Farming and Products	I	IV
Traditional Food Production	II	IV
Saving Traditional Production	II	IV

- Grid I: High Importance-High Satisfaction, Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction, Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction, Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction.
- The grand mean for importance ($X=4,35$; $SD=0,9545$) and the grand mean of satisfaction ($X=2,64$; $SD=1,2147$).