

From Terroir to Trust: Generation Z, English for Specific Purposes, and Croatian Food Heritage—Part One

Tihomir Živić, Maja Novoselec

Faculty of Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, V. Preloga 1, Osijek, Republic of Croatia (tihomir.zivic@fazos.hr)

Abstract

This article examines how two first-year Croatian cohorts, Biology and FABSO, conceptualize geographical indications and translate food heritage into English public discourses. Drawing on surveys and open responses, it identifies strong engagement with traditional products, confidence in EU protected-origin labels, and recurrent appeals to authenticity, traceability, quality, and locality. Biology students report higher English-language proficiency, while FABSO students show greater familiarity with EU quality schemes. Both cohorts favor digital, packaging-centered narration. The study concludes that instruction should combine precise terminology, genre awareness, and ethical representation.

Keywords: European Union quality schemes, Protected Designation of Origin, Protected Geographical Indication, English for Specific Purposes, traceability

Introduction

Conceptual Rationale and Objective of the Research Conducted

Dedicated to the revaluation of place, provenance, and pedagogical practice in Croatian agri-food communication, this study examines four course-generated artifacts: two aggregated survey exports and two qualitative compilations of student responses collected at Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek on 8 February 2026. Its analytical focus is the intersection of geographical indications (GIs), heritage mediation¹, and English-language representation within English for Specific Purposes

¹ Heritage mediation comprises the translational and rhetorical process by which local food traditions, terroir, production know-how, and cultural memory are rendered intelligible, marketable, and ethically representable for non-local audiences.



(ESP), with particular attention to the ways in which first-year students (i.e., Generation Z, or Gen Z) conceptualize, translate, and rhetorically frame Croatian heritage foods for non-Croatian audiences (Mesić et al., 2011: 283, 285; Blažević & Blažević, 2023; cf. Trubek, 2008: 208–44; Evans, 2025: 413).

In this regard, *terroir* designates not merely the physical provenance of an agricultural or alimentary object but the historically sedimented articulation of geology, climate, topography, biological milieu, technical practice, and cultural memory through which place becomes sensuously legible, locality is converted into form, matter into meaning, and environmental contingency into recognizable aesthetic, economic, and symbolic value.

The study, local in scope by virtue of its restriction to students at a single university, offers a comparative analysis of two first-year student cohorts: one enrolled in the Department of Biology (BIO) and the other in the Faculty of Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek (FABSO). The corpus documents how the BIO cohort (N = 45) and the FABSO cohort (N = 64) understand and communicate GIs and related European Union (EU) quality schemes, as well as how they perform English-language advocacy of Croatian heritage foods (Martić Kuran et al., 2021). The comparison is especially pertinent because the two cohorts occupy adjacent but distinct disciplinary positions: BIO students bring stronger self-reported English-language proficiency, whereas FABSO students demonstrate greater prior familiarity with EU quality schemes and agri-food certification discourse.

Accordingly, in methodological terms, the study conducts a comparative mixed-methods analysis of aggregated survey data and open-ended student responses from BIO and FABSO first-year cohorts, testing the hypothesis that students' disciplinary orientation differentially shapes their English-language mediation of Croatian geographical-indication discourse: BIO students exhibit stronger linguistic self-efficacy, whereas FABSO students exhibit greater prior familiarity with EU quality schemes and certification-based heritage communication.

The quantitative data indicate substantial everyday engagement with traditional products and a generally positive association between GI labels and consumer confidence. The qualitative responses, in turn, reveal recurrent rhetorical priorities: authenticity, traceability, quality assurance, and place-based distinctiveness (Gajdić, 2019: 390–91). At the same time, they register tensions concerning commodification, cultural ownership, and the ethical limits of transforming inherited food practices into marketable heritage narratives. Across both cohorts, students show a pronounced orientation toward short-form, platform-specific digital narration and packaging-centered semiotics, thereby suggesting that GI communication is increasingly imagined through multimodal, consumer-facing genres².

