

# The Impact of the Slow Food Movement on Sustainable Local Gastronomy: The Case of Northern Cyprus

Ilkcan Cilasin<sup>1</sup> and Mete Unal Girgen<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School and Tourism and Culinary Arts, Final International University, Cyprus

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Business and Economics, Rauf Denktaş University, Cyprus

\* Correspondence: mete.girgen@rdu.edu.tr

## Abstract

This study investigates the impact of the Slow Food movement on sustainability and local gastronomy in Northern Cyprus. After reviewing key concepts such as sustainable gastronomy, local food heritage and regional practices, the research focuses on the five Cittaslow regions of Northern Cyprus and the development of Slow Food activities since 2013. Using a qualitative design with purposive sampling, semi-structured interviews were conducted with twelve participants, including local producers, chefs and regional administrators. The study identifies the challenges faced by local businesses, the role of Slow Food in promoting sustainable practices and the ways regional actors contribute to cultural and environmental preservation. Findings highlight both progress and gaps, offering practical recommendations and outlining areas for future research. As one of the few studies examining Slow Food in Northern Cyprus, the research provides valuable insights and contributes significantly to the existing literature.

**Keywords:** slow food; Northern Cyprus; local gastronomy; sustainability

---

## 1. Introduction

Contemporary food systems must be viewed not as linear structures but as complex, interdependent networks shaped by diverse actors, institutions, and socio-cultural dynamics. As Scoones (2016) argues, food-system transformation arises through alliances, coalitions and socio-political networks, in which farmers, social movements, policymakers, researchers, firms and investors all play integral roles in shaping sustainable futures (Garat & Alexandra, 2022). This perspective underscores the fact that food systems are embedded within broader political, ecological, and cultural processes that require holistic and inclusive governance.

Industrialization accelerated deep shifts in human–environment relations, contributing to the erosion of cultural distinctiveness and the increasing standardization of urban life (Sağır, 2017). The Industrial Revolution also marked the rise of a globalized consumption culture, profoundly influencing culinary practices. Industrial food production led to the widespread adoption of the fast-food paradigm, or what Pietrykowski (2004) describes as McDonaldization, reshaping dietary habits, weakening traditional food cultures, and threatening the survival of local gastronomic identities, particularly in developing regions (Yıldız, 2014).

As a counter-response to these homogenizing forces, the Slow Food movement emerged in Italy in 1986, advocating biodiversity preservation, heritage agriculture, and sustainable gastronomic practices (Avcı Kurt & Özgürel, 2018). Built around the principles of “good, clean, and fair” food, the movement encourages communities to reconnect with local production systems, culinary traditions, and environmentally responsible food choices (Arslan & Seçim, 2023). In an era characterized by technological acceleration and lifestyle intensification, consumers increasingly seek quality, authenticity and ecological responsibility in their food choices (Tokucoglu Yumuşak et al., 2024).

Correspondingly, the Slow Food network works to strengthen people's relationship with food by documenting its origins, production models and cultural meanings, while also addressing global concerns such as obesity, food justice, labor rights and environmental degradation (Barstow et al., 2021a).

Slow Food initiatives—including the Ark of Taste, Presidia, and Terra Madre networks—play a crucial role in safeguarding endangered foods and supporting small-scale, sustainable producers (Barstow et al., 2021b). Over time, the philosophy underpinning the movement has transcended culinary boundaries, inspiring broader “slow living” practices such as slow tourism, slow cities, slow work, and slow education, illustrating the movement's expanding conceptual influence across global socio-cultural contexts (Marenzana, 2023).

### *1.1. Problem Statement*

Evidence from the past five decades indicates that approximately 60% of global ecosystem services have been degraded or used unsustainably, including freshwater resources, fisheries, soil regulation and climate systems (Tencati & Zsolnai, 2012). Agriculture remains one of the most significant contributors to ecological pressure, representing roughly 11% of global land use and a substantial share of water consumption. Deforestation and agricultural intensification also disproportionately contribute to global greenhouse gas emissions. Transitioning toward sustainable development—defined as meeting current needs without compromising future generations—requires economic practices that avoid ecological harm and foster cross-sector collaboration (Tencati & Zsolnai, 2012).

Since the 1980s, research has explored the potential for linking local food producers with tourist demand in developing regions. Despite increasing consumer interest in authentic local foods, the supply chains in many tourism destinations remain dominated by imported goods and standardized menus. This persistent imbalance demonstrates the need for frameworks that integrate economic, cultural, and social dimensions when evaluating food systems in tourism (Laeis et al., 2020). Hospitality professionals frequently report tensions between guest expectations, local food availability and cultural culinary norms—further reinforcing the importance of sustainable, culturally grounded gastronomic strategies.

### *1.2. Purpose of the Study*

This study aims to examine the role and impact of the Slow Food movement on sustainable local gastronomy in Northern Cyprus, with a specific focus on its contributions to cultural preservation, environmental sustainability and community well-being. By engaging chefs, producers and local operators associated with or influenced by the Slow Food philosophy, the study seeks to identify key practices, challenges and opportunities that support sustainable gastronomic development.

Additionally, the research aims to document local producers' perspectives on sustainability, highlight existing gaps and propose evidence-based recommendations. Given the limited academic work on Slow Food and Cittaslow initiatives in Northern Cyprus, this study also aims to enrich the regional and international literature on sustainable gastronomy.

### *1.3. Significance of the Study*

This study holds significant value for both academic research and regional policy-making. Through expert interviews and stakeholder insights, it provides an empirically grounded understanding of how local culinary traditions, sustainability practices and food systems are maintained and transmitted in Northern Cyprus. The findings have the potential to guide policymakers, tourism planners and local operators in developing culturally grounded, sustainable gastronomic strategies. Furthermore, because the topic remains underexplored in the Northern Cyprus context, the study offers an important contribution to filling a notable gap in the literature.

#### 1.4. Research Questions

The primary research question guiding this study is: “What are the impacts of the Slow Food movement on sustainable and local gastronomy?”. Supporting sub-questions include:

1. How does the Slow Food movement influence sustainable gastronomy?
2. How does the movement shape local gastronomic identities and practices?
3. What conceptual and operational frameworks define the Slow Food movement?
4. How is the movement implemented in practice within local contexts?

#### 1.5. Limitations

The research is limited to Cittaslow regions in Northern Cyprus and focuses on businesses, chefs and producers affiliated with or influenced by the Slow Food network. While secondary data from documents and online sources were used to supplement the literature review, the qualitative research design—particularly purposive sampling and semi-structured interviews—limits generalizability. However, this approach offers depth, contextual richness and nuanced insights appropriate for exploratory studies on sustainable gastronomy.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Conceptual Framework: Sustainability and Food Systems

Global environmental challenges such as climate change and biodiversity loss have placed unprecedented pressure on food systems and intensified calls for sustainability-oriented transformations. The Brundtland Report introduced the concept of sustainable development as a process that meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own, highlighting the need for coherent changes in resource use, technology and institutions (WCED, 1987). Sustainability is now widely understood as a multidimensional construct encompassing ecological, social and economic dimensions (Giovannoni & Fabietti, 2013; Kuhlman & Farrington, 2010). It not only addresses environmental protection but also concerns such as social justice, local development and food security (Akay et al., 2023).

The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) explicitly emphasize ending hunger and promoting sustainable food systems, which in turn requires rethinking production, distribution and consumption practices at local and global scales (Akay et al., 2023). In this context, food is increasingly framed as both an ecological and political act, and alternative food movements such as Slow Food have been proposed as pathways to more just and sustainable food futures (Sobreira et al., 2022; Slow Food, 2023).

### 2.2. Sustainability and Sustainable Tourism

Within tourism, sustainability refers to the long-term preservation of environmental resources, cultural heritage and community well-being while ensuring economic viability. Sustainable tourism seeks to balance economic, social and aesthetic needs with the protection of natural and cultural environments (Akdağ et al., 2016; Çilginoğlu et al., 2022). It calls for planning practices that go beyond visitor numbers to include residents’ quality of life, visitor behaviour, and local expectations. Sustainable tourism frameworks typically promote; conservation of ecological and cultural resources; reduction of waste and overconsumption; participation of local stakeholders in decision-making, and continuous monitoring, education and responsible marketing (Demir, 2021). Recent research highlights that local food and gastronomy are increasingly integral to sustainable tourism, particularly in forms such as gastronomy, rural and cultural tourism (Çilginoğlu et al., 2022). In this sense, food is not merely a service but a medium through which destinations express identity, authenticity and sustainability commitments.

