THE ROLE OF GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATIONS ON CITY BRANDING

Elif Pınar Başkaya
Garanti Bank, Operational Risk Acceptance Management, Turkey
Assoc. Prof. Ayça Can Kırgız Ph.D
İstanbul Kent University, Department of Business Administration, Turkey

Abstract: In todays globalizing world, competition is not only among products, services or companies, but also between countries and cities. From this point of view, it is important that cities that want to gain advantage against to their competitors, should put forward their own features that play an important role in being a brand and to go to benefit from these features. Geographical indications (GI) are marks indicating the origin of a product that shows a product identified with a locality, area, region or country of origin with a distinctive characteristic feature, reputation or other qualities. As this study investigates the role of food products protected under geographical indications on city branding. The main theme of the article, and measuring hypotheses developed from the literature in order to measure consumer perception a questionnaire survey was conducted and analyzed via SPSS 22.0 package program and the validity of hypotheses is tested. As a result, food products under GI protection makes many advantages by their own nature and encourages trade. Also they play an important role in city branding.

JEL classification: I23, Z30

Key words: Geographical indication, geographical indicated food product, city branding.

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays cities are struggling with each other for branding like a product or service. Becoming a brand city means becoming preference of the target market as well as being more valuable in the eyes of target market. While this value for a product means that it sold more and made profit, for cities that means more visitors, more investors and more revenue for itself. In today's world where competition is increasing in all areas of life and global scale, attracting new investors from all corners of the world becomes important for executives and decision makers of cities. A city that is attractive for its target audience would gain competitive advantage with the help of bringing its own specific food products into the forefront. Cities can also take the stage by register their own food products that are grown on or foods that are produced within their own geography, attract the attention of tourists and investors like a company that uses marketing strategies to sell its own products (Kirgiz, 2011, p.45).

In light of this information, the role of food products under geographical indications (GI) on city branding is examined in this study. As this study investigates the role of food products protected under geographical indications on city branding, the concept of geographical indication which was priorly handled as an intellectual property right, for the first time, in this article, is handled by applying to a city.

FOOD PRODUCTS WITH GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATION AND CITY BRANDING

A geographical indication (GI) is a sign used for agricultural products that have a specific geographical origin and hold qualities or a fame that are due to that origin. In order to function as a GI, a sign must identify a product as originating in a given place. Besides, the qualities, characteristics or reputation of the product should be essentially due to the place of origin. Since the qualities depend on the geographical place of production, there is a clear link between the product and its original place of production.

Geographical indications (GI) help the identification of product which comes from a particular geographical region as holding specific unique characteristics, quality or fame owing to this geographical origin. All those abovementioned fame, quality and characteristics of geographical indication product is fundamentally attributable to its geographical origin. The product may be directly named after a country, region or zone or indirectly be implied to anywhere else as long as the fame of the product belongs to a particular geographical region. GIs may have either geographical or non-geographical names which are coming from the origin region. For instance, Pashmina Shawls, Scotch Whiskey, Toscana Olive Oil, Bresse Chicken, Kancheepuram Silk etc. are some of products that have direct reference to the place of origin.

According to Addori, “Geographical indications (GIs) are intellectual property rights which identify a good as originating in a certain territory or a region where a given quality, reputation or other characteristic is essentially attributable to its geographic origin”. Another definition of geographical indications are made by World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), “A geographical indication is a sign used on products that have a specific geographical origin and possess qualities or a reputation that are due to that origin”. Another definition is that Geographical Indicators (GIs) illustrates places which are inspired by the origin of products (Menapace, L., 2010). Geographical names have been used since time immemorial in order to characterize products of specific quality and uniqueness; to illustrate, historical documents shows that olive oil from Baetica was praised in Rome (Blázquez 1992, pp. 173-188). Products carrying traces of cultural heritage of a place or local folkloric characteristics often mix the benefits of the place in where its raised or manufactured and authenticity of the good with stories which increases its perception by the consumers.

