

A STUDY ON DETERMINING THE EFFECT OF GASTRONOMY ACTIVITIES ON DESTINATION PROMOTION

Erkan Akgöz

Selçuk University, Faculty of Tourism, Konya/Turkey

Abstract

The tourism sector covers many different sectors in its existence. It is closely linked to the food and beverage industry, as well as sectors such as health, sociology, and science. It is a well-known fact that food and beverage affect the choice of destination. This situation has led to gastronomy and gastronomy activities in the tourism sector. Gastronomy is not only related to eating and drinking but is also referred to by the way it is served, and the food items served. Gastronomic activities, which are handled in such a wide scope, are very important in terms of destination promotion. Touristic promotion helps destination selection. For this reason, in this study, first of all, explaining gastronomy activities and promoting the destination were investigated. The research was carried out according to the quantitative research method, considering local cuisine products. A questionnaire form was used to obtain the data and it was evaluated with the help of SPSS package program. In the research, frequency, descriptive, difference and regression analyze were made and the results were interpreted by turning them into tables. In line with the comments made, various criticisms and necessary suggestions were presented to the relevant stakeholders.

Keywords: Tourism, Destination, Promotion, Gastronomy, Gastronomy Activities

1. INTRODUCTION

Tourism, which deals with the travel of individuals to destinations other than where they are in order to evaluate their spare time, has been an activity that has been beneficial both economically and culturally in people's lives for a long time. When examined from a historical perspective, it is seen that the first steps in tourism are related to eating and drinking. Although the concept of gastronomy is not a very old concept, food and beverage culture has continued to change since the existence of human beings. Gastronomy occupies an important place in human life because it is directly related to the need to eat, which is one of the basic needs of individuals. The use of gastronomy by individuals only to survive or to experience different tastes out of necessity has given birth to "Gastronomic Tourism". Gastronomy tourism attracts the attention and interest of individuals, and gastronomy activities, which are carried out in order to increase the rate of visiting the destination, contribute to the promotion activities in tourism. Within the scope of gastronomy activities, festivals were organized, cooking competitions were held, schools were opened to provide education, and attention was drawn to this issue through television and the internet.

The aim of this study is to determine the thoughts of individuals on local food and promotional activities and the effect of gastronomy on tourism promotion. Within the scope of the research, information about gastronomy tourism, gastronomic activities and local cuisine products are included. The data of the research were obtained by applying a questionnaire to 388 individuals with different demographic characteristics by choosing the convenience sampling method.

2. GASTRONOMY

Although the concept of gastronomy is defined as the art of food, it is related to the preparation, presentation and eating of these dishes and is based on Mesopotamia (Birdir and Akgöl, 2015: 58). In the historical process, human beings instinctively determined the foods that can be consumed or not consumed by following the animals or observing the living things that died due to the consumed plants. Later, they developed the food variety in their lives by consuming small animals and plants with climate

changes. When looking at the food evolution of humans; The present point has been reached in time with the invention of fire, the use of food as a social activity, the domestication of animals, the beginning of agriculture and the development of transportation. Food has been very valuable in human life since existence. It is an indispensable need as it provides the necessary energy and food to people. This need has created the food culture. Food culture is about how food is grown, how it is supplied, how it is cooked, and what foods it is eaten with (Şengül & Türkay, 2017).

Gastronomy, which occupies a very large place in the life of human beings, is also closely related to the field of art. Especially dishes are closely related to the art of presentation. The concept of gastronomy is a concept blended with many fields (Aksoy and Sezgi, 2015: 80). Anthropology, agriculture, chemistry, medicine or theology are not conceiving far from gastronomy. The cultivation of the nutrients used in the content of the food, the cultural characteristics of the people when preparing the food or choosing it for consumption, the nutritional value of the food, its appeal to the eye, and the presence of foods that are not objectionable to be consumed religiously or that are not considered appropriate to be consumed show its relationship with various fields (Küçükkömürlü et al., 2018: 79).). When gastronomy is examined scientifically, it is related to both science and social sciences (Sökmen and Özkanlı, 2018: 100). While its relationship with science is related to nutrients, qualities, taste and its effect on human health; Its relationship with social sciences is related to psychology, sociology, economics, marketing, history, archeology and beliefs.

The impact and importance of gastronomy today is quite large. People are engaged in gastronomy activities not only to survive, but to have different experiences, to get to know, taste or learn about different cultures. Individuals tend to seek new gastronomic tastes for these activities both in their own countries and in destinations in different countries. Turkey has become one of the countries that attract attention in terms of gastronomic due to the fact that it has hosted many different cultures from past to present, both for its citizens and tourists. Turkey has benefited gastronomy with a total of 2205 food and beverage types (Hoşcan, 2018: 396). At this point, Turkey stands out with its rich gastronomic values and takes place in “Gastronomic Tourism”.