### 2.3. Sustainable Gastronomy

The global food sector has undergone a significant transformation, driven by growing consumer concern for health, well-being and environmental impact. Consumers increasingly value not only the nutritional content of food but also its contribution to long-term health, environmental integrity and cultural continuity (Payandeh et al., 2020). These shifts have strengthened the role of gastronomy as a driver of sustainable development, especially when it supports local producers, seasonal products and traditional practices (Rinaldi, 2017).

Studies on gastronomy and tourism typically stress three interrelated themes; food as a tourism product and attraction; food marketing to tourists; and food tourism as a development tool for destinations (Cheng & Huang, 2015; Rinaldi, 2017). Gastronomy tourism offers visitors distinctive culinary experiences rooted in local culture and heritage (Gálvez et al., 2017). In this context, heritage and cuisine are closely linked: gastronomic products and practices help materialize cultural memory, while destinations leverage food to differentiate themselves and build competitive advantage. From a sustainability perspective, gastronomy is often framed through the “People, Planet, Plate” triad, integrating social equity, environmental stewardship and culinary pleasure (Elkington, 2004; Debs, 2013; Petrini & Padovani, 2005). Food is seen not only as nourishment but also as a social practice that fosters conviviality, community and identity (Andrews, 2008).

### 2.4. Local Gastronomy and Sustainable Local Gastronomy

Local gastronomy is shaped by the interaction of multiple civilizations, migration patterns and ecological conditions. It is neither static nor isolated; rather, it evolves through the layering and blending of diverse culinary traditions over time (Hernández-Rojas et al., 2022). Local cuisines are widely recognized as a key component of intangible cultural heritage, providing tourists with authentic sensory experiences and communities with a vehicle for expressing identity (Labelle, 2004). Researchers emphasize that local food products play a critical role in regional growth, sustainability and cultural representation.

The disappearance of local producers can threaten the economic and social vitality of rural communities, while industrialization often accelerates this process (Bilgin & Akoğlu, 2018). For this reason, using locally grown food in hospitality and tourism is considered essential for supporting regional economies, preserving culinary traditions, and strengthening local supply chains and employment (Berno & Fusté-Forné, 2019). Sustainable local gastronomy thus emerges at the intersection of heritage protection, environmental responsibility, and community-based economic development. Within this broader agenda, the Slow Food movement has been particularly influential in positioning local gastronomy as a driver of sustainability and cultural resilience (Çilginoğlu et al., 2022).

### 2.5. The Slow Food Movement: Evolution, Principles and Instruments

The Slow Food movement originated in 1986 in Rome, when the opening of a fast-food outlet near the Spanish Steps triggered protests led by journalist Carlo Petrini against the homogenization of taste and the erosion of local food traditions (Güven, 2011; Altuna et al., 2017). In 1989, representatives from 14 countries signed the Slow Food Manifesto in Paris, officially transforming Slow Food into an international movement devoted to defending “the right to pleasure” and resisting the cultural and ecological impacts of fast food and industrial agriculture (Pietrykowski, 2004; Güven, 2011). In subsequent years, Slow Food developed a range of initiatives and institutions (Salone del Gusto (from 1996), a biennial fair in Turin showcasing small-scale high-quality producers; The Ark of Taste (Ark of Taste), a global catalogue of endangered food products and breeds; Slow Cheese (from 1997), dedicated to raw-milk cheeses and dairy biodiversity; The Presidia programme (from 1999), supporting small-scale producers and threatened products; Terra Madre, launched in 2004, bringing together food communities from around the world; and The University of Gastronomic Sciences in Pollenzo, established to study food in an interdisciplinary way). (Pietrykowski, 2004;

Nabhan et al., 2010; West & Domingos, 2012; Pezzana et al., 2014; Scaffidi, 2014; Amo, 2023; Slow Food, 2023).

Over time, Slow Food has evolved from a primarily gastronomic movement into a politically engaged, global grassroots organization, explicitly addressing topics such as food justice, biodiversity loss, agroecology and climate change (Friedmann & McNair, 2008; Stokes, 2013; Scaffidi, 2014). Leitch (2003) demonstrates how Slow Food's defence of "endangered foods" intersects with debates on European identity, neoliberal governance and the politics of 'slowness' (Leitch, 2003). Contemporary conceptual work further positions Slow Food as a form of alternative food consumption that integrates relational, sensory, temporal, sustainable, cultural and political dimensions, operating under the principles of "good, clean and fair" food (Sobreira et al., 2022).

The well-known "good, clean and fair" triad encapsulates Slow Food's normative orientation (Tencati & Zsolnai, 2012; Petrini, 2013); Good refers to sensory quality, pleasure and health; clean denotes environmentally sound production that respects ecosystems and biodiversity; fair emphasizes social justice, decent working conditions and equitable economic relations for producers and communities. Terroir is central in this framework, linking taste and product identity to specific combinations of climate, soil, landscape and cultural practice (Dias et al., 2020; Sjölander-Lindqvist et al., 2020). Consumers are encouraged to become co-producers, engaging actively with the origins, methods and meanings of their food (Petrini & Padovani, 2005; Debs, 2013; Rosa et al., 2022). Slow Food's Biodiversity Foundation coordinates initiatives such as Ark of Taste, Presidia, Earth Markets and community gardens, protecting thousands of products, producers and traditional practices worldwide (Petrini & Watson, 2001; Fondazione Slow Food, 2011; Yiğit & Bucak, 2017; Güner & Çilginoğlu, 2023). These instruments not only conserve biological and cultural diversity, but also support local economies and stimulate gastronomic tourism through tastings, educational activities and producer-consumer encounters (Bucak, 2016; Peano et al., 2014; Sabur & Güneş, 2023).

#### *2.6. Cittaslow and the Slow Living Agenda*

Inspired by Slow Food, the Cittaslow (Slow City) movement was founded in 1999 in Orvieto, Italy, with the aim of integrating slowness, sustainability and social justice into local governance (Marenzana, 2023; Kim et al., 2021). Cittaslow is a network of small towns (typically under 50,000 inhabitants) committed to improving residents' quality of life by protecting local identity, supporting traditional production, enhancing environmental performance and promoting convivial public spaces (Presenza et al., 2015; Güven, 2011).

Membership requires compliance with a set of criteria related to environmental policy, infrastructure, local products, hospitality, social cohesion and urban quality. By emphasising local distinctiveness and human-scale development, Cittaslow is seen as a response to the homogenizing effects of globalization and mass tourism (Mayer & Knox, 2006; Lowry & Lee, 2016). Cittaslow and Slow Food are closely interconnected: both share commitments to local products, biodiversity, food education and community participation. Initiatives such as school gardens, local markets, traditional food festivals and Terra Madre events are often co-organized under both labels, linking sustainable agriculture, gastronomy and urban policy (Şahin & Kutlu, 2014; Jarossová, 2019).

#### *2.7. Slow Food, Cittaslow and Local Gastronomy in Northern Cyprus*

Northern Cyprus possesses a rich Mediterranean culinary heritage, shaped by layers of Greek, Turkish, Levantine and broader Mediterranean influences (Girgen & Şah, 2020; Çavuşoğlu, 2023). The island's geography and climate support a wide range of local products such as halloumi, carob, citrus, wild herbs, grains, pulses and olive oil, which underpin traditional dishes including şeftali kebab, fırın kebabı, molehiya, kolakas, magarina bulli, pilavuna, various macun (fruit preserves) and local breads (Adalier, 2020; Şah, 2017; Oktay & Güden, 2021; Altun & Elidemir, 2023; Uzkesici & Gürdal, 2024; Ferit, 2022). These products and recipes form the core of the island's gastronomic identity and represent a valuable resource for sustainable tourism development. However, as in

many destinations, industrial food chains, changing lifestyles and globalized consumption patterns pose risks to the continuity of local practices (Yılmaz & Balyemez, 2024).

