



Batman Üniversitesi Turizm Fakültesi Dergisi

Batman University Journal of Tourism Faculty

Cilt 2, Sayı 1, Haziran 2026/ Volume 2, Issue 1, December 2026

Geliş Tarihi: 10.06.2026- Kabul Tarihi: 16.06.2026 /Submitted: 26.06.2026- Accepted: 26.06.2026

Atıf: Güçlü, C. (2026). Kaybolmadan Tüket: Efemeral Gastronomi Turizmi ve Destinasyon Değerinin Zamansal Üretimi. *Batman Üniversitesi Turizm Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2(1), 17-27.

Kaybolmadan Tüket: Efemeral Gastronomi Turizmi ve Destinasyon Değerinin Zamansal Üretimi

Consume Before It Disappears: Ephemeral Gastronomy Tourism and the Temporal Production of Destination Value

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Caner GÜÇLÜ¹

Öz

Gastronomi turizmi araştırmaları çoğunlukla yemeğin yere bağlılığını, kimliğini ve otantikliğini konu almakta; yani çözümlemeye mekânı merkeze alıp zamanı sabit bir arka plan saymaktadır. Oysa yemeği ayırt eden şey büyük ölçüde onun zamansallığıdır; hasat penceresi dardır, tabak tüketildiğinde biter, kimi ürün ya da tür kalıcı olarak yitirilebilir. Bu çalışma geçiciliği alanın merkezine taşımakta ve onu destinasyon değerinin üretildiği bir mekanizma olarak ele almaktadır. İki eksen önerilmektedir: kıtlığın kaynağı (tasarlanmış mı, doğal-yapısal mı) ve zaman mantığı (döngüsel mi, terminal mi). İki eksenin kesişiminden dört değer rejimi doğmakta; algılanan aciliyet ile tüketimin ahlaki yükü ise bu rejimlerden türeyen değişkenlerdir. Çalışmanın öne çıkardığı sonuç, yok olmakta olan bir lezzette kullanılan 'kaçırmadan ye' söyleminin çoğu zaman korumayı değil tüketimi hızlandırdığıdır; bu sezgi, ekoloji-ekonomisindeki nadirlik-değer ilişkisiyle (anthropogenic Allee effect) aynı mantığı paylaşır. Çalışma altı önerme geliştirmekte, ampirik sınamayı sonraki araştırmalara bırakmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Zamansal değer, Geçicilik, Kıtlık, Demarketing, Gastronomi turizmi

Abstract

Research on gastronomy tourism has largely asked a spatial question, examining how food is tied to place, identity and authenticity, while treating time as a fixed backdrop. Yet food's most distinctive feature is temporal: the harvest window is narrow, a dish ends once eaten, and an ingredient or species may disappear for good. This article moves transience to the centre of the field and treats it as a mechanism through which destination value is produced. Two axes are proposed: the source of scarcity (designed versus given-structural) and the logic of time (cyclical versus terminal). Their intersection yields four value regimes, while perceived urgency and the moral weight of consumption are variables derived from these regimes. The article's central observation is that, for a vanishing delicacy, the 'eat it before it's gone' appeal often accelerates depletion rather than conservation; this intuition shares its logic with the rarity-value relationship in ecological economics (the anthropogenic Allee effect). Six propositions are developed, with empirical testing left to future research.

Keywords: Temporal value, Transience, Scarcity, Demarketing, Gastronomy tourism

INTRODUCTION

Some delicacies can be eaten only at a particular time: a herb that appears for a few weeks each year, a dinner staged only once, or a fish whose species is under threat of extinction. In these cases the source of attraction is not where the food is made but when it can be reached. Yet as a mature field, gastronomy tourism has developed largely around three themes: the bond between food and place, or terroir (Trubek, 2008; Sims, 2009); the embodied, multisensory experience (Everett, 2008); and the search for authenticity

¹ Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi, Kanık Uygulamalı Bilimler Yüksekokulu, cguculu@beu.edu.tr

(MacCannell, 1973; Richards, 2021). All three share one assumption—that the variable of interest is place, while time is a fixed backdrop.

This assumption constrains the field. A monument is still there the next day; a plate of food ends once eaten, a harvest lasts a few weeks, and a product or species may vanish entirely. Even recent work on seasonality reduces transience to a single dimension, the seasonal cycle (Cheng et al., 2024; Fusté-Forné, 2019), leaving irreversibility, designed scarcity and the moral weight of consumption outside the frame. The gap, then, is not that transience is never mentioned but that it is not treated as a multidimensional mechanism of value.