2.1. Gastronomy Tourism

Although the concept of gastronomy is not only related to eating and drinking, but also very related to culture, its area of interest is people. This emerging connection situation, when combined with people's search for difference in tourism and their desire to move away from traditional tourism understanding, opens the door to gastronomy tourism (Aksoy and Sezgi, 2015: 81). Gastronomy tourism can be defined as the gastronomic activity that motivates the travel of food and beverages not only as a physiological need, but also to experience it. In addition, the desire of tourists to evaluate every moment during their tourism activities allows this tourism orientation to increase (Küçükkömürlü et al., 2018: 79).

Gastronomy tourism has a very close relationship with culinary culture as a concept. Due to the fact that each society has different characteristics on issues such as war, climate or migration, there are diversity in culinary cultures (Single and Belpınar, 2015: 6519). Due to these diversity, 3 basic features have emerged in gastronomic tourism. Recognition, the use of cooking, eating and serving to customers features belonging to a region by other regions; originality, the belonging of these techniques to a region; Diversity covers how plentiful or abundant food and beverages are. Bringing these 3 features together and presenting them to potential customers makes the region stand out in the international market. In order to provide these features, it is necessary to consider the 3 elements at the origin of gastronomic tourism. Agriculture means the regional cultivation or self-growing of the products to be offered; culture, the combination of products with cooking, serving or eating; tourism, on the other hand, includes the necessary promotion and activities that will ensure that the customers come and feel comfortable (Sökmen and Özkanlı, 2018: 101).

As in tourism, the aim in gastronomy tourism is to reach more tourists and ensure their loyalty. The most well-known tourist type within the scope of gastronomic tourism is “gastro” tourists. These tourists are potential customers who prefer to travel for different tastes as opposed to traditional tourism (Özdemir and Altınar, 2012: 4). Unlike other tourists, gastro tourists travel especially for new and different tastes, being aware of everything, instead of tasting local products and doing activities during

tourism (Single and Belpinar, 2015: 6519). Although food and beverages that can be offered to tourists as a product seem to have become widespread recently, they are actually materials that have existed for a long time and are marketed in destinations (Guzel and Ünver, 2015:64). Gastronomy tourism has a significant role in the marketing of destinations (Galvez et al., 2017: 254). It means marketing not only food and beverage, but also the culture, lifestyle and history of the region (Serçek and Serçek, 2016: 15). With the right marketing strategy, it is possible to brand the regions where the products are grown or produced. The most common method used by regions for branding is to make local products regional symbols, to highlight and promote them (Serçeoğlu et al., 2016: 100). In this way, both local products will be promoted, and the regional economy will be contributed (Akkaya and Özcan, 2019: 251). Apparently, gastronomic tourism plays a very important role in destination selection by contributing not only to the individual but also to the region (Koçoğlu, 2019: 366).

2.2. Gastronomy Activities

According to the TDK statement, gastronomy, which is defined as "the curiosity to eat", is not only related to food, but also closely related to the cultivation, cooking, eating and presentation of the foods used in the content of food and beverages. Due to human nature, food and beverages have become an indispensable and developing sector over time, as they are an indispensable element in people's lives. The development of gastronomy over time has attracted people's attention and has led them to focus on gastronomy as a destination choice. It has also passed into the literature as gastronomic tourism. Gastronomy tourism is based on food and beverage as a destination area of potential tourists. Although gastronomic tourism is a very important issue in terms of marketing and promotion of regions, it is supported by gastronomy activities. The realization of gastronomic activities not only includes marketing, but also connects societies (Erbay and Sabur, 2022: 652). In line with gastronomic tourism, festivals are highly preferred as a marketing element or promotional activity to ensure that regions attract attention from potential tourists. When festivals are examined in terms of gastronomic tourism, it means a festival for the promotion of regional products (Keskin, 2020: 29). 1209 festivals in the field of gastronomy were held in Turkey in 2022 (Festivall, 2023).

	City	n	%
Marmara (n=406, %33,581)	İstanbul	206	17,039
	Bursa	53	4,384
	Balıkesir	36	2,978
	Kocaeli	24	1,985
	Çanakkale	22	1,820
	Sakarya	20	1,654
	Edirne	16	1,323
	Tekirdağ	11	0,910
	Others (Kırklareli-9, Yalova-8, Bilecik-1)	18	1,489
Aegean (n=266, %22,002)	İzmir	125	10,339
	Muğla	46	3,805
	Denizli	30	2,481
	Aydın	24	1,985
	Afyonkarahisar	13	1,075
	Kütahya	11	0,910
	Others (Manisa-9, Uşak-8)	17	1,406