In this context, the expansion of Cittaslow and Slow Food networks in Northern Cyprus is particularly relevant. Five municipalities have joined the Cittaslow network—Yeniboğaziçi (2013), Lefke (2015), Mehmetçik-Galatya (2016), Geçitkale (2018) and Tatlısu (2019)—each leveraging local products (e.g., artichokes, citrus, carob, olives, organic vegetables) and cultural heritage (festivals, handicrafts, historic sites) as pillars of sustainable, place-based development (Atakan, 2017; Boynukalın, 2019; İnce, 2020; Cittaslow, 2024; Çavuşoğlu, 2023).

Parallel to this, two Slow Food convivia—Slow Food Salamis and Slow Food Kom-i Kebir—have been established, organizing Terra Madre events, local markets, food education activities and producer–consumer encounters that promote traditional Cypriot products such as pilavuna, tarhana, macunlar and local cheeses (Paronich, 2010; Slow Food, 2024b; Atakan, 2017). Local media sources document periodic Terra Madre celebrations, workshops and participation in international Slow Cheese events, as well as seed-saving initiatives and collaborations with other Slow Food communities, indicating an emerging but still under-researched Slow Food ecosystem in the region (Balses, 2013; Kıbrıs Postası, 2015; Yeni Düzen, 2016, 2020; Memleket Kıbrıs, 2024; Haber Kıbrıs, 2022; Diyalog, 2016).

Despite these developments, academic studies on Slow Food, Cittaslow and sustainable local gastronomy in Northern Cyprus remain scarce. This literature gap underscores the relevance of the present study, which empirically investigates how the Slow Food movement interacts with local producers, chefs and municipalities in Cittaslow regions of Northern Cyprus, and how this interaction contributes to the sustainability of local gastronomy.

### 3. Research Methods

This study employs a qualitative research design to investigate how the Slow Food movement shapes sustainable regional gastronomy in Northern Cyprus. Given the complexity of food systems—where cultural values, production practices, consumption patterns and local governance intersect—qualitative inquiry offers an effective means of capturing the nuanced perspectives of chefs, restaurant owners, food producers and municipal actors operating within Slow Food and Cittaslow frameworks. Semi-structured interview questions were adapted from established research on food systems and sustainability transitions, particularly the works of Garat and Alexandra (2022), Bucak and Turan (2016), and Akay et al. (2023), all of which emphasize the networked, multi-actor nature of contemporary gastronomy and the importance of alternative food movements in enhancing sustainability.

A purposive sampling strategy was adopted in alignment with previous studies examining gastronomic networks and regional food practices (Garat & Alexandra, 2022; Caliskan, 2023; Ertaş & Ayaz, 2023). Participants were intentionally selected based on their direct involvement in sustainable or regional gastronomy—either as restaurant operators, chefs, local producers, or decision-makers within municipal bodies connected to Cittaslow or Slow Food initiatives. Purposive sampling was deemed appropriate because it maximizes the relevance and analytic depth of the collected data, a rationale supported by Campbell et al. (2020), who identify credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability as essential elements in strengthening trustworthiness within qualitative research. In total, twelve participants ( $n = 12$ ) from the Cittaslow regions of Yeniboğaziçi, Lefke, Mehmetçik-Galatya, Geçitkale and Tatlısu were recruited and anonymized using the codes R1–R12.

Data collection followed a two-stage process, beginning with an extensive review of academic literature, organizational documents and online sources related to Slow Food activities, Cittaslow implementations, and regional gastronomic traditions in Northern Cyprus. Major academic databases such as Google Scholar and Dergipark were consulted, alongside the official websites of Slow Food and Cittaslow. Due to the scarcity of formal academic research on Slow Food in the Northern Cyprus context, additional insights were drawn from local news archives documenting relevant culinary events, Terra Madre celebrations and regional food festivals. Building upon this

contextual foundation, qualitative data were then gathered through semi-structured interviews conducted either face-to-face or online. The interview protocol covered eight core questions reflecting key themes in sustainable gastronomy literature. All interviews were audio-recorded with participants' consent, transcribed verbatim and stripped of personally identifiable information to preserve anonymity.

The data were analysed using thematic analysis, a method well suited to identifying recurring patterns across qualitative datasets and generating conceptual insights into the interconnections between food, culture and sustainability as shown in Table 1 (Adekunle et al., 2024). The analysis unfolded through three iterative stages. In the first stage, interview transcripts were manually prepared and reviewed multiple times to facilitate familiarity and generate preliminary codes, following the approach of Lamy et al. (2023). In the second stage, the coded data were reorganized around the eight guiding research questions to identify convergent and divergent viewpoints and to refine emerging categories. The final stage involved grouping these categories into overarching themes to ensure analytical coherence, a process informed by the guidelines of Shahrin et al. (2024). This rigorous multi-step approach strengthened the internal consistency and explanatory power of the findings and enhanced the study's overall methodological robustness.

**Table 1. Sub-Problems, Themes, and Codes.**

Sub-Problems	Themes	Codes
What are the considerations regarding the potential use of Slow Food organizations to enhance sustainability and preserve regional character in food and beverage businesses?	<b>1. Slow Food Network's Preservation of Regional Character</b>	Slow Food, Sustainability, Regional cuisine
What are the key challenges facing food and beverage businesses in improving sustainability and preserving regional character?	<b>2. The Challenges of Sustainable Local Businesses</b>	Sustainable, Local restaurant, Challenges
What is the role of chefs in sustainable regional gastronomy?	<b>3. The impact of chefs on Sustainable Regional Gastronomy</b>	Local Restaurant, Chef effect

Trustworthiness was ensured by adherence to Lincoln and Guba's established criteria, further supported by methodological recommendations from Campbell et al. (2020). Credibility was enhanced through sustained engagement with participants and triangulation between interviews, literature and documentary sources. Transferability was achieved through rich contextual descriptions of Cittaslow regions, Slow Food practices and the socio-cultural environment of Northern Cyprus. Dependability was supported by systematic documentation of all methodological steps, from sampling to coding decisions, while confirmability was strengthened through reflexive journaling and an audit trail designed to minimize researcher bias and maintain analytical transparency.

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Final International University (Meeting date: 01.03.2024; Decision No: 2024/06/01). All participants were informed about the purpose of the research, their rights regarding voluntary participation, the confidentiality of their responses and the use of audio recording. Written and/or verbal informed consent was obtained in accordance with ethical research standards. Demographic information was reported in aggregate form to ensure the anonymity of all contributors.

The participant group represented a diverse yet thematically coherent population with extensive experience in gastronomy and regional food practices. Participants ranged widely in age, with the largest groups falling into the 26–35 and 50+ categories, each comprising four individuals, followed by three individuals aged 36–49 and one aged 18–25. The sample was predominantly female,

including eight women and four men. Regionally, the participants were distributed across Geçitkale and Tatlısu (three each), Mehmetçik-Galatya and Lefke (two each) and Yeniboğaziçi (two participants). Professionally, the sample included four restaurant owners, six owner–chefs and two administrative officials involved in regional governance or food-related initiatives. In terms of experience, six participants reported more than eleven years in the field, four had six to ten years of experience, and two had three to five years. This diversity strengthened the richness of the qualitative insights and ensured that the study captured perspectives from across the regional gastronomic ecosystem.