This study asks: how does transience produce different forms of value in gastronomy tourism, and when does it turn consumption into a tool of conservation versus a pressure that accelerates loss? Our headline point is this: for a vanishing delicacy, the “eat it before it's gone” call markets extinction rather than conservation. The contribution is fourfold—placing time at the centre, gathering scattered phenomena into one frame, recasting the conservation–consumption tension as a conditional threshold model, and linking transience to the temporal production of destination value.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

The first strand examines food's bond with place and its authenticity (Trubek, 2008; Sims, 2009; Everett, 2008); in short, it asks where food belongs and how real it is. The second is the scarcity–value relationship. Meta-analyses show that scarcity tactics raise perceived value, and the effect varies by type: supply-based scarcity works especially well for experiences (Barton et al., 2022). A recent study theorising scarcity in tourism holistically treats supply, demand and resource scarcity together (Hosany & Hosany, 2025).

The third strand is time itself. The last-chance tourism literature shows that the desire to see a place before it disappears generates demand on its own; Fisher and Stewart (2017) tie this to two conditions: a perception that time is running out and a sense of loss. The same authors note that this logic can extend to sites beyond the natural environment; we extend it to an edible product. The idea that value is not fixed but constructed by conditions of access draws on Appadurai's (1986) analysis of regimes of value.

The fourth and most critical strand comes from ecological economics. Courchamp et al. (2006) show that humans attributing value to rarity drive a rare species to be harvested even more, pulling it into an extinction vortex—the anthropogenic Allee effect. Hall et al. (2008) set out its two bad outcomes: the species is either locked at low numbers or driven to extinction by rising effort. Fryxell et al. (2017) model how rising demand tips a fishery from high yield to low through a critical transition. This strand is the theoretical backbone of our fourth cell: rarity feeds demand, and demand consumes the resource. We should note from the outset, however, that this transfer is analogical rather than direct and requires empirical validation (see §6).

CONCEPTUAL METHOD

The study follows Jaakkola's (2020) typology-building approach to conceptual articles: the core concept is defined first, the axes are then chosen on theoretical grounds, and finally the cells and their relationships are derived. We selected the axes from several candidate variables. Predictability, for instance, is in fact a derivative of the cyclicity axis rather than a separate one; scale concerns the destination as a whole rather than the single experience and so remains secondary. We chose the source of scarcity and the logic of time because one captures where responsibility lies and the other captures how heavy the urgency is.

Two binary axes yield four cells, and every case falls into a single cell on these two axes. A case may nevertheless behave differently on a feature derived from the axes (for example, whether access to the experience recurs each year); hybrid cases arise here and are legitimate positions the typology predicts.

The variables are measurable: source and time logic are set by case coding (who designed the scarcity; does the resource return), urgency by a multi-item scale, and moral weight by a scenario-based task.

EPHEMERAL GASTRONOMY TOURISM: DEFINITION AND BOUNDARIES

We define ephemeral gastronomy tourism as a form of experience in which the touristic value of a gastronomic attraction arises largely from its transience. This transience can take one of three forms: the attraction being limited, non-repeatable, or vanishing. The concept works through two axes and two variables derived from them. The first axis is the source of scarcity: did a single person deliberately create the scarcity (designed), or did it arise beyond that person's control, through diffuse and often unintended processes (given-structural)? The second axis is the logic of time and measures whether the resource returns: cyclical, or terminal (gone for good)? Urgency and moral weight emerge from the combination of these axes; in the given-terminal cell, for example, both are highest.

By “given-structural” we do not mean that human influence is absent. The losses in the fourth cell (climate change, overfishing, agricultural abandonment) are largely human-caused. The difference is this: here scarcity is produced not by a single marketer's intent but by a diffuse system. The axis, then, is not whether humans are involved but whether the agent—the party responsible for producing the scarcity—is single and intentional, or diffuse and structural. This sharpens the ethical discussion too: when the agent is diffuse, who bears responsibility for conservation? Diffuse agency does not mean no one is at fault; it does not dissolve responsibility but shifts it to the collective and institutional level.

It matters to distinguish the concept from neighbouring ones. Ephemeral gastronomy tourism sits at the intersection of the literatures on gastronomy tourism, event and seasonal gastronomy, last-chance tourism and the experience economy. It does not reject these literatures; it reorganises them on a shared temporal axis. Transience is the umbrella concept here; seasonality, scarcity, last chance and limited access are its different axes and degrees:

Table 1.

Concept boundaries: ephemeral gastronomy tourism and neighbouring concepts.