By bringing these quantitative and qualitative materials into a single interpretive frame, the article argues that students already possess a substantial experiential vocabulary for discussing origin, quality, and tradition, but that this vocabulary requires more precise English-language mediation. The principal pedagogical challenge is therefore not the absence of conceptual engagement but the disciplined conversion of such engagement into terminologically accurate, genre-conscious, and ethically responsible ESP practice. Accordingly, the analysis concludes by identifying implications for ESP-oriented instruction, especially in relation to terminology control, genre awareness, and ethical heritage representation.

2 Consumer-facing genres are public communicative forms addressed to prospective buyers rather than specialists, including label microcopy, packaging narratives, QR-linked provenance accounts, press releases, social media scripts, and short-form video.

Materials and Methods

Cohort Profile

The corpus comprises two aggregated survey spreadsheets and two documents containing open-ended answers: the spreadsheets provide cohort-level counts by response option for Questions 1 to 28, including a mix of demographic items, knowledge checks, translation items, and Likert-type attitudinal measures (Lindner & Lindner, 2024), whereas the documents provide the verbatim student responses for six open-ended questions (i.e., Q12, Q16, Q24, Q26, Q29, and Q30). Since the spreadsheets store several multiple-choice items using option codes (e.g., A, B, C, and D) without the accompanying option texts, the present interpretation can describe distributional patterns but cannot, on the basis of these files alone, evaluate correctness for those coded items. Additionally, because the surveys are aggregated rather than respondent-level, correlations between variables cannot be computed.

As stated in the Introduction, both cohorts comprise first-year students at Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek—namely, the BIO poll comprises respondents from the Department of Biology ($N = 45$), and the FABSO poll comprises respondents from the Faculty of Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek ($N = 64$). Table 1 presents the students' English proficiency, classified in accordance with the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), and their ESP exposure (Council of Europe, 2001).

Table 1. Students' English Proficiency and ESP Exposure

Measure	BIO ($N = 45$)	FABSO ($N = 64$)
CEFR A1	3 (6.7%)	4 (6.2%)
CEFR A2	0 (0.0%)	7 (10.9%)
CEFR B1	7 (15.6%)	16 (25.0%)
CEFR B2	17 (37.8%)	30 (46.9%)
CEFR C1	15 (33.3%)	6 (9.4%)
CEFR C2	3 (6.7%)	1 (1.6%)
B2 or higher	35 (77.8%)	37 (57.8%)

Note: Attitudinal items are measured and reported using a five-point Likert-type scale, with higher values indicating stronger agreement or greater self-reported confidence, and top-two-box percentages aggregate the two highest response categories. Sociodemographically, respondents in both cohorts were 18–19 years of age, with both male and female students represented: the BIO cohort was approximately two-thirds female, whereas the FABSO cohort was approximately two-thirds male, thereby providing a partial gender counterbalance across the comparative sample.

Interestingly, self-assessed proficiency is higher in the BIO cohort, where 77.8% report B2 or higher, compared with 57.8% in the FABSO cohort, and in both cohorts the modal level is B2. A notable proportion of students, however, select "Not sure," especially in the BIO cohort (table 2). This pattern suggests that students may not reliably recognize the curricular boundary between general English instruction (i.e., English for General Purposes, EGP; see Viana et al., 2018: 1–2, 5–7) and ESP-oriented instruction (Smoak, 2003), which has direct implications for needs analysis and for the framing of learning outcomes (Salas et al., 2013: 13, 17, 18; Velčić Janjetić & Badurina Filipin, 2018; cf. Hodak & Bošnjak Terzić, 2023: 176, 189, 191).

Table 2. General English Instruction versus ESP-Oriented Instruction

ESP-focused English course completed	BIO (N = 45)	FABSO (N = 64)
Yes	4 (8.9%)	9 (14.1%)
No	17 (37.8%)	34 (53.1%)
Not sure	24 (53.3%)	20 (31.2%)

Note: Attitudinal items are measured and reported using a five-point Likert-type scale, with higher values indicating stronger agreement or greater self-reported confidence, and top-two-box percentages aggregate the two highest response categories. Sociodemographically, respondents in both cohorts were 18–19 years of age, with both male and female students represented: the BIO cohort was approximately two-thirds female, whereas the FABSO cohort was approximately two-thirds male, thereby providing a partial gender counterbalance across the comparative sample.