The Mediterranean (n=173, %14,309)	Antalya	81	6,700
	Adana	28	2,316
	Mersin	25	2,068
	Hatay	18	1,489
	Isparta	8	0,662
	Others (Burdur-6, Kahramanmaraş-6, Osmaniye-1)	13	1,075
Central Anatolia (n=141, %11,663)	Ankara	54	4,467
	Konya	27	2,233
	Eskişehir	15	1,241
	Nevşehir	15	1,241
	Kayseri	10	0,827
	Yozgat	8	0,662
	Others (Karaman-6, Aksaray-3, Kırşehir-2, Niğde-1)	12	0,993
Black Sea (n=134, %11,084)	Ordu	21	1,737
	Samsun	18	1,489
	Kastamonu	11	0,910
	Rize	11	0,910
	Trabzon	10	0,827
	Artvin	8	0,662
	Sinop	8	0,662
	Çankırı	6	0,496
	Düzce	6	0,496
	Giresun	6	0,496
	Others (Çorum-5, Karabük-5, Tokat-5, Amasya-3, Bolu-3, Zonguldak-3, Bartın-2, Bayburt-2, Gümüşhane-1)	29	2,399
Eastern Anatolia (n=50, %4,136)	Malatya	10	0,827
	Elazığ	8	0,662
	Van	7	0,579
	Ardahan	5	0,414
	Others (Sivas-4, Erzincan-4, Erzurum-3, Bitlis-3, Ağrı-2, Bingöl-2, Tunceli-2)	20	1,654
Southeast Anatolia (n=39, %3,229)	Gaziantep	15	1,241
	Diyarbakır	8	0,662
	Şanlıurfa	5	0,414
	Others (Batman-3, Hakkari-3 Adıyaman-2, Mardin-1, Siirt-1, Şırnak-1)	11	0,910
TOTAL		1209	100,000

Table 1: 2022 Year Gastronomy Festivals (Source: Festivall, 2023)

When Table 1 is examined, it is understood that the highest number of festivals are held in the Marmara Region (406), Istanbul (206), and secondly in the Aegean Region (266), İzmir (125). It is seen that the richest region in terms of festival is the Marmara Region. The least number of festivals in Turkey are organized in the Southeastern Anatolia Region (39) and the Eastern Anatolia Region (50). Festivals provide significant social, cultural, and economic benefits to destinations. The most obvious indicator of this is the number of festivals in these two regions and the tourist statistics. Festivals organized in accordance with their purpose also create important advantages for destination image and promotion.

It would be a mistake to limit gastronomy activities only to festivals and fairs. Gastronomy tours should also be evaluated in this context. Gastronomy tours aim to experience the production of a regional product or a chef's meal rather than going to a restaurant. Such activities create a conscious interest in the destination (Erşahin and Kızıllırmak, 2019: 2468). Likewise, visits to farms and wine producing places are also included in the scope of gastronomic tourism. For this reason, the concept of gastronomy can also be considered as event tourism (Erciyas and Yılmaz, 2021: 94).

There are also food competitions among gastronomy promotion activities. Cooking competitions are held both to promote gastronomy, to show the skills of the cooks and to train new cooks. Television, which appeals to the auditory and visual senses, is very important in promotional activities since it has a high permanence in people's minds. At this point, television programs affect the choices about both food and gastronomy travels, as they are an incentive for people's consumption (Aydın et al., 2017: 38). Within the scope of promotional activities, the internet factor is too important to be overlooked. The fact that many countries and regions put their local products on their web pages supports the promotion in terms of gastronomic (Alyakut, 2020: 1873).

When these promotional activities are examined, different tools are used in the promotion of country cuisines. These; festivals, events, gastronomic tours, competitions, schools and the internet (Sarıkaya and Hoşmezkalendar, 2020: 2240). In this context, using these promotional activities in Turkey, 4 cities were included in the category of gastronomy cities by UNESCO. These; Gaziantep, Hatay, Afyonkarahisar and Kayseri. It is possible that it will attract attention in other provinces with the importance and work given to promotional activities. The reason why many provinces are not recognized and not attracting attention is some problems and mistakes made in promotional activities. Promotional issues: The fact that promotional activities are not carried out effectively and efficiently, the budget allocated for promotion is insufficient, the public and private sectors do not cooperate in publicity, and the desired level in the country's image cannot be reached. In case of making certain promotional plans, increasing the budget and solving the image problem, the problems in publicity can be solved (İnanır, 2019: 61).