Brands are distinguishing signs while geographical indications are used as a primary definer sign. As featuring traditional and local characteristics of products, geographical indications are pretty commonly used in order to differentiate products from equivalents in global markets. Launching products to markets with attractive packages or distinguishing brands are not sufficient by the producers of goods, in order to prove the quality of the product some definer terms are needed. The best practice of those definer terms is geographical indications. For instance, the value of an attractive white cheese package with a specific brand logo on it increases a lot more after the statement of “Ezine Peyniri” or any other geographical indication. Many researches shows that indication of origin on a product is generally considered as an extrinsic product cue. In other respects,

like brand names, “Made in …” statements on products have an important role to change consumer perception of goods which assure producers of competition advantage and recognisability on the market.

Attack to consumers and legal producers through incorrect usage of geographical indications by unauthorized parties is demonstrated as the reason of the requirement of the protection of geographical indications. In case of there are no such protections, consumers may be deceived via fake products instead of original products. On the other hand, legal producers are divested of valuable businesses and fame of the product is made damaged.

Another reason of that GIs are required to be protected in order to prevent to turning these products into generic names. For instance, sparkling wines produced in Champagne region of France became famous with the name of “Champagne”. However, although the name of this product is originated from the place in where the product is produced, it becomes a generic name and each sparkling wine produced either in Champagne Region or not, started to be announced as “Champagne”. Hereby, this name is started to become distanced from proving that special characteristics are arisen from the region in where the product is produced.

Separately from trademarks (brand and patent…etc.) which identifies a good or service as originating from a particular legal entity / company, geographical indications identify a good or service as originating from a particular territory. Besides, while a trademark is illustrated as an arbitrary sign, geographical indications are generally predetermined by the name of a geographical origin where the characteristics of good/service comes from. In other words, geographical indications do not protect only one producer but also all producers whose productions are under the predefined circumstances.

In both domestic and international markets, programs to make branding and marketing of geographical indicated products are required to be designated and performed in order to unlock their commercial potential. Protection of products with GI label can be used as a political and marketing instrument increasing income and employment in rural areas especially for women in Anatolia and increasing exportation incomes.

Geographical indications enable the improvement of the rural products based upon local resources; therefore, play an important role in rural development with the added value that they created.

According to the “Türkiye Lezzet Haritası” study of Ankara Chamber of Commerce and Ankara Patent Institute including 81 cities of Turkey, Turkey has a rich cuisine with 2205 type of regional food and beverage. Upon this study, Gaziantep cuisine consisted of 291 type of food, dessert and beverage is placed on the top of the list, Elazığ pursues Gaziantep with 154 type and with 93 type of food Ankara takes the 3rd place. Although all of the food and beverages are not indicated with GI label, the study shows the potential of the variety of goods of Turkey. However, in current situation only 184 food products have GI labels in Turkey as of November 2019 (Ankara Ticaret Odası-ATO).

IMPORTANCE OF BRANDING FOR FOOD PRODUCTS WITH GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATION

For social, economic and cultural reasons, it is crucial to protect geographical indications. Through products which are rooted in culture, history, tradition and geographical origin, GIs add value to local communities. Geographical indications

promote the rural development, in addition to support new employment opportunities in production related areas. Most of countries have a wide range of local products which are suitable for the concept of geographical indications; however, merely some of them are known and only a few are protected. Branding of GIs let producers and exporters take advantage of their products through revealing commercial potential of them.

A brand supports sellers to constitute a unique identity and therefore give tips to customers associated with the product characteristics such as origin, quality, taste…etc. which are matter to them. By this means, brands create value to customers as giving cues related to product quality assurance and advantage of trustworthiness. GIs prevent unfair competition from imitation products. Customers are willing to buy more products from the sellers who offer better value and quality assurance with GIs.

Leveraging geographical indications in branding strategy provide differentiation which creates brand equity by helping recognition and increased awareness, building quality perceptions, and generating customer loyalty. In case of the customer confirms the value of any GI product, their stickiness to the product will increase and it becomes hard to change product preference on the basis of lower prices.

According to Teuber (2011, p. 900), Branding of GIs creates advantages to producers which are indicated as follows:

Enables Product differentiation: Lack of a specific brand name, a product is only one of similar products in the market. On the other hand, a common GI brand enables that all sellers within the GI region to differentiate their products from the non GI products in the market.

Prevents unfair competition: GIs prevent unfair competition from imitation products.