Everyday Engagement with Traditional Products

Both cohorts report frequent purchasing of Croatian traditional products. Weekly purchasing (“Often”) is the dominant category in both cohorts (42.2% in BIO; 42.2% in FABSO), and “Sometimes (monthly)” is the second most common response (31.1% in BIO; 34.4% in FABSO). This high baseline engagement is methodologically important because it indicates that GI discourse is not purely abstract for respondents; on the contrary, it is anchored in everyday consumer practice.

When students report the sources that inform their GI-related awareness and knowledge ecology (with multiple selections allowed), informal and local channels dominate. In BIO, family or household is nearly universal (95.6%), followed by local producers or markets (64.4%) and tourism or food festivals (51.1%). In FABSO, family or household remains the most common source (76.6%), while local producers or markets (53.1%) and traditional media (39.1%) follow. University courses appear as a source only in FABSO (10.9%) and are absent in BIO.

Prior Familiarity with EU Quality Schemes

Prior exposure diverges sharply across cohorts, since only 2.2% of BIO respondents report prior familiarity, whereas 35.9% of FABSO respondents do so; nevertheless, this difference is consistent with FABSO’s disciplinary orientation toward food systems and agroeconomic production, an orientation that plausibly increases prior contact with labeling regimes and certification discourse (Faculty of Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek, 2024: 13, 14). Table 3 presents students’ prior familiarity with EU quality schemes—that is, Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) and Protected Geographical Indication (PGI).

Table 3. Students' Prior Familiarity with EU Quality Schemes

Familiar with PDO/PGI before today	BIO (N = 45)	FABSO (N = 64)
Yes	1 (2.2%)	23 (35.9%)
No	25 (55.6%)	28 (43.8%)
Heard but unsure	19 (42.2%)	13 (20.3%)

Note: Attitudinal items are measured and reported using a five-point Likert-type scale, with higher values indicating stronger agreement or greater self-reported confidence, and top-two-box percentages aggregate the two highest response categories. Sociodemographically, respondents in both cohorts were 18–19 years of age, with both male and female students represented: the BIO cohort was approximately two-thirds female, whereas the FABSO cohort was approximately two-thirds male, thereby providing a partial gender counterbalance across the comparative sample.

Attitudes and Self-Efficacy

Providing a sufficient evidentiary basis for replication and following the selective literature review of applied methods and research techniques presented in the Introduction, the article observes that, across cohorts, GI labels are associated with trust and willingness to pay. Furthermore, this association is stronger among FABSO respondents, while BIO respondents report a higher perceived capacity to explain the notion of *kulen* to a non-Croatian audience, a finding consistent with their higher self-assessed English proficiency (table 4). Thus, terminological confidence remains moderate across the two cohorts, a result consonant with the observed variability on items that plausibly involve near-synonymous English terms. Ethical confidence is cautious in both cohorts, with mean responses approximating the scale midpoint and dispersion remaining substantial.

Table 4. Associations with GI Labels

Item	BIO: mean (Top 2 box)	FABSO: mean (Top 2 box)	Valid N (BIO/FABSO)
PDO/PGI labels influence trust and willingness to pay	3.55 (50.0%)	3.74 (64.9%)	42/57
Can explain <i>kulen</i> to non-Croatian audience	3.86 (66.7%)	3.57 (57.4%)	42/61
Confident selecting accurate English GI terminology	3.23 (27.3%)	3.16 (41.4%)	44/58
Heritage practices can be represented ethically	3.47 (46.5%)	3.49 (49.2%)	43/59

Note: Attitudinal items are measured and reported using a five-point Likert-type scale, with higher values indicating stronger agreement or greater self-reported confidence, and top-two-box percentages aggregate the two highest response categories. Sociodemographically, respondents in both cohorts were 18–19 years of age, with both male and female students represented: the BIO cohort was approximately two-thirds female, whereas the FABSO cohort was approximately two-thirds male, thereby providing a partial gender counterbalance across the comparative sample.