Concept	Core criterion	Place in this framework
Transience	Existing within a limited time window	Umbrella concept (core)
Seasonality	A regularly recurring window	Cyclical end of the time axis (cells 1 and 3)
Scarcity	Supply falling short of demand	Value mechanism; dominant in the designed cells
Last chance	Threat of irreversible loss	Terminal end of the time axis (cell 4)
Limited access	A capacity or privilege limit	Urgency variable; graded across all cells

THE 2×2 TYPOLOGY

The first axis asks about the source of scarcity: did a single person deliberately create it (designed), or did it arise beyond their control, through diffuse processes (given-structural)? The second axis asks whether the resource returns: cyclical, or terminal? The intersection of the two axes yields four value regimes.

Figure 1.

A typology of ephemeral gastronomy tourism (four value regimes).



Table 2.

Comparative summary of the four value regimes.

	Designed / intentional	Given / structural (diffuse agency)
Cyclical – Renewing	(1) Serial Scarcity — annual festivals, returning seasonal menus. Value: marketing scarcity.	(3) Seasonal Terroir — truffle, rhubarb, harvest. Value: authenticity / terroir.
Terminal – Irreversible	(2) Singular Spectacle — one-night chef's dinner, iconic closing. Value: status / distinction.	(4) Vanishing / Last Chance — climate loss, lost product, pearl mullet. Value: threat of loss (centre of gravity).

The cells are not of equal weight; this follows from the nature of the axes. The designed cells (1 and 2) produce value through marketing and status; there is no risk of extinction here, but that does not mean the ethical stakes are zero. Artificial scarcity carries a different ethical register—manipulation, needless urgency and overconsumption. Studies of pop-up dining show how value is staged in these cells: organisers choreograph the experience through direct and indirect inducements (Lugosi et al., 2020). The given-structural cells (3 and 4) produce value through authenticity and the threat of loss; the highest theoretical tension gathers in the fourth cell. Even so, cells 1 and 2 are necessary poles of the system: the real contribution is not any single cell but the difference between cells.

Each of the first three cells also has its own theoretical logic; the system cannot be reduced to the fourth cell alone. In the first cell (designed-cyclical; serial scarcity) value arises from a planned, regularly recurring shortage; commodity theory and scarcity marketing explain this cell, because the perception of limited number and time raises willingness to pay (Lynn, 1991; Barton et al., 2022). An example is a limited, fixed-number festival menu offered in a particular period each year. In the second cell (designed-terminal; the singular spectacle) value comes from staging a one-off event that will never be repeated; staged authenticity and the constructed experience are foregrounded here (MacCannell, 1973; Lugosi et al., 2020). An example is a pop-up dinner held by a celebrated chef only once and never again. In the third cell (given-cyclical; seasonal terroir) value arises from a natural window that returns each year and from the product's bond with place; the seasonality and terroir literatures are the core of this cell (Trubek, 2008; Sims, 2009; Fusté-Forné, 2019; Cheng et al., 2024). An example is the fresh herbs, mushrooms or unripe

almonds available for only a few weeks in spring. The typology thus offers four distinct value logics that cannot be reduced to the fourth cell.

Real cases often do not sit cleanly in a single cell. The time axis measures whether the resource returns; whether access to the experience recurs each year is a separate matter and is encoded in the urgency variable. The pearl mullet shows this clearly: the resource is terminal (the species is under threat of extinction) but access is cyclical (a spawning migration repeated each year). This is not a collapse of the axis; it is a hybrid position the typology predicts, where a terminal resource meets cyclical access. Cyclical access feeds short-term touristic value, while the terminal resource imposes a long-term conservation constraint.

The framework also yields a testable prediction: when one cell's marketing logic is transferred to another cell, a two-way mismatch arises (for its formal statement see P6). In the forward direction, if the first cell's urgency language is moved to the fourth cell, short-term demand rises but the conservation outcome deteriorates; this direction is close to the last-chance paradox and so is not original on its own. The distinctive prediction runs the other way: if the fourth cell's conservation-restricting (demarketing) logic is applied to a festival that recurs every year, it needlessly suppresses legitimate and harmless demand. The mismatch arises because each regime produces value from a different source: a tool from one regime, transferred to a regime that produces value from a different source, either damages that source or restricts it for no reason.

The limits of the typology should be stated plainly. The axes are conceptually distinct, but which cell a case falls into is often an empirical coding question, and borderline cases are inevitable. An instructive edge case is a destination management organisation launching a last-chance-themed campaign for a structurally scarce product. Here the organisation does not create the scarcity; the resource axis remains given. What it adds is not a separate cell but a layer that imports the first cell's marketing logic onto the fourth cell's resource—precisely the strategy transfer the framework names in P6. Such cases do not refute the typology; they exemplify the mismatch it predicts. How cleanly cases can be assigned to cells is a question for future empirical work (Article 2).

