

Culinary preferences of foreign tourists in India

Journal of Vacation Marketing
2014, Vol 20(1) 29–39
© The Author(s) 2013
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1356766713486143
jvm.sagepub.com



Yogesh Updhyay

Jiwaji University, India

Dhiraj Sharma

Institute of Management Technology Ghaziabad, India

Abstract

Realizing the growing importance of culinary tourism, the present study explores culinary preferences of foreign tourists through surveys conducted at various tourist spots in India. In order to identify latent factors beneath, data related to preferences were factor analyzed. The outcome of the analysis suggests that tourists' preferences converge into five factors, namely, taste and quality of food, food preparation, localization of food and dining etiquettes, tradition and nutrition of food, and food aroma and cleanliness. Furthermore, convergence in foreign tourists was also explored based on their responses. From the analysis, three segments emerged, namely, taste seekers, localization seekers and experience seekers. The study also discusses the implications of the outcome for marketers and researchers.

Keywords

Culinary tourism, foreign tourists, India, preferences, segmentation

Introduction

Tourism has been an important vehicle of widening the socioeconomic and cultural contacts, throughout human history (Ministry of Tourism, 2008). Today, tourism is a source of livelihood for millions of people in India. In 2011, 6.29 million foreign tourists visited India, contributing to 5.92% of the gross domestic product, 9.24% of the total employment (Economic Survey, 2012) and a revenue of 17.52 billion dollars (Tourism Statistics, 2011). Indian government is attempting to use tourism sector to overcome the sluggish economic growth, by targeting 12% growth rate and creating 24.9 million jobs in the sector, during the 12th five-year plan (year 2012–2017) (Dhawan, 2011).

Tourism is driven by a wide range of interests – entertainment, sports, religion, culture, adventure, education, health and business etc. Food is an important part of the culture of a region as it manifests intangible heritage. Tourists increasingly realize that 'experiencing a country's food

is essential to understanding its culture' (Canadian Tourism Commission, 2002: 5). Local food is an important element of a destination's attributes, adding to the range of attractions and the overall tourist experience (Symons, 1999). This understanding makes several marketing agencies to use food as a 'cultural artefact' (Barthes, 1979) to attract tourists. Indian government, in addition to other measures, in its annual report (Ministry of Tourism, 2008: 22) envisaged, '... India's wide variety of traditional cuisines is a source of tourist attractions that can be packaged and marketed by developing 'culinary tour routes' for special category of tourists keen on authentic tastes and cuisines'. With increasing evidence (Hall et al., 2004; Nummedal and Hall, 2006; Okumus et al., 2007; Sims, 2009) that promoting

Corresponding author:

Dhiraj Sharma, Institute of Management Technology Ghaziabad, Raj Nagar, Ghaziabad 201001, India.
Email: dsharma@imt.edu / dhiraj_sharma@ymail.com

food at destinations is a win–win situation for tourists and regions, it is being recognized as a sustainable source of destination differentiation.

Attempts have been made to identify the factors that influence tourists' local food consumption in a tourist destination (Kim et al., 2009; Ryu and Jang, 2006; Sparks, 2007); however, there is no such study in India, especially, with respect to foreign tourists. The present study fills this gap and helps various stakeholders by providing a comprehensive understanding of the culinary preference of foreign tourists, specifically in a restaurant setting.

Literature review

Food tourism

Food tourism, one of the subcategories of cultural tourism, is strongly emerging as a niche that complements other means to learn the culture of a destination. Categories of food tourism include gastronomy tourism, culinary tourism, cuisine tourism and gourmet tourism. Ignatov and Smith (2006) used semantics to differentiate these subcategories. They suggested that 'cuisine' and 'gastronomy' are nouns and denote 'styles of food preparation' and 'the art or science of good eating', respectively. 'Culinary', in contrast, is an adjectival form of 'cuisine' and in addition to including 'cuisine', that is, styles of food preparation, the social context in which food is acquired, prepared and consumed is taken into consideration. Specifically, culinary includes ingredients, prepared foods, beverages, food production, motivations, activities, institutional structures and food tourism itself (Ignatov and Smith, 2006: 237–238).