2. METHOD

In the study, gastronomy, gastronomy tourism, gastronomic activities and promotional activities were investigated. It also aims to research the effect of destinations on tourism promotion on the basis of gastronomy. For this purpose, the questionnaire technique was used to obtain the necessary data for the research. Questionnaire is a data collection method in which all individuals answer the same questions and is likely to be applied to more people (Coşkun et al., 2015: 80). The prepared questionnaire consists of 2 parts. In the first part of the form, the expressions prepared in accordance with the 5-point Likert scale were used to analyze the demographic characteristics of the participants, and in the second part, the thoughts about the local cuisine consisting of 20 questions. The obtained data were analyzed with the help of SPSS program.

The universe of the research consists of all individuals participating in gastronomy activities. However, the sample was limited due to the large size of the universe, time and economic limitations. With the convenience sampling method, data were obtained from 388 individuals who knew local dishes and local culture and had information about promotional activities. The data were obtained in June 2022 by online and face-to-face method.

The data obtained within the scope of the research were evaluated by frequency analysis in order to determine the demographic characteristics. Difference analyzes were also conducted to determine whether there was any significant difference in the opinions of the participants about local gastronomy with a descriptive analysis of thoughts about local dishes.

3. FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH

Findings and analyzes of the research were made with the SPSS program and the relevant tables were prepared. The tables prepared in accordance with its purpose were interpreted and necessary suggestions were presented.

3.1. Frequency Analysis

Frequency analysis was conducted to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants. The data obtained as a result of the analysis are given in the table below.

		N	%
Gender	Female	191	49,2
	Male	197	50,8
Age	20 years and under	76	19,6
	21-30 years	82	21,1
	31-40 years	75	19,3
	41-50 years	80	20,6
	51 years and over	75	19,3
Marital Status	Married	212	54,6
	Single	176	45,4
Education Status	High school and earlier	212	54,6
	Associate degree	82	21,1
	Undergraduate and postgraduate	94	24,2
Profession	Private sector	95	24,5
	Public sector	59	15,2
	Student	72	18,6
	Self-employment	73	18,8
	Other (Housewife, Retired, Unemployed)	89	22,9

Table 2: Frequency analysis results

When the table prepared according to demographic characteristics is examined, it is seen that there are equal proportions of male and female participants. In terms of education, the majority of them have a high school or pre-school education. 24.5% of the participants, more than half of whom are married, work in the private sector. It is understood that they are employed at least in the public sector in terms of their occupational status.

3.2. Descriptive Analysis

It is an important element in terms of both destination image and promotion of local products and gastronomy activities. Therefore, descriptive analysis was carried out in order to determine the thoughts about the expressions about local products. As a result of the analysis, both the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the opinions about the expressions were calculated.

Expressions about local products	N	Mean	Sd.
Local food is delicious	388	4,577	0,849
Local dishes are unique	388	4,397	0,879
I like to try local dishes	388	4,606	0,802
Local food is healthy	388	4,299	0,980
Local cuisine products are clean and hygienic	388	4,180	1,023
Local cuisine products have high nutritional value	388	4,294	0,976
Local cuisine products are affordable	388	3,554	1,351
Local dishes are known/recognized by everyone	388	3,961	1,105
Ingredients for local dishes can be found everywhere	388	4,454	0,866
Local dishes are easy to prepare/cook	388	4,335	0,924
I like to try local dishes	388	4,608	0,830
I prefer restaurants that serve local products.	388	4,013	1,279
I find local products more attractive	388	4,423	0,979
Local products reflect the destination culture	388	4,494	0,856
I visit the destination to taste local products	388	3,716	1,435
I recommend local products to others	388	4,521	0,927
I can pay more for local products	388	3,490	1,472
Festivals, competitions, etc. related to local products. I participate in activities	388	3,649	1,515
I buy local products as gifts	388	4,276	1,092
Local dishes should be promoted more	388	4,451	0,996

Table 3: Descriptive analysis results

As a result of the analysis, the statement "*I like to try local dishes*" has the highest average (4,608). This rate is followed by the expression "*Local food is delicious*" with 4,577. The ones with the lowest average are the statements "*I can pay more for local products*" (3,490) and "*Local dishes are affordable*" (3,554). From these results, it is understood that the participants have a positive attitude towards local dishes, but they are more selective about price.

3.3. Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was performed to examine the construct validity of the scale. Factor analysis is a type of multivariate statistical analysis that allows the data to be presented in a more meaningful and concise manner based on the relationships between the data. In factor analysis, it is basically aimed to group them in a meaningful way based on the relationships between the variables. There are two different factor analyzes. These are exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. Exploratory factor analysis method was used to test the construct validity of the scale used in this study. In this method, the

researcher examines the factors formed as a result of meaningful relevance and grouping of the variables in terms of their content and power, gives them new names and defines the factors. The eigenvalues will determine how many factors will occur here. It is important that the contents of the factors are compatible and consistent with the theory. In addition, it is desired that the total explained variance value should be at least 60% (Kurtuluş, 2010).