THE CONSERVATION–CONSUMPTION THRESHOLD

Two opposing views collide in the fourth cell: eat to save (Slow Food; Petrini, 2007) versus last-chance consumption accelerates loss (Lemelin et al., 2010). This paradox is not new; it has been discussed at length in the last-chance literature (Eijgelaar et al., 2010; Groulx et al., 2019; Denley et al., 2020). The study's contribution is not to discover the paradox but to position it as a single cell within a system of value regimes and relate it to the other regimes.

The mechanism beneath the paradox is clear in ecological economics. Courchamp et al. (2006) show that the value attributed to rarity drives a species to be harvested more and pulls it into an extinction vortex, and Hall et al. (2008) set out its two outcomes (lock-in at low numbers, or extinction). Fryxell et al. (2017) model how rising demand produces a critical transition that tips a fishery from high to low yield. This mechanism makes the threshold not a guarantee but a diagnostic.

The threshold does not say that consumption is safe below some level; it only identifies which regime a case is in. If price rises with rarity (the anthropogenic Allee effect regime), consumption almost always produces depletion; eat to save is invalid and the diagnosis points to restricting demand. Consumption can work in a conservation direction only if price is not driven by rarity, if revenue returns to conservation, and if harvest stays below the renewal rate. The three conditions (a: revenue returns to conservation; b: use stays below renewal; c: scale does not exceed carrying capacity) are therefore not a guarantee but a marker of which regime one is in. This logic is akin to common-pool resource governance: Pirotta and

Lusseau (2015) treat wildlife tourism as a common-pool resource and test regimes such as taxes, subsidies and quotas; we adapt the same logic to an edible species and gastronomic demand.

This transfer has its own limits, which is why the mechanism is presented here as a testable proposition rather than a finding. Bioeconomic models assume a homogeneous and numerous set of harvesters; the gastronomy tourist, by contrast, is few in number but carries high price elasticity and strong symbolic value. Moreover, these models have not yet been tested with tourism data. The rarity–value mechanism therefore provides an analogy and a testable expectation for the fourth cell; it is not direct evidence. In short, the mechanism should be used with three caveats: it is not transferred directly to gastronomy tourism, it works as an analogical theoretical explanation, and it requires empirical validation.

This framework warns against excessive optimism about eat to save. Holden and McDonald-Madden (2017) show that the threshold may be far higher than assumed: not only small populations but relatively large ones can be driven extinct, and even a price close to zero can put a population on an extinction trajectory. Hence, in the fourth cell where last-chance demand dominates, the default expectation is not conservation but depletion. Eat to save is the exception, not the rule, and is defensible only when the marker above clearly indicates a conservation regime. The threshold is not a safe control dial but a fragile boundary that is easily crossed.

The threshold is also not a normative prescription but an analytical tool contingent on institutional conditions, and its applicability is limited by political-economic obstacles. Who will enforce the three conditions is often unclear: revenue may flow to intermediaries rather than local producers, institutional capacity and trust are weak in many destinations, and because last-chance demand has high price elasticity, pressure rises quickly. Indeed, tourism demand has been documented straining fragile fish stocks while management focuses on harvest bans rather than reducing demand (Dorsett & Rubio-Cisneros, 2019). The threshold works only under strong and accountable governance; otherwise it remains merely a diagnostic indicating that the threshold has been crossed.

Box 1.

Case — Pearl Mullet of Lake Van.

Case Box — Pearl Mullet of Lake Van

The pearl mullet (*Alburnus tarichi*) is an illustrative—single and local—example of this threshold; not proof of the conceptual claim but a visible instance of it. The species is endemic to Lake Van; each spring it undertakes a spawning migration that adds touristic appeal to the region. To sustain the species, a 90-day fishing ban is enforced between 15 April and 15 July; many households around the lake depend on this fish (DOSDER, 2021—a non-peer-reviewed sector/NGO source, used here as case evidence). The ban is a managed form of consumption operating conditions (b) and (c) of the threshold: it does not zero out consumption but tries to keep it below the threshold. Yet Holden and McDonald-Madden's (2017) caution applies here too: as long as the species is at risk of extinction, demand fuelled by last-chance language can easily push past the threshold.

RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS

The statements below are propositions rather than hypotheses and are derived from the framework. The framework is multi-level; each proposition specifies the level of analysis and the dependent and independent variables.

P1 (individual level). The independent variable is perceived transience; the dependent variables are experiential value and willingness to pay. The relationship is positive; the mechanism varies by source (scarcity psychology in the designed cells, authenticity in the given cells). Scarcity tactics are shown by meta-analysis to be especially effective for experience products; since a gastronomic experience is an experience product, this directly supports the expectation (Barton et al., 2022; Lynn, 1991; Sims, 2009).