According to the level of interest and the number of tourists, Hall and Sharples (2003) divided food tourism into three main categories, namely, gourmet tourism (or gastronomic/cuisine tourism), culinary tourism and rural/urban tourism. The level of interest of tourists in food was used as key discriminant between the three categories in addition to their core connotation. Gourmet tourism signifies high interest in food, where all tourist activities revolve around food. It is a kind of food tourism, which includes visits to expensive restaurants or wineries that offer special products. The second category, that is, culinary tourism, exhibits moderate interest in food. Culinary tourists appreciate food as a part of the essential experience but the emphasis is not only on food. Culinary tourists are those who eat typical regional dishes at a lower price range

and in a non-fine dining, rather rustic dining ambience (Beer, et al., 2012). Thus, culinary tourism '... is not simply one more niche product such as eco-tourism but a recognition of the vital role that cuisine can play in the creation of a satisfying tourism experience as well as its role in expressing a destination's cultural heritage' (Ignatov and Smith, 2006: 236). Culinary tourism relates to the choice and production of food ingredients, their distribution, the means of preparing them for consumption, the styles of consuming them and the social contexts in which consumption occurs. The third category of food tourism is rural/urban tourism (or travel and tourism) that characterizes a clear majority of the tourists. These food tourists have less (or no) interest in any kind of food activities and consider eating as trying something different or as a plain necessity (Beer et al., 2012).

Food tourism, tourists' motivation and behavioural outcomes

The factors that explain tourists' motivation to travel and behavioural outcome related to consumption of food at travel destinations have been widely researched. Consumption of food involves relaxation, excitement, escapism, education, status and lifestyle, which captures most of the tourists' motivations to travel (Corigliano, 2002; Frochot, 2003). Hudson (1999) introduced 'push factors' and 'pull factors', which encapsulate factors that affect destination choice by tourists and factors that motivate tourists to travel to a destination, respectively. Fields (2002: 37) argued that food simultaneously plays both these roles by 'pushing people away from their familiar foods and eating patterns' and 'pulling them towards new and exciting foods'. Food, thus, has emerged as a major category of the tour package (Elmont, 1995).

Food consumption also has an impact on the behavioural outcomes of tourists. Food is a major source of tourists' satisfaction (Boyne and Hall, 2004; Ryan, 1997; Smith, 1988; Smith and Hall, 2003), recall (Ravenscroft and Westering, 2002) and revisit intentions (Kim et al., 2011; Rimmington and Yuskel, 1998). It provides unforgettable tourist experiences (Law and Au, 2000) such as excitement, inspiration and cultural exploration (Scarpato and Daniele, 2003; Sharples, 2003).

Food and destination marketing

Tourists' demand for unique products and experiences (Fields, 2002), and the emergence of new

competing destinations, is pushing marketers to differentiate (Haven-Tang and Jones, 2006). In addition to using other means of differentiating destinations, association of food with certain localities is proved to be a valuable tool for many regions (Boyne and Hall, 2003; Richards, 2002; Rusher, 2003). Food manifests a destination's intangible heritage that provides an authentic cultural experience (Grew, 2004) apart from adding distinctiveness and value to the destinations. From a strategic perspective, a destination, thus, gets a competitive advantage that reduces substitutability (Hall and Mitchell, 2002), which helps in surviving the increasing competition among destinations.

At a macro level also, the cuisine of a country can showcase its cultural or national identity (Frochot, 2003; Rand et al., 2003). For example, the images of France (Frochot, 2003) and Italy (Boyne et al., 2002) are marked by assimilation of food into their national identities (Corigliano, 2002, Ganter, 2004). Other countries, such as Croatia and South Africa, are attempting to create strategies for developing local cuisines into tourist attractions (Fox, 2007; Rand et al., 2003).