Market share increase and price premium: Products protected by Geographical Indications are sold at premium prices as marking up prices by increasing the value of brand. Branding add value to customers in terms of quality, uniqueness, identification, reliability, thereby sellers are enabled to charge their products at premium prices.

Increases the speed of market penetration: With the help of being well-known and having powerful reputation, it becomes easy to penetrate new markets.

Provides trade cooperation: A preferable brand gets easier access to retail market and let sellers have strong negotiating power.

In addition to abovementioned advantages, another motivation factor created to customers by using GI labeled products is the feeling of contributing national economy. Based upon self-motivation of love of country, people feels like that they benefit to the micro economy by using products originated from their own countries.

2. DATA & METHOD

On the purpose of evaluating the role of food products protected under geographical indications on city branding which is the main theme of the article, and measuring hypotheses developed from the literature in order to measure consumer perception a questionnaire survey was conducted. In the questionnaire survey, participants were asked about their knowledge about local food products and foods, their opinions regarding the influence of those local food products on the city branding. In response to questionnaire responses the role and effect of food products under geographical indications on city branding is analyzed via SPSS 22.0 package program and the validity of hypotheses is tested.

In the analysis of the data; descriptive statistics are presented with frequency, percent, mean, standard deviation. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used in comparison of three phase groups. In order to identify different groups, Sidak test was applied. Correlation analysis was performed to make analysis of the relationships between the sub-dimensions and regression analysis to model relationship between dimensions. P values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant in the study.

Hypotheses

H1: There is a relationship between "city branding" and "food products protected under geographical indications".

H2: There is a relationship between "city branding" and "criteria for purchasing food products".

H3: There is a relationship between "city branding" and "product preference criteria".

3. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS AND FINDINGS

Limitations of the research; not being able to reach the population therefore online survey was applied to 450 participants. So random sampling method was used. The products subject to the study are protected by registration and control by the Turkish Patent Institute.

In the questionnaire survey, participants were asked about their knowledge about local food products and foods, their opinions regarding the influence of those local food products on the city branding. In response to questionnaire responses the role and effect of food products under geographical indications on city branding is analyzed via SPSS 22.0 package program and the validity of hypotheses is tested.

4. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

As stated in Table 1, it was found that 58% of the participants were female and 42% were male. It was determined that 16-24% of participants, 25-34 of 48%, 35-44 of 17%, 45-54 of 12%, 55-64 of 6% and 2% were over 65 years of age. It was determined that 2% of the participants had primary education, 6% had high school education, 51% had undergraduate education and 41% had graduate level education. It was found that 14% of the participants were students, 6% were not working, 7% were retired, 61% were in the public sector and 13% were in the private sector. 41% of the respondents were married and 59% were single. 3% of the participants have 500-1000, 5% have 1001-2000, 15% have 2001-3000, 17% have 3001-4000, 18% have 4001-5000 and 43% have over 5001 TL monthly income.

Table 1. Properties of participants

Gender	n	%
Woman	234	57,9
Man	170	42,1
Age	n	%
18-24	63	15,6
25-34	192	47,5
35-44	69	17,1
45-54	49	12,1
55-64	25	6,2
Over 65	6	1,5
Education	n	%
Primary education	7	1,7
High school	26	6,4
License	207	51,2
Graduate	164	40,6
Working Status	n	%
Student	55	13,6
Not working	25	6,2
Retired	27	6,7
Public	246	60,9
Private sector	51	12,6
Marital Status	n	%
The married	164	40,6
Single	240	59,4
Total Monthly Revenue	n	%
500-1000	11	2,7
1001-2000	20	5,0
2001-3000	60	14,9
3001-4000	67	16,6
4001-5000	72	17,8
Over 5001	174	43,1

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants were asked that how often they buy food products. They give the following answers to this question as in seen in Table 2.

Table 2: Frequency of food product shopping of participants

How often do you buy food products?	N	%
Everyday	39	9,7
2-4 per week	246	60,9
1 week	83	20,5
1 per month	36	8,9

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants were asked that how much money they spent on during the food product purchasing. They give the following answers to this question as in seen in Table 3. It was found that 2% of the participants spend under 20 TL, 26% between 21-50 TL, 38% between 51-100 TL, 25% between 101-200 TL and 9% over 200 TL.