P2 (individual level). As the logic of time approaches the terminal, the moral weight of consumption and the conservation–consumption tension increase (Denley et al., 2020; Groulx et al., 2019).

P3 (individual level). As perceived irreversibility rises, digital sharing intensifies. This behaviour differs from sharing a generally memorable experience in that it carries a motive of documenting loss and bearing witness (Sthapit et al., 2019).

P4 (producer level). The independent variable is the source of scarcity; the dependent variable is the preservation of perceived authenticity. Designed transience tends to lose its authenticity through serial production; given transience is more resistant to commodification but open to extractive pressure (Richards, 2021; Cheng et al., 2024).

P5 (destination level). The distribution of cyclical and terminal cells in the portfolio determines the stability of destination value and brand resilience. Cyclical cells produce recurring value, terminal cells intense but one-off value (Tsai et al., 2017; Kovalenko et al., 2023).

P6 (cross-regime; the flagship prediction). Applying one cell's marketing logic to another produces a predictable mismatch in demand level, conservation outcome (measured by stock pressure and the carrying-capacity overshoot rate) and perceived authenticity. In the forward direction demand rises while conservation deteriorates; in the reverse direction legitimate demand is needlessly suppressed. Because isolating the effect requires many control variables, a vignette-based experiment or a quasi-experimental comparison is appropriate for testing.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DESTINATION MANAGEMENT

The legitimacy of urgency communication varies by cell. In the designed-cyclical cell a “don't miss it” call is a legitimate tool; in the given-terminal cell the same language turns into marketing extinction. In the fourth cell the right strategy is not to raise demand but to limit it deliberately. Demarketing—deliberately reducing demand—has already been used in tourism as a visitor and environmental management tool (Beeton & Benfield, 2002; Kotler & Levy, 1971). From this, a cell-sensitive ethics of transience communication can be derived.

Demarketing alone, however, is not enough and can backfire. Restrictive messaging may further inflame urgency in a consumer driven by the last-chance motive. Conservation-restriction must therefore be applied not through communication alone but together with structural tools such as access and quota regulation, revenue sharing and monitoring. The framework predicts a two-way risk: if demarketing goes too far, tourism and local livelihoods collapse; if there is no restriction at all, the resource is depleted. The aim is not to eliminate demand but to balance it around the threshold. In the third (seasonal) cell, by contrast, temporal value can be a positive lever that revives the low season and supports local production (Fusté-Forné, 2019; Bertella, 2020).

CONCLUSION

The study's conceptual contribution is to show that value in gastronomy tourism is produced not only spatially but also temporally, and to tie this production not to a single mechanism but to four value regimes formed where the source of scarcity intersects the logic of time. The framework gathers scattered phenomena onto one plane; recasts the conservation–consumption tension as a conditional threshold model anchored in ecological economics (the anthropogenic Allee effect and the critical transition); reads hybrid cases not as flaws but as the natural result of the axes; and shows that, in the fourth cell, the language of urgency markets extinction rather than conservation.

The study's limits are conceptual: the propositions are untested, and the applicability of the threshold model depends on institutional conditions. Because the propositions span the individual, producer and

destination levels and involve many contextual variables, these must be controlled in empirical testing. This is not a finished theory but a framework that offers gastronomy tourism a temporal lens, is promising, and is open to testing. A natural next step is to test the threshold empirically through a single species such as the pearl mullet. Put more broadly: gastronomy tourism has so far largely sought to explain the economy of place; this study proposes to explain the economy of time.

BEYANLAR / DECLARATIONS

Bilgi: Bu çalışma herhangi bir tezden veya projeden üretilmemiştir. / This study is not derived from any thesis or project.

Etik Kurul İzni: İnsan veya hayvan katılımcı içermeyen kavramsal bir çalışma olduğundan etik kurul onayı gerektirmemektedir. / As a conceptual study involving no human or animal participants, this article does not require ethics committee approval.

Araştırmacıların Katkı Oranı Beyanı: Yazarlar çalışmaya eşit oranda (%50–%50) katkı sağlamıştır. / The authors contributed equally to the study (50%–50%).

Destek/Finansman Beyanı: Bu araştırma için herhangi bir kurum veya kuruluştan finansal destek alınmamıştır. / No funding was received for this research.

Veri Erişilebilirliği Beyanı: Çalışma kavramsaldir ve herhangi bir ampirik veri içermediğinden veri paylaşımı geçerli değildir. / As the study is conceptual and contains no empirical data, data sharing is not applicable.