Role of restaurants in food tourism

Restaurants are considered gateways to food tourism. In addition to a place of eating, restaurants render a unique experience (Josiam et al., 2004; Muler, 1999) and also provide key attributes to destination attractiveness (Chen and Hsu, 1999; Chon, Weaver and Kim, 1991). Along with food and wine, restaurants serve as one of the key determinants of tourists' experience (Correia et al., 2007; Gross et al., 2008; Hall and Sharples, 2003; Kivela and Crotts, 2006). Dining in restaurants is one of the most frequent leisure activities and is a source of memorable experiences for tourists (Hall and Mitchell, 2005). Tourists' interest in culinary experiences has triggered enormous growth in the restaurant industry (Sparks et al., 2003); and today, tourists make up a significant part of the market for restaurants and cafes throughout the world (Hall and Sharples, 2003).

Considering the significance of tourists in the food and restaurant business, it is important to understand tourists' culinary preferences for better product design, menu design, marketing campaigns, service quality, thematic ambience, food quality and so on because poor quality and service failure can have negative outcomes,

affecting health, trip disruption and ruining destination reputation (Pendergast, 2006).

In order to understand and serve customers well, attempts have been made in the previous studies (e.g. Hjalager, 2004; Ignatov, 2003; Ignatov and Smith, 2006; Mack et al., 2009; Yun et al., 2011) to segment culinary tourists based on various attributes and characteristics.

Ignatov and Smith (2006), in a Travel Activities and Motivations Study, divided the Canadian culinary tourism market into three major sub-markets based on their key motivation for travel, namely, food tourists, wine tourists and food and wine tourists. Mack et al. (2009) used social value scale to classify culinary tourists into subgroups 'innovators and non-innovators' after dividing them into two groups – culinary tourists and non-culinary tourists. Yun et al. (2011) used two approaches to segment culinary tourists. First, they used the level of participation in culinary experiences and food-related activities as bases to identify four segments of culinary tourists – deliberate, opportunistic, accidental and uninterested culinary tourists. Second, the attitude towards food-related behaviours, when at home and when travelling, was used as the basis to identify three culinary tourist groups: culinary-balanced, culinary-oriented and familiarity-oriented tourists.

Methodology

Sample

The study utilized self-administered, close-ended questionnaire to get participant responses. Responses were obtained from foreign tourists at restaurants located at various monuments, beaches and other sites, soon after their meals, from seven states of India, namely Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Assam, Rajasthan and Delhi. The study period was 3 months, that is, from November 2010 to January 2011, which is the peak tourism period in India.

Of the total 954 customers contacted, 591 agreed to be part of the survey (response rate: 61.95%). Thirty questionnaires were not considered, as data could not be fully recorded. Two more questionnaires were excluded as they were considered outliers, making them sensitive for further analysis (see Table 1).

Variable measurement

The earlier definitions and scope of culinary tourism (Beer et al., 2012; Hall and Sharples,

Table 1. Demographic profile of sample.

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Age (years)		
Up to 25	82	14.7
26–35	208	37.2
36–45	120	21.5
46–55	96	17.2
56–65	28	5.0
65 and above	25	4.5
Income		
Less than \$25,999	134	24.0
\$26,000–51,999	246	44.0
\$52,000–103,999	160	28.6
\$104,000 and above	19	3.4
Gender		
Male	366	65.5
Female	193	34.5
Nationality		
German	58	10.4
United States	140	25.0
France	109	19.5
United Kingdom	50	8.9
Japan	42	7.5
Middle East	26	4.7
Others	134	24.0
Purpose of visit to India		
Visiting friends and relatives	72	12.9
Business	134	24.0
Vacations	250	44.7
Sampling Indian cuisine	18	3.2
Others	85	15.2

2003) and culinary preferences (Auty, 1992; Josiam et al., 2004; Kivela, 1997; Kivela et al., 1999, 2000; Kivela and Crotts, 2006; Mehta and Balasundram, 2002; Upadhyay et al., 2009; Yuksel and Yuksel, 2002) were used to derive items for eliciting culinary preferences of foreign tourists visiting India. The appropriateness of the scale was confirmed through pretests prior to conducting the full-fledged research in the field. Of all, 21 items were selected to collect the responses from consumers. These items were used to develop a self-administered, close-ended questionnaire consisting of a seven-point scale using 'extremely important' at one end of the continuum and 'not at all important' at the other end. Towards the end, the respondents were asked to submit their demographic profile.