Results and Discussion

Qualitative Interpretation of Open-Ended Responses

In the Results and Discussion, the established findings and empirical regularities are delineated, the relevant phenomena explicated, and the proposed hypothesis confirmed: across both cohorts, responses converge on four interrelated rationales—authenticity, quality assurance, consumer trust, and safety—while comparison with the works of the other cited authors corroborates the significance of this research (Che, 2006; cf. Šarolić et al., 2019). With respect to Q12, which asks why legally protected geographical origin is consequential for international consumers, students repeatedly conceptualize legal protection as an infrastructure of credibility that enables consumers to infer that the product “actually” originates from the place designated on the label. BIO answers additionally foreground intercultural encounter and the experiential logic of travel, namely, that visitors “would like to taste actual locally produced food,” and they also describe legal protection as a mechanism that prevents the erosion of cultural significance over time. FABSΟ answers broaden the frame by explicitly connecting GI protection to pricing power, marketing rights, and a perceived duty to make Croatia visible in global markets.

With regard to the repertoire of candidate GI products (Q16), the product lists indicate wide recognition of Croatian place-based foods and beverages, with regional diversity across Slavonia, Baranja, Istria, Dalmatia, Lika, Međimurje, and Zagorje. Both cohorts repeatedly list kulen variants, Pag Island cheese, and products associated with curing, smoking, and fermentation. The BIO list is notable for including several items that index micro-regional specificity, while the FABSΟ list tends to foreground widely commercialized categories and category-level descriptors. In both cases, the lists function as a pragmatic inventory for pedagogy: they reveal which heritage objects students already possess as cultural knowledge and which objects may serve as anchoring examples for GI terminology.

As indicated by responses to the questions concerning English-language product descriptions and keywording (Q24 and Q26), students’ English descriptions are rhetorically patterned, since many adopt a marketing register that combines sensory lexicon (i.e., “rich,” “aromatic,” or “melt-in-your-mouth”) with place-based imagery (e.g., sea breeze, island conditions, or local herbs) and with credential discourse (PDO or PGI status, traceability, and specification compliance). Across cohorts, the most frequent promotional predicates are “authentic,” “traditional,” “premium,” and “quality,” which indicates that students intuitively treat GI as a semiotic bridge between geography and value. BIO responses often emphasize natural conditions and craft knowledge as a combined origin story, while FABSΟ responses more consistently foreground controlled production, certification, and the promise of traceability.

With respect to the digital presentation and communication strategy examined in Q29, both cohorts conceptualize GI communication as multimodal and platform-sensitive, insofar as students call for short-form social media video, increased advertising, and narrative packaging. A recurring proposal is to modernize packaging while increasing transparency through traceability instruments such as QR codes that link the product to producers and production practices; therefore, students also recommend rebalancing visual identity. They propose moving away from generic folklore motifs and toward credible documentary imagery, including local farms, production processes, and legible origin statements, as these proposals indicate an emergent competence in digital genre awareness, even when the underlying language control remains uneven.

Finally, in addressing terroir, know-how, and the legal basis for protection (Q30), students supply a largely coherent justification for GI law in terms of place-based distinctiveness and traditional expertise. They repeatedly invoke environmental conditions, local raw materials, inherited methods, and reputational capital as the grounds for protection. They also link GI status to consumer-facing outcomes, most notably traceability and the prevention of misleading labels or low-quality imitation. Importantly, FABS0 includes an explicit dissenting position that challenges the logic of proprietary claims over tradition, and that frames GI as a potentially extractive or exclusionary mechanism. This dissent is analytically valuable because it signals that at least some students can recognize the normative contestability of heritage commodification, which should be integrated into any ethical module rather than treated as an anomaly (McBride, 2010; Hasić & Rački Marinković, 2022; see also Stublić & Samovojska, 2018).

Conclusions

Pedagogical Implications for ESP and Heritage Mediation

In terms of empirical findings, the four artifacts, considered synthetically, indicate that students already possess an everyday, consumer-grounded understanding of authenticity, origin, and quality, and that they readily map these notions onto GI labeling; however, the data also show a distinction between conceptual assent and linguistic control. Students can, namely, articulate why GI matters and can propose plausible digital communication strategies, yet their confidence in selecting precise English terminology remains only moderate, and at least one high-salience translation item yields visibly split selections. Thus, cohort differences are consistent with disciplinary orientation, as FABS0 students report substantially greater prior familiarity with PDO and PGI regimes and more frequently cite university and traditional media as knowledge sources, while BIO students report higher English proficiency and higher self-efficacy in explaining a product to a non-Croatian audience.