#### 4. Findings

The findings are presented in line with the demographic and eight interview research questions. Each subsection synthesizes common views across participants and illustrates them with selected anonymized quotations (R1–R12) as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. Demographic Information Table of Research Participants.**

<i>Participant no</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i>Experience</i>
<i>R1</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>Lefke</i>	<i>Management</i>	<i>26 years</i>
<i>R2</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>Gecitkale</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>5 years</i>
<i>R3</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>Lefke</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>6 years</i>
<i>R4</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>Y. Bogazici</i>	<i>Manager/ Chef</i>	<i>8 years</i>
<i>R5</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>Tatlısu</i>	<i>Manager/ Chef</i>	<i>19 years l</i>
<i>R6</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>Tatlısu</i>	<i>Management</i>	<i>30 years</i>
<i>R7</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>Mehmetcik</i>	<i>Manager/ Chef</i>	<i>10 years</i>
<i>R8</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>Tatlısu</i>	<i>Manager/ Chef</i>	<i>11 years</i>
<i>R9</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>49</i>	<i>Y. Bogazici</i>	<i>Manager/ Chef</i>	<i>13 years</i>
<i>R10</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>Mehmetcik</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>3 years</i>
<i>R11</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>Lefke</i>	<i>Manager/ Chef</i>	<i>8 years</i>
<i>R12</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>Gecitkale</i>	<i>Manager</i>	<i>12 years</i>

##### 4.1. Perceptions of the Importance of Sustainability and Preserving Regional Cuisine

All participants (n = 12) agreed that developing sustainability and preserving regional cuisine is critically important in the current context. They emphasized that regional food is not only an economic asset but also a marker of identity and continuity. Several participants underlined that local dishes are what distinguish their communities from others and must therefore be kept alive for future generations:

“Regional food is what makes this place ‘ours’. If we cannot keep these tastes alive, we lose our identity and our future in our own country.” (R1)

Others stressed that traditions must be transmitted in their original form as much as possible:

“We try to cook like our parents and grandparents did, using the same ingredients. That is how we carry regional cuisine to younger generations.” (R3)

Participants also highlighted the tension between fast-paced lifestyles and fast food on the one hand, and the need to retain traditional flavours on the other:

“Fast food is everywhere now. If we don’t consciously protect our childhood dishes, the new generation will never taste them.” (R7)

Overall, sustainability and regionality were perceived as inseparable: preserving traditional dishes was seen as a way to safeguard cultural heritage, support local producers and foster healthier, more authentic food systems.

#### *4.2. Role of Awards and Certification in Supporting Sustainability and Regional Cuisine*

Most participants ( $n \approx 10$ ) believed that awards and certification schemes (e.g. Slow Food and Cittaslow labels, UNESCO recognitions) can be effective tools for promoting sustainability and regional cuisine. They argued that such symbols contribute to visibility, trust and motivation:

“When guests see the Slow Food or Cittaslow flags, they show more interest and trust. It helps us economically and encourages us to keep using local products.” (R8)

“Awards can motivate businesses. If you work hard to reach certain criteria, and then you receive a label, it pushes you to maintain and improve your standards.” (R5) Some participants ( $n=2$ ) explicitly referenced international models:

“UNESCO-type mechanisms show how standards and financial support can protect quality and sustainability.” (R2)

However, a small number of participants reported limited direct benefit for their own businesses, either because they had not yet engaged with such schemes or because local authorities were not using them actively:

“In my case, I didn’t really see any benefit during the opening or continuation of my restaurant.” (R4)

#### *4.3. Key Challenges in Enhancing Sustainability and Preserving Regional Cuisine*

Participants identified a range of structural and operational challenges faced by food and beverage businesses striving to be sustainable and regional; volatile input prices and rising costs for local ingredients; lack of financial incentives and institutional support; shortage of qualified staff familiar with regional dishes and techniques; limited demand from some segments of the local population; environmental threats (urbanization, wildfires, habitat loss) affecting wild edible plants. As one owner–chef explained:

“Local ingredients are expensive and the prices change constantly. When we raise our menu prices, regular customers are unhappy; if we don’t, we struggle to survive.” (R4) Another pointed to the lack of institutional backing:

“There is no serious support for small businesses working with local food. We can only go so far on our own; we need promotion and assistance from higher-level institutions.” (R5) The shortage of knowledgeable kitchen staff was a recurring theme:

“Many employees don’t know the history or the proper way to cook regional dishes. We spend time training them, but it requires extra effort and resources.” (R7)

#### *4.4. Role of Chefs and Restaurants in Sustainable Gastronomy*

All participants agreed that chefs and restaurants are central actors in sustainable gastronomy. Several described them as “the main force” behind the sustainability of regional cuisine and in support of this, they gave theses following anecdotes;

“Chefs and restaurants are the strongest actors in keeping regional food alive.” (R1)

Participants stressed that chefs must have knowledge of local products, traditional techniques and the cultural meaning of dishes, and that they should use their position to educate guests:

“Chefs should know the local plants, seasons and traditional methods. They can guide customers and connect them with regional flavours.” (R6)

Some also emphasized horizontal collaboration among small businesses:

“A regional tavern can buy desserts from a local pastry shop or halloumi from a traditional producer. That kind of cooperation also supports sustainability.” (R9)

At the same time, participants warned that restaurants labelling themselves as “regional” without actually respecting authenticity can harm the culinary heritage they claim to promote:

“If a place calls itself ‘regional’ but does not serve real regional food, it can damage the culture instead of protecting it.” (R7)

#### 4.5. *Perceived Changes in the Sustainability of the Restaurant Industry*

Most participants (n=8) felt that, compared to the past, the restaurant sector has moved towards greater sustainability and awareness, though progress is uneven and constrained by economic realities:

“We are in a better position than before. People are more aware and social media helps us promote regional dishes.” (R2)

“There are now strong, reputable regional restaurants in the area. This is a big change compared to the past.” (R3)

Several participants highlighted improved waste management and broader acceptance of eating out as a regular habit:

“We are much more conscious about food waste and how to use leftovers compared to the old days.” (R10)

However, one participant clearly distinguished between fast-food growth and regional gastronomy:

“Fast-food has absolutely grown, but regional gastronomy is not at a good point yet. Local people still do not show enough sensitivity toward regional dishes, and there are not enough restaurants to meet tourist demand.” (R8)

Others drew attention to post-pandemic price instability as a major threat to small enterprises:

“After the pandemic, price instability has made life very difficult for local businesses trying to keep quality and authenticity.” (R9)

#### 4.6. *Challenges in Food Quality and Supply for Sustainable / Regional Menus*

Some participants stressed that financial burdens (taxes, wages, utilities) compound these sourcing challenges and may undermine sustainability in the long term (R7, R12). Participants’ experiences with food quality and supply were mixed. Those who also produce some of their own raw materials reported fewer problems:

“We produce many of our own ingredients, so we do not experience serious supply issues.” (R3)

Others minimized risk by increasingly growing or processing key products themselves:

“Over time, we started to grow or produce the basic items we need, so we are less dependent on unstable external suppliers.” (R5)

However, several participants underlined ongoing difficulties with consistent quality and fluctuating prices:

“It is not always easy to access high-quality products in the market. Sometimes we spend a lot of time just to find the standard we are looking for.” (R1)

“We struggle because products we must buy from outside are neither stable in quality nor in price.” (R8)

#### 4.7. *Time to Protect Sustainability and Regional Cuisine*

Most participants (n=10) believed it is not too late to protect sustainability and regional cuisine, as long as conscious efforts continue:

“As long as we keep fighting, it is never too late.” (R1)

“If people keep cooking and others keep researching, we are not too late.” (R8)

Several mentioned increasing societal awareness and the potential of education and incentives:

“The community is only now becoming more aware. With the right support and education, we can still protect many things.” (R9)

A minority of participants expressed stronger concern, arguing that some damage has already occurred, especially in relation to uncontrolled production and declining standards:

“In some cases, it is already very late. If producers do not clearly state what is in the product and local authorities do not check them, they can damage the image of regional food.” (R3)

#### 4.8. Adequacy of Existing Awards and Suggested Measures

Most participants considered current awards and recognition mechanisms insufficient on their own to protect sustainability and regional cuisine. They called for stronger public awareness campaigns; vocational education for young people; financial incentives (e.g. tax reductions, targeted subsidies) for small regional businesses; more active use of Slow Food and Cittaslow symbols in national and international events; better engagement of local authorities in implementing and promoting these frameworks.