Dimensions Factor	Factor Load	Eigenvalue	Variance	A. Mean	Kolmogorov-Smirnov
1. Health and Taste (11 items)		8,973	44,013	4,448	0,210
I like to try local dishes	,786				
local food is delicious	,778				
I like to try local dishes	,754				
I find local products more attractive	,705				
Local dishes are unique	,704				
Local food is healthy	,687				
Local dishes should be promoted more	,675				
Local products reflect the destination culture	,641				
I recommend local products to others.	,640				
Local dishes have high nutritional value	,609				
Local products are clean and hygienic.	,529				
2. Price and Preference (4 items)		3,263	9,274	3,676	0,086
Festivals, competitions, etc. related to local products. I participate in activities	,766				
I can pay more for local products	,601				
I prefer restaurants that serve local products.	,526				
Local dishes are affordable	,459				
3. Accessibility (3 items)		2,121	4,807	4,354	0,223
Local dishes are easy to prepare/cook	,789				
Ingredients for local dishes can be found everywhere	,786				
I buy local products as gifts	,510				
4. Recognition (2 items)		1,745	3,588	3,872	0,112
I visit the destination to taste local products	,589				
Local dishes are known/recognized by everyone	,519				

Direct oblmin rotation principal component analysis. Total variance explained: %61,682.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sample sufficiency: ,921; Bartlett's sphericity test x2: 4257,265; df 253; Sig. 0,000;
Overall mean:4 202; Cronbach's Alfa: ,777

Response Categories; 1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Undecided, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly Agree

Table 3: Factor Analysis by Dimensions

The factor analysis results of the participants' responses to local dishes and gastronomy activities are given in the table above. The table includes the factor load, eigenvalue, variance and arithmetic mean of the statements answered by the participants. It is stated that the lower KMO value should be 0.70 and it is stated that the KMO value above 0.70 is suitable for factor analysis of the data set (Sarıkaya, 2002: 132). The sphericity test result, which shows that significant factors or variables can be extracted from the research data, was determined as 4257,265. This value obtained is statistically significant at the 0.000 level. In other words, the data set is suitable for factor analysis since there is a high correlation between the variables. As a result of the analysis, four factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 were obtained. Factors explain 61,682% of the total variance.

According to Table-3, the first factor explaining the scale with the highest variance (44.013%) consists of 11 items. In this factor, propositions such as health, taste and taste related to local dishes came together. For this reason, this factor was named "*Health and Taste*". The second factor, which has a variance value of 9,274 and consists of four statements, is named "*Price and Preference*" because it is related to the reasons for choosing local foods and prices. The third factor consists of 3 items. Because the statements are related to the availability of local products, it is called "*Accessibility*". The explanation rate of this factor variance is 4.807. The statements in the last factor are named as "*Recognition*" since they are related to the destination image and promotion.

3.4. Diversity Tests

Within the scope of the research, diversity tests were applied to determine whether there was a significant difference in the opinions of the participants about local products. If the number of groups depending on the changing parameters is two, the t test is performed. ANOVA test should be performed to examine whether there is a difference between more than one group.

3.4.1. T Tests

A t-test was conducted to analyze the difference in the participants' thoughts between gender and marital status and dimensions. Two separate tables were prepared to evaluate the results.

Gender		N	Mean	Sd.	Df.	F	P
Health and Taste	Female	191	4,540	0,574	386	5,082	0,009
	Male	197	4,359	0,766			
Recognition	Female	191	3,958	0,856	386	1,788	0,067
	Male	197	3,789	0,950			
Price and Preference	Female	191	3,610	0,897	386	3,051	0,182
	Male	197	3,741	1,027			
Accessibility	Female	191	4,415	0,712	386	1,784	0,118
	Male	197	4,296	0,783			

Table 4: Analysis of the difference between gender and dimensions

As a result of the analysis, no significant difference was determined between gender and dimensions. In short, although the genders of the participants are different, their thoughts about local dishes are the same.

Marital status		N	Mean	Sd.	Df.	F	P
Health and Taste	Married	212	4,504	0,665	386	0,003	0,79
	Single	176	4,381	0,701			
Recognition	Married	212	3,836	0,936	386	2,557	0,387
	Single	176	3,916	0,872			
Price and Preference	Married	212	3,633	0,997	386	2,674	0,333
	Single	176	3,729	0,928			
Accessibility	Married	212	4,514	0,656	386	10,659	0,003
	Single	176	4,163	0,812			

Table 5: Analysis of difference between marital status and dimensions

A t-test was also conducted to examine whether the opinions about local dishes differ according to the Marital status of the participants. According to the results of the analysis, it was determined that there was no significant difference in the dimensions of “*Health and Taste*”, “*Recognition*”, “*Price and Preference*” of the participants. Only in the “*Accessibility*” dimension, it was observed that the participants' thoughts changed according to their Marital status. It can be said that the reason for this is that Married ones have a more positive opinion about the accessibility of local dishes than Singles.