Data analysis

Respondents' ratings were subjected to principal factor analyses with varimax rotations for reducing the potential multicollinearity among the items, and improving reliability in tourists'

segmentation, as factor scores were used for subsequent analysis. The internal consistency of each factor was checked by computing the coefficient α of reliability. Consistent with the suggestions of Punj and Stewart (1983), tourists' culinary preferences as identified by factor analysis were used for cluster analysis, instead of the original ratings on scale items. The identified cluster structure was then subjected to multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and discriminant analysis to double-check the classification reliability.

Step 1: factor analysis. The sample size met the set parameters as it was more than 100 (Hair et al., 1995), and the sampling adequacy as measured by Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (0.616) was meritorious (Hair et al., 1995). The significance of correlation matrix (with the Bartlett test of sphericity value of 6864.58) indicated significant correlation between the variables, thus advocating appropriateness of application of factor analysis. Rotation converged in 14 iterations. Varimax rotation converged the original 21 variables into five orthogonal factor dimensions, with eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1.0 and reliability coefficient more than 0.65 (Nunnally, 1978) accounting for 62.33% of the overall variance. These five factors are defined by 19 variables that loaded heavily on them (loading > 0.5) (see Table 2). Each factor's name was derived from the characteristics of its composing variables. The first factor was labelled as 'taste and quality of food' as this factor was formed by the variables such as quality, preparation and hygiene, spices and condiments used and taste and palatability. This factor explained more than 26% of the total variance and has an eigenvalue of 5.84 (Table 2). The second factor was labelled as 'food preparation' as this factor was markedly composed of 'method of cooking' related variables. This factor explained about 14% of the total variance and had an eigenvalue of 3.04. Other retained factors were labelled in accordance with their composite characteristics.

Step 2: cluster analysis. To assign observations to clusters, we clustered the complete sample by a hybrid approach (Punj and Stewart, 1983) that combined hierarchical and non-hierarchical methods. Punj and Stewart (1983) noted that outliers can hamper algorithm performance when more than 90% of all observations are fed into the cluster algorithm. Therefore, outliers ($n = 52$) were deleted from the data to make it

Table 2. Factor analysis.^a

	Loadings	Mean	Community	Eigenvalue	Variance (%)	Cumulative variance (%)	Reliability
Factor 1: taste and quality of food				5.84	26.56	26.56	0.73
Quality of the food	0.77	6.34	0.78				
Food preparation hygiene	0.74	5.87	0.58				
Spices and condiments used	0.66	5.23	0.63				
Taste and palatability of food	0.69	3.88	0.75				
Factor 2: food preparation				3.04	13.81	40.37	0.77
Garnishes used	0.66	5.38	0.72				
Presentation style	0.79	5.94	0.77				
Methods of cooking applied	0.63	5.30	0.76				
Dining ambience	0.60	5.57	0.70				
Factor 3: localization of food and dining etiquettes				2.07	9.31	49.77	0.72
Use of locally available ingredients	0.54	4.89	0.38				
Visibility of food preparation area	0.73	4.09	0.62				
Value for money	0.51	5.87	0.56				
Dining etiquettes followed by diners	0.75	3.77	0.70				
Provision of regional drinks	0.70	3.04	0.76				
Factor 4: tradition and nutrition of food				1.61	7.34	57.17	0.69
Portion size of food	0.66	5.47	0.76				
Nutritional aspects of food	0.73	5.43	0.65				
Dishes with historical connection	0.59	4.85	0.71				
Traditions associated with food	0.70	4.89	0.65				
Factor 5: food aroma and cleanliness				1.15	5.22	62.33	0.67
Grooming and cleanliness of prepared food	0.83	5.98	0.77				
Flavour and aroma of food	0.55	3.77	0.70				
Factor 6: food service quality				1.05	4.73	67.06	0.44
Warmth of the servers' attention	0.73	5.91	0.66				
Cleanliness of the crockery and cutlery served	0.53	6.23	0.58				