“Awards are not enough by themselves. We need to educate the younger generation and raise awareness in society, otherwise there is no one to carry these traditions forward.” (R1)

“In other countries, regional restaurants sometimes get tax relief if they work for a purpose. Even such a simple measure would be a huge incentive for small businesses here.” (R8)

Some participants acknowledged that awards can be powerful, but only if local governments actively leverage them:

“The organisations are strong, but regional authorities must use these symbols more visibly and strategically.” (R9)

A few participants perceived current efforts as potentially sufficient, but underutilized:

“The systems are there, but we need to place the flags and signs everywhere and use them much more.” (R10)

## 5. Discussion

Findings reveal a strong consensus among chefs, restaurateurs and producers in Northern Cyprus that sustainability and regional gastronomy are mutually reinforcing pillars of cultural identity, ecological responsibility and economic resilience. Participants consistently described regional cuisine as a key vector of heritage preservation, community well-being and biodiversity protection, aligning with prior research emphasizing the cultural and ecological value of local food systems (Sorcaru, 2019; Güneş, 2019; Rivza et al., 2022; Barstow et al., 2021). In this sense, Slow Food principles—grounded in “good, clean and fair” production—appear well suited to the Mediterranean foodscape of Northern Cyprus, where traditional dishes and seasonal ingredients still shape local identities. Certifications such as Slow Food, Cittaslow and UNESCO designations were viewed as helpful for strengthening visibility, trust and visitor interest (Wang et al., 2013; Bui et al., 2022), yet insufficient without active governance, consistent monitoring and robust communication strategies. These insights support broader arguments that transformative food-system change requires multi-actor collaboration, institutional engagement and strong regional leadership (Garat & Alexandra, 2022; Laeis et al., 2020; Marenzana, 2023).

At the same time, participants highlighted significant structural constraints that hinder sustainability efforts. These include volatile input prices, high operational costs, a shortage of trained staff familiar with heritage cuisine, and environmental pressures affecting local products and wild edibles—challenges widely documented in studies of small-scale gastronomic and rural enterprises (Abas et al., 2023; Roy, 2024; Adekunle et al., 2024). A central contribution of this study is its demonstration of chefs as pivotal intermediaries in sustainability transitions, functioning as cultural mediators who can safeguard authenticity, guide consumers and support producer networks (Huang & Hall, 2023; Garcia et al., 2023). However, the emergence of “pseudo-regional” restaurants that misuse regional labels underscores the need for professional integrity and regulatory oversight to prevent cultural dilution. Although the sector is perceived as more sustainability-oriented than in the past—supported by social media visibility, rising consumer interest and improved waste practices—progress remains uneven and constrained by post-pandemic economic pressures and the dominance

of fast-food culture (Ditlevsen et al., 2020). Nevertheless, participants expressed optimism that it is not too late to protect regional gastronomy, provided that coordinated action—education, incentives, producer–restaurant networks and strategic deployment of Slow Food/Cittaslow mechanisms—is implemented to prevent irreversible loss and ensure long-term cultural and ecological resilience.

## 6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examined the emergence, principles and operational dynamics of the global Slow Food network and explored its implications for sustainable regional gastronomy in Northern Cyprus. The research began by tracing the historical development, ideology and project-based structure of Slow Food, followed by an evaluation of the Cittaslow movement and its adoption across five Northern Cyprus regions. These contextual foundations were supported by an in-depth literature review and a qualitative field investigation conducted with twelve participants, including local producers, chefs, restaurateurs and regional administrators. Through semi-structured interviews, the study assessed participants' perceptions of sustainability, challenges in preserving regional cuisine, and the practical relevance of Slow Food and Cittaslow initiatives.

The findings clearly demonstrate that Slow Food principles resonate strongly with the realities and aspirations of regional producers in Northern Cyprus, yet the sustainability of local gastronomy remains vulnerable. Participants emphasized that safeguarding regional cuisine requires not only individual commitment but also stronger institutional support, coherent policies and effective coordination between producers, regional authorities and international networks. Although Slow Food and Cittaslow labels possess significant symbolic and promotional value, their impact remains limited when local communities are insufficiently informed or when governance structures do not actively implement and monitor related standards.

A recurring theme in the study is the insufficient awareness and engagement of the local population, driven partly by modern lifestyle shifts, globalized consumption patterns and the growing dominance of fast food. This trend threatens the continuity of regional dishes, traditional production methods and intergenerational culinary knowledge. Another critical finding concerns the challenges faced by producers—fluctuating prices, lack of training, inadequate incentives and weak strategic planning—highlighting the urgent need for reinforced systems that financially and operationally support small-scale local enterprises.

Overall, the study concludes that Northern Cyprus possesses a strong foundation for sustainable regional gastronomy, but the long-term protection of local culinary heritage requires more comprehensive policies, sustained education, stronger Slow Food/Cittaslow utilization and community-level engagement. Given the limited academic attention previously directed to Slow Food in Northern Cyprus, this research provides an important contribution and offers a basis for future scholarly work on sustainable gastronomy in island contexts.

Based on the study's results, several recommendations can be proposed for local producers, food and beverage businesses, regional authorities, the tourism sector and academic institutions:

- **Strengthen Awareness and Training for Local Producers and Communities:** Structured training programs and continuous community education should be implemented to enhance knowledge of sustainability, traditional food practices and the significance of Slow Food/Cittaslow certifications across all regional stakeholders.
- **Enhance the Role of Regional Authorities in Promotion and Governance:** Local administrations should adopt a more proactive role in international promotion, branding and enforcement of quality standards through strategic use of Slow Food and Cittaslow networks, supported by transparent monitoring mechanisms.
- **Develop Incentive-Based Support Systems for Producers:** Financial aid, tax benefits, subsidies and collaborative partnerships can help reduce operational burdens on small producers and create more resilient, locally rooted supply chains.
- **Encourage International Promotion and Gastronomy Tourism Integration:** Tourism authorities should integrate regional products into global events and culinary tourism

strategies to increase visibility, stimulate economic opportunities and reinforce cultural heritage.

- **Document and Preserve Traditional Food Knowledge:** Systematic documentation of recipes, production methods and native food varieties is essential to prevent cultural erosion and ensure that local gastronomic knowledge is preserved for future generations.
- **Future studies;** should further advance understanding of sustainable regional gastronomy by conducting detailed case analyses of individual Cittaslow regions, exploring the structure and influence of local Convivium groups, examining biodiversity-focused initiatives such as the Zeka Bey Seed Center, comparing Northern Cyprus with other island contexts implementing Slow Food/Cittaslow principles and undertaking longitudinal research to observe how sustainability perceptions and food practices evolve over time.

## Appendix A. Research Questions

1.	How do you evaluate the current situation of sustainability efforts and the preservation of regional cuisine within today's food system? (reflects system-wide assessment of sustainability transitions)
2.	To what extent can certification schemes and award-granting organizations contribute to enhancing sustainability and safeguarding regional culinary heritage in the foodservice sector? (broadens "award-winning organizations" to governance instruments)
3.	What do you perceive as the major systemic barriers that food and beverage businesses face when attempting to improve sustainability practices and protect regional gastronomic traditions? (aligns with barriers across networks and value chains)
4.	How would you describe the role of chefs, restaurants, and other key food-system actors in advancing sustainable gastronomy and supporting culinary heritage? (expands individual actors to broader actor networks)
5.	In your view, has the restaurant sector undergone meaningful transformation toward sustainability over recent years? If so, in what ways? (centers on system change and transitions)
6.	Do businesses that prioritize sustainable sourcing and regional gastronomy encounter challenges related to food quality, consistency, or supply chains? (connects to supply-chain resilience and local networks)
7.	From your perspective, is it still possible to reverse or mitigate the decline in sustainability and the loss of regional cuisine, or have critical thresholds already been crossed? (addresses tipping points and urgency, a theme in sustainability literature)
8.	Do you believe that current sustainability and gastronomy awards are adequate mechanisms for protecting regional cuisine? If not, what additional policy, community-based, or network-driven measures could strengthen these efforts? (moves from awards alone to multi-actor governance and policy interventions)

Source: Garat & Alexandra, 2022.

## References

1. Abas, A., Phong, S. Y., Kassim, S., Borhanordin, A. H., Saja, I., and Rahman, N. H. A. (2023). The challenges faced by traditional food entrepreneurs in business sustainability. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(11)
2. Abidin, M. R. Z., Ishak, F. A. C., Ismail, I. A., and Juhari, N. H. (2022). Explicating chefs' creativity in utilising Malaysian local herbs toward the development of modern Malaysian cuisine: A proposition of a conceptual framework for creative culinary process. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 46, 101133.
3. Adalier, M. (2020). Kıbrıs mutfağında yerel ürünlerde kullanılan malzemelerin ve pişirme yöntemlerinin bölgelere göre analizi (Master's thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University).