3.4.2. Anova Tests

Since the participants' age, education level and occupation consisted of more than two groups, ANOVA test was performed. Separate tables were prepared to measure the diversity of all variables.

	Age		N	Mean	Sd.	Df.	F	P	Explain
Health and Taste	A	20 years and under	76	4,388	0,501	4	2,965	0,020	B>C
	B	21-30 years	82	4,586	0,512				
	C	31-40 years	75	4,249	0,981				
	D	41-50 years	80	4,534	0,585				
	E	51 years and over	75	4,464	0,707				
Recognition	A	20 years and under	76	3,990	0,744	4	7,035	0,007	A>C
	B	21-30 years	82	4,229	0,746				
	C	31-40 years	75	3,517	1,035				
	D	41-50 years	80	3,806	0,950				
	E	51 years and over	75	3,790	0,899				
Price and Preference	A	20 years and under	76	3,714	0,853	4	6,592	0,012	B>C
	B	21-30 years	82	4,067	0,818				
	C	31-40 years	75	3,517	1,087				
	D	41-50 years	80	3,709	0,987				
	E	51 years and over	75	3,337	0,937				
Accessibility	A	20 years and under	76	4,013	0,698	4	7,259	0,023	A<D

B	21-30 years	82	4,358	0,746
C	31-40 years	75	4,289	0,939
D	41-50 years	80	4,529	0,662
E	51 years and over	75	4,578	0,535

Table 6: Analysis of difference between age variable and dimensions

According to the age variable, the difference in the opinions of the participants about the dimensions was also measured. Since the age groups of the participants were close to each other, the Post-Hoc Gabriel test of ANOVA was applied (Gabriel, 1981). As a result of the test, it was determined that there was a significant difference in the thoughts of individuals between their ages and dimensions ($p < 0.005$). The difference in the first and third dimensions is between the age groups of 21-30 and 31-40. The difference in the second dimension arises from those younger than 20 years old and those between 31-40 years old. In the fourth dimension, the difference is between those younger than 20 years old and those between 41-50 years old.

Education Status		N	Mean	Sd.	Df.	F	P	Explain
Health and Taste	A High school and earlier	212	4,561	0,584		6,659	0,001	A>B
	B Associate degree	82	4,307	0,716	2			B<C
	C Undergraduate and postgraduate	94	4,413	0,810				A>C
Recognition	A High school and earlier	212	3,911	0,873		0,445	0,641	...
	B Associate degree	82	3,814	0,995	2			
	C Undergraduate and postgraduate	94	3,835	0,908				
Price and Preference	A High school and earlier	212	3,612	0,928		1,064	0,346	...
	B Associate degree	82	3,737	1,008	2			
	C Undergraduate and postgraduate	94	3,768	1,010				
Accessibility	A High school and earlier	212	4,410	0,707		1,923	0,147	...
	B Associate degree	82	4,219	0,841	2			
	C Undergraduate and postgraduate	94	4,347	0,753				

Table 7: Analysis of the difference between educational status variable and dimensions

There is great diversity between the groups related to the educational background of the participants. For this reason, Scheffe test, one of the Post-Hoc tests, was used to measure the source of the difference (Scheffe, 1999). As a result of the analysis, the above table was prepared. When the relevant table is examined, only the first dimension reveals a difference in the educational status of the participants and their thoughts about local dishes. In other dimensions, although the participants had different education levels, there was no significant difference in their thoughts. The difference in the first dimension is seen among all groups.

Profession		N	Mean	Sd.	Df.	F	P	Explain
Health and Taste	A Private sector	95	4,402	0,769	4	4,545	0,001	D<E
	B Public sector	59	4,334	0,669				
	C Student	72	4,504	0,444				
	D Self-employment	73	4,266	0,901				
	E Other (Housewife, Retired, Unemployed)	89	4,675	0,457				
Recognition	A Private sector	95	3,921	0,962	4	2,009	0,093	...
	B Public sector	59	3,644	0,808				
	C Student	72	4,020	0,719				
	D Self-employment	73	3,750	1,049				
	E Other (Housewife, Retired, Unemployed)	89	3,952	0,898				
Price and Preference	A Private sector	95	3,752	1,124	4	1,776	0,133	...
	B Public sector	59	3,788	0,886				
	C Student	72	3,795	0,808				
	D Self-employment	73	3,633	1,044				
	E Other (Housewife, Retired, Unemployed)	89	3,460	0,862				
Accessibility	A Private sector	95	4,305	0,768	4	6,992	0,000	A<E C<E D<E
	B Public sector	59	4,418	0,796				
	C Student	72	4,097	0,736				
	D Self-employment	73	4,242	0,855				
	E Other (Housewife, Retired, Unemployed)	89	4,666	0,471				