Table 3: Money spent by participants during the food product purchasing

How much do you spend during your food product purchasing?	N	%
Below 20 TL	9	2,2
21-50 TL	104	25,7
51-100 TL	155	38,4
101-200 TL	100	24,8
200 TL	36	8,9

Source: Authors' contribution

As is illustrated in Table 4., according to the answers, the first city-geographical indicated food product couple that comes to mind from the point of participants is Finike (orange) with 7%, Gaziantep Baklavası with 6%, Malatya Kayısısı with 5%, Kayseri Pastırması with 5%, Kars, Adana Kebap with 3, Hatay Künefe with 3%, Rize Çayı with 3%, Gaziantep Kebap with 3% and Erzincan Tulumu with 2%. The most frequently given these responses compose 41% of the total responses.

Table 4: The first city-food product couple coming to mind

Which is the city / food product couple that first comes to mind as geographical indication for you?	n	%
Finike Portakalı	29	7,2
Gaziantep Baklavası	24	5,9
Malatya Kayısısı	21	5,2
Kayseri Pastırması	19	4,7
Kars Kaşarı	17	4,2
Adana kebap	15	3,7
Hatay Künefe	11	2,7
Rize Çayı	11	2,7
Antep Kebap	10	2,5
Erzincan Tulumu	9	2,2

Source: Authors' contribution

It is given in Table 5, 91% of respondents answered that they read labels on food packages.

Table 5: Participant distribution according to reading labels

Do you read labels on food package?	n	%
Yes	368	91,1
No	36	8,9

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants were asked that why they buy geographically indicated food products. They give the following answers to this question which are stated below from the highest rank to lowest as in seen in Table 6.

Table 6: Reasons of participants to prefer geographically indicated food products (most answered questions)

I buy geographically indicated food products because	n	%
More delicious, Better quality, Healthier	34	8,4
Contribution to the regional economy, More delicious, Better quality, Healthier	26	6,4
More delicious	26	6,4
Contribution to the regional economy	25	6,2
Healthier	23	5,7
More delicious, Healthier	21	5,2
Contribution to the regional economy, More delicious, Better appearance, Cheaper, Accessibility, Higher quality, Healthier, Not pleased with substitute goods	18	4,5
Contribution to the regional economy, More delicious, Higher quality, Healthier, Not pleased with substitute goods	14	3,5
Contribution to the regional economy, More delicious	13	3,2

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants were asked that where they buy geographically indicated food products. They give the following answers to this question which are stated below from the highest rank to lowest as in seen in Table 7.

Table 7: Places where participants buy geographically indicated food products

Where do you buy geographically marked products?	n	%
Supermarket	65	16,1
Supermarket, I buy from my hometown	29	7,2
District bazaar, Local bazaar, I buy from my hometown	29	7,2
I buy from my hometown	25	6,2
Supermarket, District bazaar, Local bazaar, I buy from my hometown	20	5,0
Local bazaar, I buy from my hometown	18	4,5
Supermarket, Greengrocer, District bazaar, Local bazaar, I buy from my hometown	17	4,2
Supermarket, Local Bazaar, I buy from my hometown	17	4,2
Supermarket, Local Market	14	3,5
District bazaar, I buy from the country or market	14	3,5

Source: Authors' contribution

Varience analysis (ANOVA) was performed in order to examine the role of food products protected under geographical indications on city branding in this study. The results of the analyzes on the tables are given together with the mean, standard deviation, variance analysis test statistic value (F) and corresponding critical decision probability value (p). In the different groups, Sidak binary comparison (post hoc test) was applied to determine which variables cause the difference.

Table 8: Participants' perceptions regarding certified food products on city branding

Certified food products	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	p
Never	12	3,75	1,02	3,78	0,01
Sometimes	66	4,06	0,66		
Often	109	4,03	0,77		
Mostly	78	3,97	0,85		
Always	137	4,28	0,62		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants' perceptions about the certification of products were found to be influential on city branding perception levels ($F = 3.78$, $p < 0.05$) as is seen in Table 8. City branding points received from participants who always prefer certificated products during the purchasing activity of packaged food products are more than other preferances (mostly, often, sometimes, never). It was found that the level of city branding of participants who always prefer certificated products during the purchasing activity of packaged food products is more than other group of participants ($p < 0.01$).