4. Adekunle, O., Akinremi, T., Oluwafemi, O., Caleb, A., Olarinde, R. O., and Idowu-Mogaji, G. O. (2024). Sustainable culinary tourism in Osogbo integrating ecotourism, nutrition, and gastronomy for holistic destination experiences. *Toros University Journal of Food Nutrition and Gastronomy*, 3(2), 147-161.
5. Akay, E., Yılmaz, İ., and Çiçek, A. (2023). Michelin yeşil yıldız kriterlerinin zincir işletmeler tarafından uygulanabilirliğinin değerlendirilmesi: İstanbul örneği. *Sosyal, Beşerî ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(9), 1182-1197.
6. Akdağ, G., Özata, E., Sormaz, Ü., and Çetinsöz, B. C. (2016). Sürdürülebilir gastronomi turizmi için yeni bir alternatif: Surf & Turf. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 4(1), 270-281.
7. Alpat, E. (2013). Yavaş Moda Nedir?. *Akdeniz Sanat Dergisi*, 5(7), 44- 47.
8. Altun, Ö., and Elidemir, S. N. (2023). Kıbrıs meyhane lezzetlerinin gastronomi turizmi bağlamında incelenmesi. *Sosyal, Beşerî ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(3), 410-426.
9. Altuna, N., Dell'Era, C., Landoni, P., and Verganti, R. (2017). Developing radically new meanings through the collaboration with radical circles: Slow food as a platform for envisioning innovative meanings. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 20(2), 269-290.
10. Alves, J., Gaspar, P. D., Lima, T. M., and Silva, P. D. (2023). What is the role of active packaging in the future of food sustainability? A systematic review. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 103(3), 1004-1020.
11. Amo, E. (2023). The Slow Food Movement and the Terra-Madre project: Food sovereignty and translocal assemblages. *Globalizations*, 20(4), 644-660.
12. Andrews, G. (2008). *The slow food story: Politics and pleasure*. Pluto Press.
13. Arslan, Ö. and Seçim, Y. (2023). Slow Food Akımı ve Sille Köyüne Uygulanabilirliğinin İncelenmesi. *Tourism Economics, Management and Policy Research (TEMAPOR)*, 3(2), 75-85.
14. Atakara, C. (2017). Sürdürülebilir yerel kalkınmada belediyelerin rolü, KKTC-Yeniboğaziçi Cittaslow (Sakin Şehir) örneği (Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
15. Avcıkurt, C., and Özgürel, G. (2018). Yavaş yemek (slow food) hareketinin yerli turistler (akademisyenler) tarafından algılanışı. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 568- 587.
16. Bales, B. (2013, 22 Aralık). *Teşekkürler Toprak Ana*. Havadis Kıbrıs. <https://www.havadiskibris.com/tesekkurler-toprak-ana/>
17. Barstow, C., Mukibi, E., and Zocchi, D. M. (2021a). Slow Food and NUS: Protecting and promoting endangered food products. *In Orphan Crops for Sustainable Food and Nutrition Security* (pp. 216-224). Routledge.
18. Barstow, C., Jones, M., & Patterson, L. (2021b). *Slow Food and the politics of sustainable eating*. *Journal of Sustainable Food Systems*, 14(2), 115-132.
19. Bellebaum, C., and Daum, I. (2008). Learning-related changes in reward expectancy are reflected in the feedback-related negativity. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 27(7), 1823-1835.
20. Berno, T., and Fusté-Forné, F. (2019). Imaginaries of cheese: Revisiting narratives of local produce in the contemporary world. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 23(5), 608-626.
21. Bilgin, S. and Akoğlu, A. (2018). Yerel Gıda Ürünlerinin Sürdürülebilirlik Açısından Önemi. *In: International Conference on Food, Nutrition and Dietetics, Gastronomy Research*, 326, 331.
22. Boynukalın, R. (2019). Dijital Sanatta Yeniden Üretim Olanakları and İmgesel Aktarımlar. *In Erasmus International Academic Research Symposium October* (pp. 11-13).
23. Bucak, T. (2016). Slow Food akımı. In O. N. Özdoğan (Ed.), *Yiyecek içecek endüstrisinde yeni trendler* (pp.210-270 ). Detay Yayıncılık
24. Bucak, T., and Turan, Ö. (2016). Bölge turizmine yeni akımların etkisi: Gökçeada Slow Food örneği. *Yaşar Üniversitesi E-Dergisi*, 11(43), 211-219.
25. Bui, T. D., Aminah, H., Wang, C. H., Tseng, M. L., Iranmanesh, M., and Lim, M. K. (2022). Developing a food and beverage corporate sustainability performance structure in Indonesia: Enhancing the leadership role and tenet value from an ethical perspective. *Sustainability*, 14(6), 3658.
26. Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., and Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652-661.
27. Cheng, Q. and Huang, R. (2015). Is food tourism important to Chongqing (China). *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 1(13), 225-236.

28. Chi, X. and Han, H. (2021). Performance of tourism products in a slow city and formation of affection and loyalty: Yaxi Cittaslow visitors' perceptions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(10), 1586-1612.
29. Cittaslow (2024) Tatlısu. Alındığı Yer: <https://www.cittaslow.it/network/tatlisu>
30. Clancy, M. (2018). Slow tourism, food and cities. *Routledge*.
31. Çilginoğlu, H., Muharrem, A., and Çilginoğlu, Ü. (2022). Sürdürülebilir gastronomi açısından dikey tarımın önemi. *Journal of Humanities and Tourism Research*, 12(3), 455-467.
32. Debrah, J. K., Vidal, D. G., and Dinis, M. A. P. (2021). Raising awareness on solid waste management through formal education for sustainability: A developing countries evidence review. *Recycling*, 6(1), 6.
33. Debs, P. (2013). Analysis of the Slow Food movement impact on the farmers and rural areas' sustainable development. Retrieved from: <http://amsdottorato.unibo.it/5628/>
34. Demir, B. (2021). Sürdürülebilir turizm hareketi olarak slow food: Germiyan örneği. *GSI Journals Serie A: Advancements in Tourism Recreation and Sports Sciences*, 4(2), 99-114.
35. Dias, R. R., Lopes De Almeida, A., and Hemsworth, K. (2023). Slow tourism and food: The 'Good' principle as Portuguese trend. *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento (RT&D). Journal of Tourism & Development*, (42).
36. Dimitrovski, D., Starčević, S., and Marinković, V. (2021). Which Attributes Are the Most Important in the Context of the Slow Food Festival? *Leisure Sciences*, 1-19.
37. Ditlevsen, K., Denver, S., Christensen, T., and Lassen, J. (2020). A taste for locally produced food-Values, opinions and sociodemographic differences among 'organic' and 'conventional' consumers. *Appetite*, 147, 104544.
38. Diyalog Gazetesi (2016, Şubat). Proje Başarılı Oldu. Kültür – Sanat. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.diyaloggazetesi.com/kultur-sanat/proje-basarili-oldu-h37960.html>
39. Donat, O. (2016). *Sakin Kent (Cittaslow) Üyeliğinin Kamusal Mekânlara Etkisi: Türkiye'deki Sakin Kentler Üzerine Bir İnceleme*, Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı, Kamu Yönetimi ve Kent Çalışmaları Programı, (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Denizli.
40. Elkington, J. (2004). Enter the triple bottom line. In A. Henriques & J. Richardson (Eds.), *The triple bottom line: Does it all add up? Assessing the sustainability of business and CSR* (pp. 1-16). Earthscan.
41. Ertaş, Ç. and Ayaz, M. (2023). Yerli turistlerin yavaş şehir algısı: Gökçeada örneği. *Tourism and Recreation*, 5(2), 114-124.
42. Ferit, K. (2022). Kuzey Kıbrıs' ta Yetişen Yenilebilir Ot Çeşitleri and Kullanım Alanlarının Belirlenmesi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU)-Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi (DAÜ)).
43. Fondazione Slow Food (2011). *Slow Food Foundation for Biodiversity*. Retrieved from: <https://www.fondazione-slowfood.com/wp>.
44. Fondazione Slow Food, (2024). *Ark of Taste*. Retrieved from: <https://www.fondazione-slowfood.com/en/ark-of-taste-slow-food/pafos-cheese/>
45. Friedmann, H., and McNair, A. (2008). Whose rules rule? Contested projects to certify 'Local production for distant consumers'. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(2-3), 408-434.
46. Fusté-Forné, F., and Jamal, T. (2020). Slow food tourism: an ethical microtrend for the Anthropocene. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 6(3), 227-232.
47. Gálvez, J. C. P., Granda, M. J., López-Guzmán, T., and Coronel, J. R. (2017). Local gastronomy, culture and tourism sustainable cities: The behavior of the American tourist. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 32, 604-612.
48. Garat, M., and Alexandra, J. (2022). Gastronomy and sustainability: a study of the role of the Michelin Green Star sustainability award in food system transformation. (Thesis, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, A's).
49. Garcia Santana, T. K. (2023) Good, clean, and fair food for all: Slow Food role in safeguarding food heritage in Brazil and Germany.
50. Garcia, J. P., Capelari, M. G., Guéneau, S., Zaneti, T. B., and Diniz, J. D. (2023). The role of chefs and gastronomy in transforming the Brasília food system. In *Evaluating Sustainable Food System Innovations* (pp. 36-54). *Routledge*.
51. Giovannoni, E., and Fabietti, G. (2013). What is sustainability? A review of the concept and its applications. *Integrated reporting: Concepts and cases that redefine corporate accountability*, 21-40.