Table 9: Analysis of difference between occupational status and dimensions

The occupations of the individuals within the scope of the research were evaluated in 5 main groups. Since the groups related to the occupational status of the participants were close to each other, they were analyzed with the Gabriel test. As a result of the analysis, a significant difference was found between Self-Employed and Other (Housewife, Retired, Unemployed) groups in the first dimension ($p<0.005$). In the second and third dimensions, although the participants have different education levels, there is no significant difference in their thoughts. In the fourth dimension (Accessibility), it was concluded that there is a significant difference between all occupational groups except Other (Housewife, Retired, Unemployed) and Public Sector employees.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Gastronomy can be defined as the local food culture of a country or region, traditional dishes, local flavors, and special culinary experiences. This area is gaining more importance in the tourism industry. Because gastronomic activities play an important role in the promotion of a destination and attract the

attention of potential tourists. In the study prepared for this purpose, the contribution of the activities to the destinations was investigated.

According to the results of the research, it is understood that the majority of those who participate in the gastronomy activities participate in order to try local dishes. In addition, it is seen that local dishes are delicious, unique to the region and make an important contribution to promoting the destination culture. It is also stated that those who visit the destination and experience local products buy products specific to the region as gifts. In this situation, it is understood that the products of the destinations are promoted not only in the place where the gastronomic activities are held, but also in different areas by the visitors. However, in order to obtain the desired results from local products, it is necessary to be more sensitive about pricing.

In addition, expressions about local products are evaluated by the participants in four different dimensions. Opinions on this subject differ according to the demographic characteristics of those who visit the destination. For this reason, activities related to the local gastronomic products of the destination should be prepared carefully. It is possible to summarize the contributions of gastronomy activities organized in accordance with their purpose to destinations as follows.

- a. The gastronomy of a destination is linked to the cultural identity and history of that region. Traditional dishes and food rituals offer visitors the opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of the lifestyle and values of the locals. Therefore, local delicacies can be an attraction for tourists.
- b. Gastronomy is the most ideal field for experiential tourism. Tourists can accumulate unforgettable memories by experiencing new tastes and participating in the local food culture. Cooking workshops, local market tours and culinary tours allow tourists to explore the destination in greater depth.
- c. Local dishes can be an effective way to increase the number of tourists in a destination. Because gastronomy is an important factor in tourists' decision to visit a particular region. Positive comments and media sharing about food or restaurants specific to a destination can attract tourists and increase demand for the destination.
- d. Gastronomy activities can promote sustainable tourism. Restaurants based on local producers and using traditional recipes can support the local economy and preserve cultural heritage. In addition, using local produce and traditional dishes can also help protect the local environment and ecosystems.
- e. Gastronomy activities can be used effectively in the promotional materials and marketing campaigns of the destination. Food photos and promotion of local delicacies can attract the attention of tourists and highlight the unique characteristics of the destination.

As a result, gastronomic activities can affect tourists' decision to visit a region as an important element in destination promotion. Emphasizing local flavors and food culture can reveal the unique characteristics of the destination and help tourists have unforgettable experiences.

REFERENCES

1. Akkaya, A., Özcan, C. C. (2019). Türkiye’de Gastronomi Turizminin Ekonomik Etkilerinin İndeks Değerlendirmesi. *International Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 6(32), 251-267. <https://doi.org/10.26450/jshsr.1032>
2. Aksoy, M., Sezgi, G. (2015). Gastronomi Turizmi ve Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi Gastronomik Unsurları. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 3(3), 79-89. <https://jotags.net/index.php/jotags/article/view/130/181>,
3. Alyakut, Ö. (2020). Destinasyon Pazarlaması Kapsamında Gastronomi Bilgi İçeriklerinin Analizi: Web Siteleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(3), 1867-1884. Doi: 10.26677/TR1010.2020.455