Çıkar Çatışması Beyanı: Yazarların araştırma ile ilgili herhangi bir çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır. / The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Üretken Yapay Zekâ Kullanım Beyanı: Bu çalışmanın hazırlanmasında, yazarlar tarafından tasarlanan kavramsal çerçevenin düzenlenmesi, metnin yazımı ve dil düzenlemesi ile Türkçeden İngilizceye çeviri aşamalarında üretken bir yapay zekâ aracından (Claude, Anthropic) yararlanılmıştır. Çalışmanın özgün fikri katkısı, eksenleri ve önermeleri yazarlara aittir. Yazarlar üretilen tüm içeriği gözden geçirmiş, her iddiayı ve özellikle her atfı birincil kaynaklarına karşı doğrulamış ve makalenin bilimsel içeriğinden tüm sorumluluğu üstlenmiştir. Araç hiçbir veri üretmemiş ve hiçbir analiz yapmamıştır; çalışma kavramsaldir ve ampirik veri içermez. / During the preparation of this work the authors used a generative AI tool (Claude, Anthropic) to assist with organising the conceptual framework—which was conceived by the authors—editing and writing the text, and translating it from Turkish into English. The study's original intellectual contribution, its axes and propositions belong to the authors. The authors reviewed all generated content, verified every claim—and in particular every citation—against its primary sources, and take sole responsibility for the scientific content of the manuscript. The tool generated no data and performed no analysis; the study is conceptual and contains no empirical data.

REFERENCES

- Appadurai, A. (1986). Introduction: Commodities and the politics of value. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The social life of things* (pp. 3–63). Cambridge University Press.
- Barton, B., Zlatevska, N., & Oppewal, H. (2022). Scarcity tactics in marketing: A meta-analysis of product scarcity effects on consumer purchase intentions. *Journal of Retailing*, 98(4), 741–758.
- Beeton, S., & Benfield, R. (2002). Demand control: The case for demarketing as a visitor and environmental management tool. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(6), 497–513.
- Bertella, G. (2020). Re-thinking sustainability and food in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 84, 103005.
- Cheng, D., Wu, J., Chen, X., & Zhou, Y. (2024). Never eat foods that are not in season: The commodification and authentication of gastronomic identity in tourism. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 36, 101035.

- Courchamp, F., Angulo, E., Rivalan, P., Hall, R. J., Signoret, L., Bull, L., & Meinard, Y. (2006). Rarity value and species extinction: The anthropogenic Allee effect. *PLoS Biology*, 4(12), e415.
- Denley, T. J., Woosnam, K. M., Ribeiro, M. A., Boley, B. B., Hehir, C., & Abrams, J. (2020). Individuals' intentions to engage in last chance tourism: Applying the value–belief–norm model. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(11), 1860–1881.
- DOSDER. (2021). Van Gölü balıkçılık yönetimi ve inci kefali (*Alburnus tarichi*) koruma çalışmaları [Lake Van fisheries management and pearl mullet conservation]. *Doğanın Sesi Dergisi*. [Non-peer-reviewed sector/NGO source.]
- Dorsett, C., & Rubio-Cisneros, N. (2019). Many tourists, few fishes: Using tourists' and locals' knowledge to assess seafood consumption on vulnerable waters of the archipelago of Bocas del Toro, Panama. *Tourism Management*, 74, 110–122.
- Eijelaar, E., Thaper, C., & Peeters, P. (2010). Antarctic cruise tourism: The paradoxes of ambassadorship, last chance tourism and greenhouse gas emissions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(3), 337–354.
- Everett, S. (2008). Beyond the visual gaze? The pursuit of an embodied experience through food tourism. *Tourist Studies*, 8(3), 337–358.
- Fisher, D., & Stewart, E. J. (2017). Tourism, time, and the last chance. *Tourism Analysis*, 22(4), 511–521.
- Fryxell, J. M., Hilborn, R., Bieg, C., Turgeon, K., Caskenette, A., & McCann, K. S. (2017). Supply and demand drive a critical transition to dysfunctional fisheries. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(46), 12333–12337.
- Fusté-Forné, F. (2019). Seasonality in food tourism: Wild foods in peripheral areas. *Tourism Geographies*, 23(5–6), 1276–1298.
- Groulx, M., Boluk, K., Lemieux, C. J., & Dawson, J. (2019). Place stewardship among last chance tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 75, 202–212.
- Hall, R. J., Milner-Gulland, E. J., & Courchamp, F. (2008). Endangering the endangered: The effects of perceived rarity on species exploitation. *Conservation Letters*, 1(2), 75–81.
- Holden, M. H., & McDonald-Madden, E. (2017). High prices for rare species can drive large populations extinct: The anthropogenic Allee effect revisited. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 429, 170–180.
- Hosany, A. R. S., & Hosany, S. (2025). On scarcity and tourism: Theoretical perspectives and implications. *Journal of Travel Research*. Advance online publication.
- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10(1–2), 18–26.
- Kotler, P., & Levy, S. J. (1971). Demarketing, yes, demarketing. *Harvard Business Review*, 49(6), 74–80.
- Kovalenko, A., Dias, Á., Pereira, L., & Simões, A. (2023). Gastronomic experience and consumer behavior: Analyzing the influence on destination image. *Foods*, 12(2), 315.
- Lemelin, H., Dawson, J., Stewart, E. J., Maher, P., & Lueck, M. (2010). Last-chance tourism: The boom, doom, and gloom of visiting vanishing destinations. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(5), 477–493.
- Lugosi, P., Robinson, R. N. S., Walters, G., & Donaghy, S. (2020). Managing experience co-creation practices: Direct and indirect inducement in pop-up food tourism events. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 35, 100702.
- Lynn, M. (1991). Scarcity effects on value: A quantitative review of the commodity theory literature. *Psychology and Marketing*, 8(1), 43–57.
- MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(3), 589–603.
- Petrini, C. (2007). *Slow food nation: Why our food should be good, clean, and fair*. Rizzoli Ex Libris.
- Pirota, E., & Lusseau, D. (2015). Managing the wildlife tourism commons. *Ecological Applications*, 25(3), 729–741.