^a Extraction method: principal component analysis. Rotation method: varimax with Kaiser normalization. Rotation converged in 14 iterations.

safe for cluster analysis. Based on the guidelines for the identification of clusters in the literature, a visual inspection was carried out of the horizontal icicle dendrogram (on the computer print-out) and the sudden jumps in the algorithm schedule were pointed out. This initial analysis indicated three- to five-cluster solutions. Subsequently, *k*-mean clustering procedure was used to develop three-, four- and five-cluster solutions based on the seed points suggested by the earlier hierarchical clustering.

The *K*-mean cluster analysis resulted in 559 respondents being grouped into three clusters that are labelled as 'taste seekers,' 'localization seekers' and 'experience seekers'. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests also indicated that all five factors aggregating restaurant preferences make a significant contribution to differentiate the three clusters ($p < 0.000$). The sample included 182 palatability seekers, 247 localization seekers and 130 experience seekers. Table 3 presents the profile of the three clusters with factor scores of culinary preferences and significant level of ANOVA tests.

Cluster 1: taste seekers. As in the factor analysis, each cluster was also labelled in accordance with the characteristics of its composites. This cluster contains 32.56% of the total sample (182 out of 559). Mean scores (Table 3) suggest that consumers in this cluster are more concerned with the quality, taste, ambience and method of cooking. Broadly, they are less interested in location, value, nutrition and history and tradition of dishes, rather they look for quality food that is tasty, presented in nice styles using garnishing, and is being offered in a nice ambience. To summarize, this segment is interested in cuisine but is not very enthusiastic about its tradition and historical connection. Any tasty food in a nice ambience suits them.

Cluster 2: localization seekers. This cluster comprises the highest number of tourists, that is, 44.19% (247 out of 559) of the total sample. Mean scores (Table 3) suggest that consumers in this cluster are fond of localization of cuisine that could be in the form of local ingredients and/or regional drinks. Moreover, they also enjoy

Table 3. Cluster analysis.

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
	Taste and quality of food	Food preparation	Localization of food and dining etiquettes	Tradition and nutrition of food	Food aroma and cleanliness
Cluster1 (182)	0.25422	0.51605	-0.44865	-0.49295	-0.27714
Cluster2 (247)	0.44812	0.39680	0.66398	0.18717	0.02082
Cluster3 (130)	-0.03454	-0.73565	-1.03038	0.20470	0.33032
Results of ANOVA	$F = 146.136$ $p < 0.000$	$F = 200.148$ $p < 0.000$	$F = 309.659$ $p < 0.000$	$F = 48.968$ $p < 0.000$	$F = 19.706$ $p < 0.000$

ANOVA: analysis of variance.

being part of any local dining etiquette. Even in the quest for localization, this cluster does not overlook taste, quality, palatability, method of cooking and ambience. The challenge this cluster poses is that it is value conscious as well. Therefore, this cluster is interested in authentic cuisines but at reasonable prices.

Cluster 3: experience seekers. This cluster comprises 23.25% (130 out of 559) of the total sample. Consumers in this cluster attach relatively highest importance to tradition and historical relevance of the cuisine. They prefer to have traditional dishes with historical connections. Additionally, they have hygiene and health concerns as they pay attention to grooming and cleanliness, and nutrition of the food. The focus remains on intangibles like aroma, flavour, tradition and historical connection but not on food per se. Tourists in this cluster are rather explorers who prefer to learn not only about their historical connections of cuisine but also about their nutrition, flavour and aroma.