4. Aydın, B. O., Duğan, Ö., Gürbüz, S. (2017). Gastronomi TV Programı Kaynaklı Turizm: Gaziantep Örneği. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(5), 33-48. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mjss/issue/40513/485776>
5. Single, A., Belpınar, A. (2015). Turistlerin Gastronomi Turizmine İlişkin Görüşlerinin Milliyetlerine Göre Değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Yasar University*, 10(38), 6519-6530. <https://doi.org/10.19168/jyu.34717>
6. Birdir, K., Akgöl, Y. (2015). Gastronomi Turizmi ve Türkiye'yi Ziyaret Eden Yabancı Turistlerin Gastronomi Deneyimlerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *İşletme ve İktisat Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 3(2), 57-68.
7. Coşkun, R., Altunışık, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S., Yıldırım, E. (2015). Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri SPSS Yöntemleri. Sakarya: Sakarya Kitabevi.
8. Erbay, M., Sabur, D. G. (2022). Gastronomi Turizmi Kapsamında Pazarlama Stratejileri: Türkiye ve Avrupa Örneği. *Journal of Tourism Gastronomy Studies*, 10(1), 649-670. <https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2022.1009>
9. Erciyas, N., Yılmaz, İ. (2021). Gastronomi Turizminin Gelişiminde Gastronomi Festivalleri ve Türkiye'deki Mevcut Durumu. *ART/icle: Sanat ve Tasarım Dergisi*, 1(1), 91-108. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1993869>.
10. Erşahin, E. & Kızıllırmak, İ. (2019). Gastronomi Turlarına Katılan Turistlerin Memnuniyet Faktörlerinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 7 (4), 2466-2480. <https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2019.482>.
11. Festivall. (2023). *Etkinlik Takvimi*. www.festivall.com.tr: <https://festivall.com.tr/takvim/> A. Date: 20/02/2023.
12. Gabriel, K.R. (1981). Biplot Display of Multivariate Matrices for Inspection of Data and Diagnosis. In V. Barnett (ed.), *Interpreting Multivariate Data* Wiley, Chichester, pp. 147-173.
13. Galvez, J.C.P., Lopez-Guzman, T., Buiza, F. C., Medina- Viruel, M. J. (2017). Gastronomy as an Element Of Attraction in a Tourist Destination: The Case of Lima, Peru. *Journal of Ethnic Food*, 4(4), 254-261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jef.2017.11.002>
14. Güzel, G. Ş., Ünver, G. (2015). Destinasyon Pazarlama Aracı Olarak "Gastronomi Turizmi": İstanbul'un Gastronomi Turizmi Potansiyeli Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 3(2), 63-73. <https://jotags.net/index.php/jotags/article/view/118/165>
15. Hoşcan, N. (2018). Küreselleşme Sürecinde Yöresel Gastronomik Ürünlerin Üretiminde ve Pazarlanmasında Kooperatifçilik Üzerine Bir Model Önerisi. *Güncel Turizm Araştırma Dergisi*, 2(Ek1), 390-413. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/513925>
16. İnanır, A. (2019). Türk Turizminde Tanıtım Sorunları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Issues*, 1(1), 58-65. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/898243>
17. Keskin, E. (2021). *Gastronomi Festivalleri*. Ö. Yayla ve H. Çetiner içinde, *Turizm Alanında Güncel Konu ve Yaklaşımlar* (s. 29-39). Çizgi Kitabevi, Konya.
18. Koçoğlu, C. M. (2019). Yerli Turistlerin Gastronomi Turizmine Yönelik Tutumlarının Demografik Özellikler Açısından İncelenmesi: Gaziantep Örneği. *Gastroia: Journal of Gastronomy and Travel Research*, 3(2), 366-380. <https://doi.org/10.32958/gastoria.532807>
19. Kurtuluş, K. (2010). *Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Türkmen Kitabevi, İstanbul
20. Küçükkömürler, S., Şirvan, N. B., Sezgin, A.C. (2018). Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Gastronomi Turizmi. *International Journal of Tourism, Economic and Business Sciences*, 2(2), 75-55. <https://ijtebs.org/index.php/ijtebs/article/view/234/209>
21. Özdemir, G., Altın, D. D. (2012). Gastronomi Kavramları ve Gastronomi Turizmi Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(1), 1-14. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/748113>

22. Sarıkaya, G, S., Düşmezkalander, E. (2020). Gastronomik Öğelerin Turizm Tanıtım Faaliyetlerindeki Yeri: Tanıtım Bültenleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal*, (2020), 8(2): 2431-2448, <http://dx.doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v8i2.1500>.
23. Scheffe, H. (1999). *The Analysis of Variance*, John Wiley&Sons, Inc. New York
24. Serçek, G. Ö., Serçek, S. (2015). Destinasyon Markalaşmasında Gastronomi Turizminin Yeri ve Önemi. *Journal of Tourism Theory and Research*, 1(1), 15-28. <https://doi.org/10.24288/jttr.202819>
25. Serçeoğlu, N., Boztoprak, F., Tırak, L. (2016). Gastronomi Turizmi ile Şehir Markalaşması İlişkisi: Atatürk Üniversitesi Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 4(2), 94-114. <https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2016.1>
26. Sökmen, C., Özkanlı, O. (2018). Gastronomi Turizmi Alan yazının Gelişimi: *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies* Dergisinde Yayımlanan Makaleler Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 6(2), 99-127., <https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2018.204>.
27. Şengül, S., Türkay, O. (2017). *Türkiye'nin Yöresel Mutfakları*, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.