In terms of pedagogical recommendations derived from these empirical findings, however, the following steps should be operationalized: (1) instruction should treat GI communication as a bundle of genres, including label microcopy, short product narratives, press releases, and social media scripts, and because students already orient toward these genres, such instruction can formalize their genre constraints, especially evidentiality (what can be claimed) and specificity (what must be named); (2) terminology should be taught as a controlled lexicon with usage conditions, not as isolated vocabulary, and a minimal core should include standardized equivalents for geographical origin, labeling, traceability, and production know-how, with attention to near-synonyms that risk semantic drift; (3) the rhetorical structure evident in Q24 responses can be refined into a template that balances sensory appeal with verifiable GI claims, thereby reducing the tendency toward purely promotional language; and (4) the ethical question should be addressed explicitly through case-based discussion, including the dissenting view that contests ownership of tradition. This is the most direct, yet gradual, path to turning the moderate ethical confidence observed in the Likert item into reflective competence.

In this manner, the four files document a coherent trajectory: students begin with strong experiential familiarity with traditional products, they adopt GI as a language of authenticity and trust, and they spontaneously propose digitally mediated, traceability-oriented communication

solutions; yet, the principal bottleneck is not the absence of ideas but the precision of English-language mediation. Accordingly, the most productive instructional emphasis is a disciplined integration of terminology control, genre awareness, and ethical reflection.

References

- Blažević, A. P., Blažević, M. R. (2023). A Focus on Objectives, Outcomes, and Learner Needs in ESP Courses. *Strani jezici* 52: 101–25. Available from: https://stranijezici.ffzg.unizg.hr/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/SJ_52_1_5.pdf.
- Che, D. (2006). Select Michigan: Local Food Production, Food Safety, Culinary Heritage, and Branding in Michigan Agri-Tourism. *Tourism Review International* 9: 349–69. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3727/154427206776330616>.
- Council of Europe (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe. Available from: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages>.
- European Commission (2017). Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/1992 of 6 November 2017 Entering a Name in the Register of Protected Designations of Origin and Protected Geographical Indications ('Slavonski kulen'/'Slavonski kulin' (PGI)). *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 288: 2–3. Available from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017R1992>.
- Evans, S. (2025). Trademarking Terroir: Geographical Indications as a Form of Cultural Property in the U.S.–EU Trade War. *Chicago Journal of International Law* 26: 410–43. Available from: <https://cjl.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/2025-08/Evans.pdf>.
- Faculty of Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek (2024). Strategic Programme for Scientific Research, 2024–2028. Osijek, Croatia: Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek. Available from: <https://www.fazos.unios.hr/media/Dokumenti/opci%20oakti/temeljni%20dokumenti/Strategic%20programme%20for%20scientific%20research.pdf>.
- Gajdić, D. (2019). Definiranje i obilježja kratkih opskrbnih lanaca poljoprivredno-prehrambenih proizvoda. *Ekonomika misao i praksa / Economic Thought and Practice* 28: 381–408. Available from: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/en/file/322683>.
- Hasić, T., Rački Marinković, A. (2022). Zaštita tradicijskih proizvoda primjenom zemljopisnih oznaka u Europskoj uniji nakon stupanja na snagu Ženevskog akta na Lisabonski sporazum. *Pravni vjesnik* 38: 113–30. Available from: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/399484>.
- Hodak, J., Bošnjak Terzić, B. (2023). Engineering Students' Use of Technical Literature in English and Attitudes towards ESP. *Strani jezici* 52: 171–95. Available from: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/452202>.
- Lindner, J. R., Lindner, N. J. (2024). Interpreting Likert-type Scales, Summated Scales, Unidimensional Scales, and Attitudinal Scales: I Neither Agree nor Disagree, Likert or Not. *Advancements in Agricultural Development* 5: 152–63. Available from: <https://agdevresearch.org/index.php/aad/article/view/351/301>.
- Martić Kuran, L., Drinovac Topalović, M., Đugum, J., Krvavica, M. (2021). Mišljenje hrvatskih potrošača o tradicionalnoj dalmatinskoj janjetini u procesu dobivanja ZOI oznake. *Meso: prvi hrvatski časopis o mesu* 23: 483–96.
- McBride, W. D. (2010). GI Joe? Coffee, Location, and Regulatory Accountability. *New York University Law Review* 85: 2138–69. Available from: <https://www.nyulawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/NYULawReview-85-6-McBride.pdf>.
- Mesić, Ž., Cerjak, M., Tojčić, T. (2011). Zaštita zemljopisnim oznakama u Hrvatskoj — slučaj slavonskog kulena / Protection of Geographical Indications of Origin in Croatia—Case Study of Slavonian Kulen. *Agronomski glasnik: glasilo hrvatskog agronomskog društva* 73: 283–94. Available from: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/en/file/122854>.