- Richards, G. (2021). Evolving research perspectives on food and gastronomic experiences in tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(3), 1037–1058.
- Sims, R. (2009). Food, place and authenticity: Local food and the sustainable tourism experience. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(3), 321–336.
- Sthapit, E., Coudounaris, D. N., & Björk, P. (2019). Extending the memorable tourism experience construct: An investigation of memories of local food experiences. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 19(4–5), 333–353.
- Trubek, A. B. (2008). *The taste of place: A cultural journey into terroir*. University of California Press.
- Tsai, C.-T., & Wang, Y.-C. (2017). Experiential value in branding food tourism. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 6(1), 56–65.
- Yayla, Ö., Köseoğlu, M. A., Yıldız, M., & Okumuş, F. (2021). Mise en place for gastronomy geography through food: Flavor regions in Turkey. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 26, 100384. [NOT: tam yazar listesi dergi kaydından teyit edilmeli.]

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Gastronomi turizmi yazını uzun süredir yemeği büyük ölçüde mekânsal bir mesele olarak ele almış; bir ürünün hangi yöreye ait olduğunu, kimliğini ve otantikliğini incelemiştir. Bu yaklaşımda zaman çoğu kez sabit bir arka plan olarak kabul edilir. Oysa kimi gastronomik çekiciliklerin turistik değeri tam da geçici oluşlarından doğar: yılda yalnızca birkaç hafta bulunabilen bir ot, yalnızca bir kez sahnelenen bir akşam yemeği ya da nesli tükenme tehdidi altındaki bir balık. Bu çalışma, geçiciliğin gastronomi turizminde tek bir olgu olmadığını; farklı değer rejimleri ürettiğini ve bu rejimlerin tüketimi kimi koşulda korumaya, kimi koşulda yıkıma çevirdiğini ileri sürmektedir.

Çalışma, Jaakkola'nın (2020) tipoloji-inşa yaklaşımını izleyen kavramsal bir makaledir; ampirik veri içermez. Çekirdek kavram önce tanımlanmış, eksenler kuramsal gerekçelerle seçilmiş, ardından hücreler ve aralarındaki ilişkiler türetilmiştir. Efemeral gastronomi turizmi, bir gastronomik çekiciliğin turistik değerinin büyük ölçüde geçiciliğinden doğduğu bir deneyim biçimi olarak tanımlanır. Bu geçicilik üç biçim alabilir: sınırlı olma, tekrarlanamaz olma veya yok olma.

Çerçeve iki eksen üzerine kuruludur. Birinci eksen kıtlığın kaynağıdır: kıtlık tek bir aktör tarafından bilinçli olarak mı üretilmiştir (tasarlanmış), yoksa dağınık ve çoğu zaman istenmeden işleyen süreçlerle mi ortaya çıkmıştır (verili-yapısal)? İkinci eksen zamanın mantığıdır ve kaynağın geri dönüp dönmediğini ölçer: döngüsel mi, yoksa terminal (kalıcı kayıp) mı? Bu iki ikili eksenin kesişimi dört değer rejimi üretir: (1) Seri Kıtlık (tasarlanmış-döngüsel; değer pazarlama kıtlığından doğar), (2) Tekil Gösteri (tasarlanmış-terminal; değer statü ve ayrıcalıktan doğar), (3) Mevsimsel Terroir (verili-döngüsel; değer otantiklik ve yöreden doğar) ve (4) Yok Oluş / Son Şans (verili-terminal; değer kayıp tehdidinden doğar).