Participants' perceptions about the local products were found to be influential on city branding perception levels ($F = 4,12$, $p < 0,05$) as is seen in Table 9. City branding points received from participants who always prefer local products during the purchasing activity of packaged food products are more than other preferances (mostly, often, sometimes, never). Participants who always prefer local products in the stage of purchasing packaged food products were found to have higher city branding level than the other groups ($p < 0.01$).

Table 9: Participants' perceptions regarding local food products on city branding

Local food products	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	p
Never	29	4,04	0,80	4,12	0,01
Sometimes	129	4,02	0,67		
Often	105	4,00	0,77		
Mostly	60	4,06	0,79		
Always	79	4,42	0,67		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Participants' opinions regarding to purchasing of labeled food products were not found to have any significant impact on city branding perception levels (F = 0.37, p> 0.05) as is seen in Table 101. It was noted that the perception level of city branding of participants whose preferances about purchasing labeled food products are mostly, often, sometimes, is identical.

Table 10: Participants' perceptions regarding labeled food products on city branding

Labeled food products	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Sometimes - Never	22	4,07	0,54	0,37	0,83
Often	105	4,08	0,72		
Mostly	75	4,03	0,95		
Always	200	4,14	0,67		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants' opinions about the freshness of food products they purchased were not found to have any effect on city brand perception levels (F = 1.21, p> 0.05) as is seen in Table 112. It has been found that the perception level of city branding of participants who often, sometimes, often, and sometimes, pay attention to the freshness of food products are same with each other.

Table 11: Participants' perceptions regarding freshness of food products on city branding

Freshness of food products	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Sometimes	61	4,08	0,64	1,21	0,31
Mostly	76	4,02	0,83		
Always	265	4,12	0,73		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants' perception level about the appearance of food products they bought were found to be influential on city branding perception levels (F = 3.63, p <0.05) as is seen in Table 12. City branding points received from participants who never prefer food products that have good appearance during the purchasing activity of packaged food products are more than other preferances (always, mostly, often, sometimes). It was

[1]Sometimes and never groups are merged because the number in the group is insufficient.
[2] Sometimes and frequent groups are combined because the number in the group is insufficient.

found that the level of city branding of participants who never prefer food products that have good appearance during the purchasing activity of packaged food products is more than other group of participants ($p < 0.01$).

Table 12: Participants' perceptions regarding freshness of food products on city branding

Appearance of food product	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Never	11	4,66	0,54	3,63	0,01
Sometimes	51	4,18	0,59		
Often	135	3,99	0,76		
Mostly	91	4,01	0,82		
Always	114	4,22	0,68		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

It was found that the participants' opinions about nutritional values of food products they purchase were not found to have any effect on city brand perception levels ($F = 1.18$, $p > 0.05$) as is seen in Table 13. It has been determined that the level of preference of the food products they purchased according to their nutritional value do not affect the level of city branding perceptions of the participants.

Table 13: Participants' perceptions regarding nutritional values of food products on city branding

Nutritional value of food product	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Never	9	4,21	0,54	1,18	0,32
Sometimes	61	3,98	0,65		
Often	99	4,02	0,77		
Mostly	111	4,14	0,75		
Always	122	4,18	0,76		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

It was found that the opinions of the participants regarding to storage conditions of food products they purchased were not effective on the level of city branding perceptions ($F = 1.33$, $p > 0.05$) as is seen in Table 14. It was determined that the level of preference of the food products according to the storage conditions do not affect the level of city branding perception of the participants.

Table 14: Participants' perceptions regarding storage conditions of

food products on city branding

Storage Conditions of food products	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Never	11	3,93	0,78	1,33	0,26
Sometimes	58	4,21	0,62		
Often	122	4,10	0,74		
Mostly	82	3,96	0,84		
Always	129	4,16	0,71		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants' opinions regarding to appetizingness of food products they purchased were not found to have an affect on city branding perception levels (F = 2.13, p> 0.05) as is seen in Table 15. It has been determined that the level of preference of food products they purchase according to appetizingness level do not affect the level of city branding perception of the participants.