- Salas, S., Mercado, L. A., Hanson Ouedraogo, L., Musetti, B. (2013). English for Specific Purposes: Negotiating Needs, Possibilities, and Promises. *English Teaching Forum* 51: 12–19. Available from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1020688.pdf>.
- Smoak, R. (2003). What Is English for Specific Purposes? *English Teaching Forum* 41: 22–27. Available from: https://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/03-41-2-g.pdf.
- Stublić, H., Samovojska, R. (2018). Uvod u problematiku komodifikacije teške baštine. *Studia ethnologica Croatica* 30: 279–93. Available from: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/419417>.
- Šarolić, M., Roguljić, J., Friganović, E., Delić, Ž., Dorbić, B., Torić, M. (2019). Poljički soparnik. *Glasilo Future: stručno-znanstveni časopis* 2: 59–66. Available from: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/325520>.
- Trubek, A. B. (2008). The Next Phase: Taste of Place or Brand? In *The Taste of Place: A Cultural Journey into Terroir*, pp. 208–44. California Studies in Food and Culture 20. Berkeley, CA, USA; Los Angeles, CA, USA: University of California Press.
- Velčić Janjetić, E., Badurina Filipin, A. (2018). Students' Attitudes towards General English vs. Technical English Ratio in ESP Classes. In *Conference Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference From Theory to Practice in Language for Specific Purposes*, Krakić, A.-M., Omrčen, D. (eds.), 364–80. Zagreb, Croatia: Association of LSP Teachers at Higher Education Institutions.
- Viana, V., Bocorny, A., Sarmiento, S. (2018). *Teaching English for Specific Purposes*. ELT Development Series. Alexandria, VA, USA: TESOL Press.

Od terroira do povjerenja: naraštaj Z, engleski jezik struke i hrvatska prehrambena baština — prvi dio

Sažetak

U članku se ispituje kako dvije skupine polaznika kolegija Engleski jezik s prvih godina studija na Odjelu za biologiju (BIO) i Fakultetu agrobiotehničkih znanosti (FAZOS) Sveučilišta J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku konceptualiziraju oznake zemljopisnoga podrijetla te prevode prehrambenu baštinu u javne diskurse na hrvatskome i na strukovnome engleskom jeziku. Polazeći od anketa i otvorenih odgovora, članak utvrđuje njihovu evidentnu zainteresiranost za hrvatske tradicijske proizvode, povjerenje u EU-ove oznake zaštićenoga podrijetla te ponavljajuća pozivanja na autentičnost, sljedivost, kvalitetu i lokalnost. Primijetiti je da studenti s BIO-a iskazuju višu razinu ovladanosti engleskim jezikom, dok studenti FAZOS-a pokazuju veću upoznatost sa sustavima kvalitete EU-a. No, obje studentske skupine daju prednost digitalnoj naraciji usmjerenoj na ambalažu. U Zaključku se stoga ističe da nastava strukovnoga engleskog jezika, kao i kolegiji na hrvatskome, trebaju objediniti precizno nazivlje, žanrovsku osviještenost i etičko predstavljanje.

Ključne riječi: sustavi kvalitete EU-a, zaštićena oznaka izvornosti, zaštićena oznaka zemljopisnoga podrijetla, engleski jezik struke, sljedivost