Hücreler eşit ağırlıkta değildir ve bu, eksenlerin doğasından kaynaklanır. Tasarlanmış hücrelerde tükenme riski yoktur; ancak yapay kıtlığın kendine özgü bir etik yükü (manipülasyon, gereksiz aciliyet, aşırı tüketim) vardır. En yüksek kuramsal gerilim dördüncü hücrede toplanır. Yine de çalışmanın asıl katkısı herhangi bir tek hücre değil, hücreler arasındaki farktır.

Gerçek vakalar çoğu zaman tek bir hücreye temiz biçimde oturmaz. Van Gölü inci kefalini bunu açıkça gösterir: kaynak terminaldir (tür tükenme tehdidi altındadır) ama erişim döngüseldir (her yıl tekrarlanan bir üreme göçü). Bu, eksenin çökmesi değil; tipolojinin öngördüğü melez bir konumdur. Döngüsel erişim kısa vadeli turistik değeri beslerken, terminal kaynak uzun vadeli bir koruma kısıtı dayatır.

Çalışmanın en çok vurguladığı bulgu, dördüncü hücrede iki karşıt görüşün çarpışmasıdır: 'korumak için ye' (Slow Food) ile 'son şans tüketimi kaybı hızlandırır' (son şans turizmi yazını). Bu paradoks yeni değildir; çalışmanın katkısı paradoksu keşfetmek değil, onu bir değer rejimleri sistemi içinde tek bir hücre olarak konumlandırmak ve diğer

rejimlerle ilişkilendirmektir. Paradoksun altındaki mekanizma ekolojik ekonomiden okunur: nadirliğe atfedilen değer, türü daha çok avlanmaya ve bir tükeniş girdabına sürükleyebilir (antropojenik Allee etkisi). Bu mekanizma gastronomi turizmine doğrudan kanıt olarak değil, sınanabilir bir analogi olarak taşınır; çünkü biyoekonomik modeller çok sayıda homojen avcı varsayar, oysa gastronomi turisti az sayıda ama yüksek fiyat esnekliğine ve güçlü sembolik değere sahiptir.

Eşik, tüketimin belirli bir düzeyin altında güvenli olduğunu söylemez; yalnızca bir vakanın hangi rejimde olduğunu teşhis eder. Fiyat nadirlikle birlikte yükseliyorsa tüketim neredeyse her zaman tükenme üretir ve 'korumak için ye' geçersizleşir. Tüketim ancak fiyat nadirlikten beslenmiyorsa, gelir korumaya dönüyorsa ve hasat yenilenme oranının altında kalıyorsa koruma yönünde işleyebilir. Bu üç koşul bir garanti değil, hangi rejimde olunduğunun göstergesidir ve güçlü, hesap verebilir bir yönetim gerektirir.

Çerçeveden altı önerme türetilmiştir (P1–P6). En ayırt edici olanı P6'dır: bir hücrenin pazarlama mantığını başka bir hücreye taşımak iki yönlü bir yanlış eşleşme üretir. İleri yönde, birinci hücrenin aciliyet dili dördüncü hücreye taşınırsa kısa vadeli talep artar ama koruma sonucu kötüleşir. Asıl özgün öngörü ters yöndedir: dördüncü hücrenin talep-kısıtlayıcı (demarketing) mantığı her yıl tekrarlayan bir festivale uygulanırsa, meşru ve zararsız talebi gereksiz yere bastırır.

Yönetmelik düzeyde, aciliyet iletişiminin meşruiyeti hücreye göre değişir. Tasarlanmış-döngüsel hücrede 'kaçırma' çağrısı meşru bir araçken, verili-terminal hücrede aynı dil tükenişi pazarlamaya dönüşür. Dördüncü hücrede doğru strateji talebi artırmak değil, onu bilinçli olarak sınırlamaktır; ancak demarketing tek başına yetersizdir ve erişim/kota düzenlemesi, gelir paylaşımı ve izleme gibi yapısal araçlarla birlikte uygulanmalıdır. Sonuç olarak çalışma, gastronomi turizminin yalnızca mekânın ekonomisini değil zamanın ekonomisini de açıklaması gerektiğini önermektedir. Bu, tamamlanmış bir kuram değil; alana zamansal bir mercek sunan, sınanmaya açık bir çerçevedir.