Table 15: Participants' perceptions regarding appetizingness of food products on city branding

Appetizingness of food products	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Never	50	4,15	0,71	2,13	0,08
Sometimes	100	3,97	0,69		
Often	120	4,15	0,65		
Mostly	76	4,01	0,90		
Always	56	4,28	0,75		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants' opinions regarding to seasonality of food products they purchased were not found to have an affect on city branding perception levels (F = 0,96, p> 0,05) as is seen in Table 16. It has been determined that the level of preference of food products they purchase according to seasonality do not affect the level of city branding perception of the participants.

Table 16: Participants' perceptions regarding seasonality of food products on city branding

Seasonality of food products	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Sometimes- Never	50	4,03	0,58	0,96	0,43
Often	111	4,09	0,76		
Mostly	126	4,08	0,75		
Always	115	4,12	0,77		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

It has been found that the opinions of the participants regarding to the fact that prices of the food products they purchased are higher than substitute food products, have no affect on city branding perception levels ($F = 0,74$, $p > 0,05$) as is seen in Table 17. It has been determined that the level of preference of food products they purchased that have higher prices in comparison with substitute food products do not affect the level of city branding perception of the participants.

Table 17: Participants' perceptions regarding higher food product prices on city branding

Higher food product prices	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Never	81	4,12	0,68	0,74	0,57
Sometimes	138	4,04	0,76		
Often	98	4,10	0,70		
Mostly	40	4,10	0,89		
Always	45	4,25	0,69		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants' opinions regarding to the fact that products they purchased are organic, have no affect on city branding perception levels ($F = 1.83$, $p > 0.05$). It was determined that the perception level of city branding of the participants who tend to buy products at different levels according to the organic status of the products they purchased is not different.

Table 18: Participants' perceptions regarding to organic food products on city branding

Organic food products	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Never	32	4,34	0,64	1,83	0,12
Sometimes	94	4,05	0,73		
Often	105	4,06	0,76		
Mostly	97	4,02	0,72		
Always	74	4,22	0,75		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

Participants' perception level regarding to brand of food products they bought were found to be influential on city branding perception levels ($F = 3,12$, $p < 0,05$) as is seen in Table19. City Branding points received from participants who never consider brand of food products during the purchasing activity of packaged food products are more than other preferances (always, mostly, often, sometimes). It was found that the level of city branding of participants who never consider brand of food products during the purchasing activity of packaged food products is more than other group of participants ($p < 0.01$).

Table 19: Participants' perceptions regarding to brand of food products on city branding

Brand of food products	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	P
Never	13	4,72	0,52	3,12	0,02
Sometimes	40	4,12	0,62		
Often	115	4,02	0,76		
Mostly	123	4,04	0,76		
Always	111	4,17	0,71		
Total	402	4,10	0,74		

Source: Authors' contribution

5. INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CITY BRANDING VARIABLES

In this study, correlation analysis was performed to make analysis of the relationships between the sub-dimensions; city branding, food products protected under geographical indications, product preference criteria and criteria for purchasing food products. The results of correlation analysis are given as a summary including correlation coefficient (r) and level of significance (p) values in the Table 20:

Table 20: Correlation analysis- relationships between the sub-dimensions

Dimensions		City Branding	Food products protected under Geographical Indications	Product Preference Criteria	Criteria for purchasing food products
City Branding	r	1	0,75**	0,69**	0,71**
	p		0,01	0,01	0,01
	n	404	404	404	404
Food products protected under Geographical Indications	r	0,75**	1	0,55**	0,63**
	p	0,01		0,01	0,01
	n	404	404	404	404
Product Preference Criteria	r	0,69**	0,55**	1	0,85**
	p	0,01	0,01		0,01
	n	404	404	404	404
Criteria for purchasing food products	r	0,71**	0,63**	0,85**	1
	p	0,01	0,01	0,01	
	n	404	404	404	404

***0,01 level demonstrates meaningful relation.*

It was found that there is a significant correlation between the level of food products protected under geographical indications of the participants and the level of city branding in the positive direction ($r = 0,75$, $p < 0,01$). According to the participants, food products which are protected under Geographical Indications has a positive impact on advertisement of the city, city economy, demand for tourism which impacts city branding in positive aspect. It was found that there was a significant correlation between participants' product preference levels and city branding levels ($r = 0,69$, $p < 0,01$). It has been determined that participants consider that preferance of products according to the product characteristics, origin, reliability, awareness, price, presentation, package, quality, promotion has an important effect on city branding.