52. Girgen, M. Ü., and Şah, M. (2020). Kuzey Kıbrıs'a ait geçmişten günümüze geleneksel mutfak kültürü üzerine bir çalışma. Proceeding paper.
53. Gopal, R., and Chaudhery, A. (2022). A Systematic Review of Various Promotional Events and Festivals Organized in Uttarakhand and Their Impact on Regional Cuisine. *Central European Management Journal*, 30(3).
54. Güner, D., and Çılgınoğlu, H. (2023). Gastronomi şehri Afyonkarahisar ve slow food Nuh'un Ambarı Projesindeki yeri. *Güncel Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(1), 281-300.
55. Güneş, S. G. (2019). Eco-gastronomy, tourism and sustainability: The rise of sustainable restaurants in the world. *Organization*, 16, 17.
56. Güven, E. (2011). 'Yavaş Yemek'ten Yavaş Medya'ya Hızlı Tüketime Dair Bir Çözüm Önerisi', *Selçuk İletişim Dergisi*, 7(1), 113-121.
57. Haber Kıbrıs, (2022, Nisan 17). Cittaslow Lefke ve Cittaslow Mehmetçik üreticileri Uluslararası peynir festivalinde KKTC'yi temsil etti. Retrieved from: <https://haberkibris.com/cittaslow-lefke-ve-cittaslow-mehmetcik-ureticileri-iv-uluslararası-slowcheese-bodrum-peynir-festivalinde-kktcyi-temsil-etti>
58. Hernández-Rojas, R. D., Huete-Alcocer, N., and Hidalgo-Fernández, A. (2022). Analysis of the impact of traditional gastronomy on loyalty to a world heritage destination. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 30, 100585.
59. Cittaslow, (2024). Yeniboğaziçi Terra Madre Day 2013. Retrieved from: <https://www.cittaslow.it/news/yeni-bogazici-yenibogazici-turkish-rep-north-cyprus-terra-madre-day-2013>
60. Huang, Y., Hall, C. M., and Chen, N. (2023). The sustainability characteristics of Michelin green star restaurants. *Journal of Food Service Business Research*, 1-26.
61. Huang, Y., and Hall, C. M. (2023). Locality in the promoted sustainability practices of Michelin-Starred restaurants. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3672.
62. İnce, E. (2020). Impacts of Cittaslow Philosophy on Sustainable Tourism Development: Case of North Cyprus. *Open House International*, 45(1/2), 173-193.
63. Jarossová, M. A. (2019). Slow food and Culinary Heritage as European activities to promote traditional and regional foods and dishes. In *The 6th International Scientific Conference: Trends and Challenges in The European Business Environment: Trade, International Business And Tourism, Mojmírovce* (pp. 170-178).
64. Jeronen, E. (2020). Sustainable developmeng. In *Encyclopedia of Sustainable Management* (pp. 1-7). Springer International Publishing.
65. Kıbrıs Postası, (2015, Aralık 5). 3. Toprak Ana Etkinliği Yeniboğaziçi'nde. Retrieved from: [https://www.kibrispostasi.com/toprak-ana-etkinligi-yenibogazicinde\\_](https://www.kibrispostasi.com/toprak-ana-etkinligi-yenibogazicinde_)
66. Kıbrıs Postası, (2017 Haziran 24). Mehmetçik Belediyesi Cittaslow Pazarı'nda sona yaklaşıyor. Retrieved from: <https://www.kibrispostasi.com/mehmetcik-belediyesi-cittaslow-pazarında-sona-yaklaşıyor>
67. Kim, J. H., King, B. E. M., and Kim, S. (Sam). (2021). Developing a slow city tourism evaluation index: a Delphi-AHP review of Cittaslow requirements. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30(4), 846-874.
68. Koch, M. A., Tosun, J., Kellermann, L., Marek, C., Kiefer, M., and Thiv, M. (2023). Reducing pesticides without organic certification? Potentials and limits of an intermediate form of agricultural production. *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, 9(1), 2202892.
69. Kuhlman, T., and Farrington, J. (2010). What is sustainability? *Sustainability*, 2(11), 3436-3448.
70. Kursun, U. (2015) Toprak Ana Günü. *Yenidüzen*. Retrieved from: <https://www.yeniduzen.com/toprak-ana-gunu-82930h.htm>
71. Labelle, J. E. (2004). Beyond food as fuel: a socio-cultural analysis of the Slow Food Movement. Published thesis. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/1828/722>
72. Lamy, A., Costa, S., Sirieix, L., and Michaud, M. (2023). Less red meat to be greener? An exploratory study of the representations of sustainable cuisine among French chefs. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 31, 100627.
73. Laeis, G. C., Scheyvens, R. A., and Morris, C. (2020). Cuisine: a new concept for analysing tourism-agriculture linkages? *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 18(6), 643-658.
74. Leitch, A. (2003). Slow food and the politics of pork fat: Italian food and European identity. *Ethnos*, 68(4), 437-462.