Step 3: MANOVA. In order to test whether significant differences in culinary preferences exist across segments, a MANOVA was conducted using the three segments as the independent variables and the five factors as dependent variables. Wilks' λ 0.82 (significant at 0.000 level) indicated the overall differences between clusters. It is important to note that a fundamental assumption of MANOVA was satisfied, as the test of equality of group covariance matrices using Box's M (Box's $M = 769.86$, $F = 25.30$ with 30, 620642.29 df , $p = 0.000$) indicated that the covariance was equal. Then, a univariate F test was used to investigate the sources of these group differences (Table 4). The results revealed that all factors contributed towards significant difference among clusters ($p < 0.000$). Therefore, the analysis indicates the robustness of the factor

structure in segmenting foreign tourists in accordance with their culinary preferences.

Step 4: discriminant analysis. Discriminant analysis was employed to double-check the cluster structure. As the significance value of Wilks' λ test (which tests the hypothesis that the means of the functions listed are equal across groups) is less than 0.05, it indicates that the groups differ, and, therefore, the function is a significant discriminator (Table 5). This is clearly the case in this study ($p < 0.000$), and one can conclude that both the functions are valid discriminators. The three clusters generated in the study are significantly different from each other.

Finally, the effectiveness of discriminant function is decided by its rate of correct classification of original variables among the clusters. To this effect, it can be observed that the discriminant function has been able to classify 99.7% of original variables into the predefined groups. The high level of accurate classification suggests the robustness of the discriminant function (Table 6).

Discussion and implications

This study examines the culinary preferences of foreign tourists visiting India. Preferences of foreign tourists were factor analyzed to explore the latent dimensions among their preferences with the intent to reduce 21 variables into a few manageable ones. Next, the evolved factor structure was used to ascertain proximity/distance of foreign tourists' culinary preferences. The exercise was conducted to segment foreign tourists based on the evolved factor structure and to understand broad leanings among them, so that marketing efforts could be economized. The study was initiated in the backdrop of the absence of significant similar studies in India.

Consumers' preferences that were measured on a 21-item scale converged into five broad

Table 4. Univariate analysis (*F* test) results.

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Factor 1: taste and quality of food	Between segments	55.094	2	27.547	146.136	0.000
	Within segments	104.807	556	0.189		
Factor 2: food preparation	Between segments	141.124	2	70.562	200.148	0.000
	Within segments	196.017	556	0.353		
Factor 3: localization of food and dining etiquettes	Between segments	278.785	2	139.393	309.659	0.000
	Within segments	250.283	556	0.450		
Factor 4: tradition and nutrition of food	Between segments	57.816	2	28.908	48.968	0.000
	Within segments	328.234	556	0.590		
Factor 5: food aroma and cleanliness	Between segments	28.261	2	14.130	19.706	0.000
	Within segments	398.696	556	0.717		

Table 5. Wilks' λ .

Test of function(s)	Wilks' λ	Chi square	df	<i>p</i>
1 through 2	0.143	1077.945	10	0.000
2	0.447	445.960	4	0.000

factors. These five factors are explained by 19 variables. These factors are taste and quality of food, food preparation, localization of food and dining etiquettes, tradition and nutrition of food and food aroma and cleanliness. The findings of the present study are partly in consonance with the outcome of similar studies conducted earlier (e.g. Andersson and Mossberg, 2004; Cullen, 2005; Kivela et al., 2000; Nield et al., 2000; Yuksel and Yuksel, 2002) to explore the dining preferences of tourists. These studies identified food quality as one of the primary preferences. In the present study too, taste and quality of food figured out as the most important attribute. The present study identified other factors of culinary preferences, namely, food preparation, localization of food and dining etiquettes, tradition and nutrition of food and food aroma and cleanliness. These factors offer a preview of culinary preferences of foreign tourists visiting India. In particular, factors emphasizing localization and historical and traditional relevance could be used by various stakeholders in increasing satisfaction and patronage of foreign tourists.