It was found that there was a significant and high power relationship between the level of criteria for purchasing food products and city branding levels ($r = 0,71$, $p < 0,01$). Participants' criteria for purchasing food products; such as being certified, being labeled, expire date, good appearance, nutritional values, storage conditions, being appetizing, seasonality, having higher price than substitute products, being organic, brand; has significant effect on city branding.

In this study; the modeling of the relationship between the sub-dimensions (product preference criteria, food products protected under geographical indications, criteria for purchasing food products and city branding) was carried out with regression analysis. In the regression model, on the purpose of determining that whether the model is meaningful or not, it is necessary to obtain necessary results from 3 basic analyses. These are R2 value, meaningfulness of the model and the meaningfulness of the coefficients. It is not possible to talk about the regression model if even one of these three basic subjects

does not meet the desired norms. Variables whose coefficients are not found meaningful are removed from the model and the analysis is performed again.

In this study; how product preference criteria, food products protected under geographical indications and criteria for purchasing food products sub-dimensions influence city branding, which is the most affecting subject and the level of change on product preference criteria, food products protected under geographical indications, criteria for purchasing food products was examined.

In the obtained model; it has been found that product preference criteria, food products protected under geographical indications and criteria for purchasing food products sub-dimensions affect city branding dimension. The model is found to be mathematically meaningful (F = 22,60, p = 0,001, p <0,05) as is seen in Table 21. The coefficients (β) of dimensions (product preference criteria, food products protected under geographical indications, criteria for purchasing food products) were found as meaningful (tfppugi=9,44, tppc=6,37, tcfpfp=7,24, p=0,001, p<0,05). Percentage of changes in those dimensions on City Branding was found to be around 82% (R2=0,823).

Table 21: Regression analysis- model of the relationship between the sub-dimensions

Dependent variable	R^2	Model	Food products protected under Geographical Indications	Product Preference Criteria	Criteria for Purchasing Food Products
(Y)			Coefficients (β)		
City Branding	0,823	F=22,60	0,72	0,41	0,59
		p=0,001	p=0,001	p=0,001	p=0,001

Y (city branding) = 0,72 * (food products protected under geographical indications) + 0,41 * (product preference criteria) + 0,59 * (criteria for purchasing food products) (4.1)

According to the model as indicated in Formula 4.1, it was determined that the most important variable affecting city branding is the “food products protected under geographical indications”. While an increase in one unit of food products protected under geographical indications dimension results in an increase of 0.72 units in city branding, an increase in one unit of in the criteria for purchasing food products dimension results in an increase of 0.59 units in city branding. An increase in one unit of product preference criteria dimension results in an increase of 0.41 units in city branding.

In the model; it has been determined that product preference criteria, food products protected under geographical indications, criteria for purchasing food products sub-dimensions are in place and it was observed that all sub-dimensions affect city branding at very high level (R2 = 0,823).

According to this study, the food products protected under geographical indications is the most effective subject on city branding (**β = 0.72**), which situation is followed by criteria for purchasing food products (**β = 0.59**), product preference criteris (**β = 0.41**) (p< 0.05).

6. DISCUSSION& CONCLUSION

Turkey has a variety of climates, various types of cultural inheritances and enormous human capital with different kind of food products, but the number of GI food products under protection is critically low which creates a big contrast to its potential. Lack of awareness about GI food products, lack of knowledge about advantages of GI labels on both producers and consumers are some of reasons that's why GI labeled food products are so few in our country.

Differentiation and identification constitute the essence of branding together. In order to provide the differentiation, there must be unique characteristics, features or outcomes and identification comes from the name, logo, symbol or sign related to a product. According to Tregear and Gorton (2005, pp. 399-401), geographical indication can be considered as a powerful tool which can easily be leveraged in order to attain both differentiation and identification.