75. Lotti, A. (2010). The commoditization of products and taste: Slow Food and the conservation of agrobiodiversity. *Agriculture and human values*, 27, 71-83.
76. Marenzana, A. (2023). *Slow living and socio-cultural transitions: Reframing community, time and sustainability*. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 26(4), 512-529.
77. Memleket Kıbrıs, (2024). "Toprak Ana – TerraMadre, Motherland Cyprus 10 December. Retrieved from: <https://www.memleketkibris.net/post/toprak-ana-terramadre>
78. Mısır, S., and Koç, B. (2023). Cittaslow Kentlerde Yaşayan Halkın Slow Food Algı Düzeyinin Belirlenmesi. *Turkish Journal of Agriculture-Food Science and Technology*, 11(1), 51-58.
79. Morrissey, L. (2010). Slow Food: An Interview with Carlo Petrini. *Development*, 53(3), 447-448.
80. Nabhan, G. P., Walker, D., and Moreno, A. M. (2010). Biocultural and ecogastronomic restoration: The renewing America's food traditions alliance. *Ecological Restoration*, 28(3), 266-279.
81. Nazifi, H., Sabouri, M. S., Allahyari, M. S., Niknami, M., and Danaei, E. (2023). Exploring Extension Implications for Slow Food Development in Iran: A Comprehensive Analysis. *Sustainability*, 15(23), 16538.
82. Oktay, S., and Guden, N. (2021). Yunan, Türk ve Kıbrıs Mutfaklarının Gastronomik Kültürel Yansıması. *Journal of Gastronomy, Hospitality, and Travel*, 4(2)
83. Page, J. R. (2012). Slow food revisited. *Journal of Agricultural & Food Information*, 13(1), 2-6.
84. Pajo, A., and Uğurlu, K. (2015). Cittaslow kentleri için slow food çalışmalarının önemi. *Ejovoc. Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges*, 5(6), 65-73.
85. Paksoy, M., and Özdemir, B. (2014). Yeni bir gıda tüketim alışkanlığı olarak slow food (yavaş yemek) hareketi. *XI. Ulusal Tarım Ekonomisi Kongresi*, 3(5).
86. Paronich, I. (2010). Talking Slow Food. *Journal for Activist Science and Technology Education*, 2(1).
87. Payandeh, E., Allahyari, M. S., Fontefrancesco, M. F., and Surujlale, J. (2020). Good vs. Fair and Clean: An Analysis of Slow Food Principles Toward Gastronomy Tourism in Northern Iran. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, 20(1), 51-70.
88. Peano, C., Migliorini, P., & Sottile, F. (2014). A methodology for the sustainability assessment of agri-food systems: An application to the Slow Food Presidia Project. *Ecology and Society*, 19(4).
89. Petrini, C., & Padovani, G. (2005). *Slow food revolution: Da Arcigola a Terra Madre. Una nuova cultura del cibo e della vita*. Rizzoli Publications.
90. Petrini, C. (2013). *Slow food nation: Why our food should be good, clean, and fair*. Rizzoli Publications.
91. Petrini, C., and Watson, B. (2001). *Slow food: Collected thoughts on taste, tradition, and the honest pleasures of food*. Green Publications.
92. Pezzana, A., Bersani, L., Baldereschi, F., Ponzio, R., Frighi, Z., Durelli, C. P., Vassallo, D., and Petrini, C. (2014). An "LCA" Approach to Slow Food Presidia Products: From Agro-Environmental and Socio-Cultural Aspects to Economic Sustainability and Nutritional Evaluations. 9. *International Conference LCA of Food*, San Francisco, USA, 8-10 October.
93. Pietrykowski, B. (2004). You are what you eat: The social economy of the slow food movement. *Review of social economy*, 62(3), 307-321.
94. Presenza, A., Abbate, T., and Micera, R. (2015). The Cittaslow movement: Opportunities and challenges for the governance of tourism destinations. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 12(4), 479-488.
95. Rinaldi, C. (2017). Food and gastronomy for sustainable place development: A multidisciplinary analysis of different theoretical approaches. *Sustainability*, 9(10), 1748.
96. Rivza, B., Foris, D., Foris, T., Privitera, D., Uljanova, E., and Rivza, P. (2022). Gastronomic heritage: A contributor to sustainable local tourism development. *Geo Journal of Tourism and Geosites*, 44(4), 1326-1334.
97. Rosa, R., Nogueira, M., and Azinheira, F. (2022). Spirituality, socialization and knowledge: a philosophical approach to the Slow Food agri-food system. *International Journal on Food System Dynamics*, 13(4), 411-424.
98. Roy, H. (2024). Connecting farmers' markets to foodservice businesses: A qualitative exploration of restaurants' perceived benefits and challenges of purchasing food locally. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 25(3), 602-637.
99. Sabur, D. G., and Güneş, S. G. (2023). Lezzet Turları ve Slow Food Hareketi. *Toros University Journal of Food Nutrition and Gastronomy*, 2(1), 105-123.
100. Scaffidi, C. (2014). Slow Food: The politics and the pleasure. *Development*, 57(2), 257-261.

101. Schirmacher, H., Elshiewy, O., and Boztug, Y. (2023). That's not natural! Consumer response to disconfirmed expectations about 'natural' food. *Appetite*, 180, 106270.
102. Scoones, I. (2016). The politics of sustainability and development. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 41(1), 293-319.
103. Shahrin, N., Hussin, H., and Shahrin, R. (2024). Malay Heritage Food Competitiveness and Sustainability in Kuala Lumpur. *Journal of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing*, 1-21.
104. Shawki, N., and Hunter, G. L. (2022). Building Solidarity in the Slow Food Movement. *The International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 28(2), 75-93.
105. Sjölander Lindqvist, A., Skoglund, W., and Laven, D. (2020). Craft beer-building social terroir through connecting people, place and business. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 13(2), 149-162.
106. Slow Food (2023a). Our History. Retrieved from: <https://www.slowfood.com/our-history/>
107. Slow Food (2023b). What is the foundation? Retrieved from: <https://www.slowfood.com/whatis-thefoundation/>
108. Slow Food (2023c). *Good, clean and fair food for all*. Retrieved from Slow Food International.
109. Slow Food (2024a). Biodiversity programs, Presidia. Retrieved from: <https://www.slowfood.com/biodiversity-programs/presidia/>
110. Slow Food (2024b). Convivia. Retrieved from: <https://www.slowfood.com/convivia/>
111. Slow Food Educa (2011). Slow food, Educazione. Retrieved from: <http://www.slowfood.it/educazione/>
112. Sobreira, É. M. C., et al. (2022). Slow Food as an alternative food consumption. *Research, Society and Development*, 11(3), e53111326771.
113. Sorcaru, I. A. (2019). Gastronomy Tourism-A Sustainable Alternative for Local Economic Development. *Annals of the University Dunarea de Jos of Galati: Fascicle: I, Economics & Applied Informatics*, 25(1).
114. Stokes, A. Q. (2013). You are what you eat: Slow Food USA's constitutive public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 25(1), 68-90.
115. Şah, M. (2017). Kıbrıs' in tatlari-Kıbrıslı gastronomik öğün. *Lefkoşa: Zoom Yayınevi*.
116. Şahin, İ., and Kutlu, S. Z. (2014). Cittaslow: sürdürülebilir kalkınma ekseninde bir değerlendirme. *Journal of Tourism & Gastronomy Studies*, 2(1), 55-63.
117. Tencati, A., and Zsolnai, L. (2012). Collaborative enterprise and sustainability: The case of slow food [İşbirlikçi girişim ve sürdürülebilirlik: Yavaş yemek örneği]. *Journal of business ethics*, 110, 345-354.
118. Tokucoglu Yumusak, T., Yilmaz, K. G., Deligonul, S. Z., and Cavusgil, T. (2024). Slow food and the slow food movement: a case study of consumer activism in Turkey. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*.
119. Turamberk Özerden, S. and Ilgaz B. (2019). Cittaslow Hareketi Sürdürülebilir Turizm çeşidi olarak KKTC Turizmi içindeki yeri. 2. *ERASMUS Uluslararası Akademik Araştırmalar Sempozyumu*.
120. Uzkesici, D., and Gürdal, İ. (2024). Destinasyon Pazarlamasında Çok Kültürlülük ve Gastronominin Rolü. *Güncel Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(1), 134-153.
121. Yiğit, S., and Bucak, T. (2017). Yöresel Ürünlerin Destinasyon Pazarlamasına Etkisi: Mardin Bulguru İçin Bir Model Önerisi. *Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi*, 18, 18-22.
122. Wang, Y. F., Chen, S. P., Lee, Y. C., and Tsai, C. T. S. (2013). Developing green management standards for restaurants: An application of green supply chain management. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 263-273.
123. WCED, (1987). Report of the world commission on environment and development: Our common future. *World Commission on Environment and Development. UN Documents Gathering a body of global agreements*. Retrieved from: <http://www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm>
124. West, H. G., and Domingos, N. (2012). Gourmandizing poverty food: The Serpa cheese slow food presidium. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 12(1), 120-143.
125. Wooten, S. (2016). An Indigenous Slow Food Revolution: Agriculture on the West African Savanna.
126. Yeni Düzen, (2016, Aralık 13). *Bugün Bladanisyo (Balalan) Köyündeyiz*. Retrieved from: <https://www.yeniduzen.com/bugun-bladanisyo-balalan-koyundeyiz-84133h.htm>
127. Yeni Düzen, (2020, Aralık 17). *Yeniboğaziçi'nde "Toprak Ana/Tetra Madre" Etkinliği* <https://www.yeniduzen.com/yenibogazicinde-toprak-anatetra-madre-etkinligi-134947h.htm>

128. Yıldız, F. (2014). Mutfak Kültürünün Tarihsel Gelişiminde Slow Food ve Günümüz Tüketim Kültüründe Slow Food'un Algılanması. *Cittaslow Gökçeada Eko-Gastronomi Kongresi, Gökçeada, 24-25 Nisan 2014.*
129. Yılmaz, İ., and Balyemez, M. (2024) Kıbrıs Türk Mutfak Kültürünün Tarihine Dair Nitel Bir Araştırma. *Journal of Gastronomy, Hospitality and Travel.*

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.