The study further contributes by exploring the heterogeneity/homogeneity among consumers with respect to the evolved factors. Their classification into taste seekers, localization seekers and experience seekers based on their preferences offers better insight related to the benefits sought by each segment, which in turn can help them to calibrate their marketing efforts. The study of Kivela and Crofts (2006) partially supports the evoked segmentation structure. Taste

seekers are the ones for whom, food is at the centre and the adjacent rings are other factors like service, fine cuisine and so on (Andersson and Mossberg, 2004). However, the majority of the surveyed tourists, that is, localization seekers and experience seekers, who constitute 67.44% of the respondents, prefer delicacies of localization or traditional relevance. These are the segments that can be explored further to open vistas for culinary tourism. Tourists' segments that prefer localization and historical relevance offer opportunities for marketers to promote the destination as a culinary destination. Customers' choices in these segments seem to be the result of their psychological rather than physical needs (Finkelstein, 1989). The emergence of these large segments corroborates that people prefer enjoyment over and above their biological needs (Cardello et al., 2000). If these segments are targeted and served, they may enhance the tourists' patronage of India as culinary tourism destination. A major portion of these tourists are value seekers, in addition to their preference for localization. Therefore, it will be challenging for marketers to offer a right trade-off of localization of food and dining etiquettes and value for such localization seekers. The outcome of the present study could also be used by government agencies to deliberate on policy initiatives. Hospitality industry too can use the findings of this study to fine-tune their marketing mix and target specific segment(s) of foreign tourists visiting India. It is high time to realize that for tourists visiting India, a destination's cuisine offers an opportunity to deliver pleasure that generates emotions and experiences while on holidays (Kivela and Chu, 2001). Taking a clue from the preferences, delicacies whose taste and quality is rated high by such tourists can be developed into tourists' products (Hobsbawn and Ranger, 1983), the way

Table 6. Classification results.^a

		Cluster number of case	Predicted group membership			Total
			1	2	3	
Original	Count	1	182	0	0	182
		2	13	234	0	247
		3	0	0	130	130
	Percentage	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
		2	5.3	94.7	0.0	100.0
		3	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

^a 99.7% of original grouped cases correctly classified.

Italian cuisine and wine have been promoted (Hjalager and Corigliano, 2000). The evolved factors also accommodate partly the growing importance of diet, hygiene and health (Harrington and Ottenbacher, 2010).

Future research

This study provides a foundation for future research on culinary preferences of the foreign tourists, by evolving possible dimensions of tourists' culinary preferences and their distinct segments. The evolved segments can be enriched by additional research that supplements the psychographic details of tourists.

Finally, the analysis of respondents' culinary preferences in this study has underpinned the structuring of the hypotheses for a more in-depth investigation – whether these preferences play any role in tourists' selection of a destination, the development of positive/negative image regarding a destination, patronage of a destination and so on.

Acknowledgements

The authors are indebted to anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Andersson TD and Mossberg L (2004) The dining experience: do restaurants satisfy customer needs? *Food Service Technology* 4(4): 171–177.
- Auty S (1992) Consumer choice and segmentation in the restaurant industry. *Service Industries Journal* 12(3): 324–339.
- Barthes R (1979) Toward a psychosociology of contemporary food consumption. In: Forster R and Ranum O (eds) *Food and Drink in History*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 28–35.
- Beer CL, Ottenbacher MC, and Harrington RJ (2012) Food tourism implementation in the black forest destination. *Journal of Culinary Science and Technology* 10(2): 106–128.
- Boyne S and Hall D (2003) Managing food and tourism developments: issues for planning and opportunities to add value. In: Hall CM, Sharples L, Mitchell R, Macionis N, and Cambourne B (eds) *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 285–295.
- Boyne S and Hall D (2004) Place promotion through food and tourism: rural branding and the role of websites. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 1(1): 80–92.
- Boyne S, Williams F, and Hall D (2002) On the trail of regional success: tourism, food production and the Isle of Arran taste trail. In: Hjalager A and Richards G (eds) *Tourism and Gastronomy*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 91–114.
- Cardello AV, Schutz H, Snow C, and Leshner L (2000) Predictors of food acceptance, consumption and satisfaction in specific eating situations. *Food Quality and Preference* 11(3): 201–216.
- Canadian Tourism Commission (2002) *Acquiring a Taste for Cuisine Tourism: A Product Development Strategy*. Ottawa, UK: Canadian Tourism Commission.
- Chen JS and Hsu CHC (1999) The use of logit analysis to enhance market segmentation methodology. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 23(3): 268–283.
- Chon KS, Weaver PA, and Kim CY (1991) Marketing your community: image analysis in Norfolk. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 31(4): 31–37.
- Corigliano A (2002) The route to quality: Italian gastronomy networks in operations. In: Hjalager AM and Richards G (eds) *Tourism and Gastronomy*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 166–185.