Geographical indications promote the rural development, while supporting new employment opportunities in production related areas. Many countries have a wide range of local products which are suitable for the concept of geographical indications; but only some of them are known and only a few are protected. Branding of GIs let producers and exporters take advantage of their products through revealing commercial potential of them. GIs also contribute to socio-economic development of the region to where they belong to and have immanent potential to enhance sustainable development. They strategically create employment opportunities for the public as a whole while ensuring economic welfare.

Protection of the patents, copyrights, and other similar creative activities provides very few benefit to the developing countries. Therefore, food products under GI protection makes simple advantages by their own nature and encourages trade.

Geographical indications can be assumed a type of branding tool that adds economic value to agricultural food products by accepting the worth of human capabilities and natural resources during the whole production process, transferring cultural heritage as using region of origin and creating unique identity for the products.

In today's globalization process historical, cultural and social assets of countries become very significant for tourism purposes as well as sustainable development. Countries are under risk increasing day by day, as a result of economic, political and technological changes, inevitable urban evolution and deterioration, restricted resources, worldwide competition. Increasing competition at the global stage obliged countries to be aware about their own local resources. Local food products are the main asset of countries. In order to survive at the international trade level, it is important to enter into rivalry with the other countries especially for developing countries such as Turkey. Turkey has a rich cuisine with 2205 type of regional food and beverage however even as Turkey has so much wealthy cuisine and cultural heritage, it could not be utilized and presented to the world efficiently.

In the current study the role of food products protected under GIs on city branding are analyzed in detail. GI labels is used for products that's all production, processing and preparation are performed within a specific region or place or country. For instance Ezine Peyniri, Gaziantep Baklavası, Amasya Elması, Kayseri Pastırması are only some of raised or processed within the boundaries of Turkey by the reason of physical and humane characteristics and quite specific to the region. Even those food products or foods are made somewhere else different from their origin regions, it does not give the

same or even a similar taste. Therefore there is a strong relationship between local products and their originated regions/countries. Many studies reveals that countries are remembered with their localized food products and this relation makes contribution to branding of cities. Countries benefits from food products under GI labels involuntarily since local food products hype countries up to the world with their fame. Correlatively, with increasing tourism potential, economies of countries are developed. Tourists who visits a destination, firstly want to learn and taste the cuisine culture of the place.

REFERENCES

1. Addor, F. & Grazioli A., Geographical indications beyond wines and spirits: A roadmap for a better protection for geographical indications in the WTO Trips Agreement. Journal of World Intellectual Property, 5 (6), 2002, pp. 865-897.
2. Addor, F. Geographical indications: Important issues for industrialized and developing countries. The IPTS report. p. 24. 2003
3. Blázquez, J. M. The latest work on the export of Baetican Olive Oil to Rome and the army. Greece & Rome. 39 (2), 2009, pp.173-188.
4. Herrmann, R., and R. Teuber. "Geographically Differentiated Products." In J. Lusk, J. Roosen, and J. F. Shogren, eds., Oxford Handbook of the Economics of Food Consumption and Policy, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, 811–842.
5. Kirgiz, A. C. Şehir Markalaşmasının Pazarlama Estetiği ile Desteklenmesi ve İstanbul Örneği. Doctoral Dissertation. Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences, 2011.
6. Menapace, L. Geographical indications and quality promotion in food and agricultural markets: domestic and international issues. Doctoral Dissertation. Iowa State University, Economics, 2010.
7. Reviron S., E. Thevenod-Mottet, N El-Benni "Geographical indications: creation and distribution of economic value in developing countries. NCCR Trade Working Papers, 2009
8. El-Sharkawy, O. K. Exploring knowledge and skills for tourist guides: evidence from Egypt, 2007
9. ATO (Ankara Ticaret Odası), 5 January 2008, http://www.atonet.org.tr/yeni/index.php?p=1473&l=1 [accessed 9 April 2018]
10. WIPO, Economic importance of trademarks and geographical indications and their use in commerce, 2003, http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/arab/en/2003/tm_bey/pdf/wipo_tm_bey_03_3.pdf[accessed 19 March 2017], p. 3.

11. WIPO, nd., http://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/geographical/952/wipo_pub_952.pdf [accessed 9 April 2017], p. 8.

12. WIPO, nd., http://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/geographical/952/wipo_pub_952.pdf [accessed 16 March 2017], p. 13.