- Correia A, Do Valle PO, and Moço C (2007) Why people travel to exotic places. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 1(1): 45–61.
- Cullen F (2005) Factors influencing restaurant selection in Dublin. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research* 7(2): 53–85.
- Dhawan H (2011) Government eyes on tourism sector to bail out ailing economy. *The Times of India*, 08 November. Available at: <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/Government-eyes-on-tourism-sector-to-bail-out-ailing-economy/articleshow/10649209.cms> (accessed on 10 January 2012).
- Economic Survey (2012) Chapter-10: service sector. Available at: <http://indiabudget.nic.in/es2011-12/echap-10.pdf> (accessed 15 June 2012)
- Elmont S (1995) Tourism and food service two sides of the same coin. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 36(1): 57–63.
- Fields K (2002) Demand for the gastronomy tourism product: motivational factors. In: Hjalager AM and Richards G (eds) *Tourism and Gastronomy*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 36–50.
- Finkelstein J (1989) *Dining Out: A Sociology of Modern Manners*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Fox R (2007) Reinventing the gastronomic identity of Croatian tourist destinations. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 26(3): 546–559.
- Frochot I (2003) An analysis of regional positioning and its associated food images in French tourism regional brochures. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 14(3–4): 77–96.
- Ganter HD (2004) Changes in work organizations in French top-quality restaurants. *Business History* 46(3): 439–460.
- Grew R (2004) *Food in Global History*. Newton, MA: New Global History Press
- Gross MJ, Brien C, and Brown G (2008) Examining the dimensions of a lifestyle tourism destination. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 2(1): 44–66.
- Hair JF, Jr, Anderson RE, Tatham RL, and William CB (1995) *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*. New Jersey, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hall CM and Mitchell R (2002) Tourism as a force for gastronomic globalisation and localization. In: Hjalager AM and Richards G (eds) *Tourism and Gastronomy*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 71–90.
- Hall CM and Mitchell R (2005) Gastronomic tourism: comparing food and wine tourism experiences. In: Novelli M (eds) *Niche Tourism: Contemporary Issues, Trends and Cases*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 73–88.
- Hall CM and Sharples L (2003) The consumption of experience or the experience of consumption? an introduction to the tourism of taste. In: Hall CM, Sharples L, Mitchell R, Macionis N, and Cambourne B (eds) *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 314–335.
- Hall CM and Thomas R (2004) Small firms and wine and food tourism in New Zealand: Issues of collaboration, clusters and lifestyles. In: Thomas R (ed) *Small Firms in Tourism: International Perspectives*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier, pp. 167–181.
- Harrington RJ and Ottenbacher MC (2010) Culinary tourism: a case study of the gastronomic capital. *Journal of Culinary Science and Technology* 8(1): 14–32.
- Haven-Tang C and Jones E (2006) Using local food and drink to differentiate tourism destinations through a sense of place. *Journal of Culinary Science and Technology* 4(4): 69–86.
- Hjalager AM (2004) What do tourists eat and why? Towards a sociology of gastronomy and tourism. *Tourism (Zagreb)* 52(2): 195–201.
- Hjalager AM and Corigliano MA (2000) Food for tourists determinants of an image. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 2(4): 281–293.
- Hobsbawn E and Ranger T (1983) *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson S (1999) Consumer behaviour related to tourism. In: Pizam A and Mansfeld Y (eds) *Consumer Behaviour in Travel and Tourism*. New York, NY: The Haworth Hospitality Press, pp.7–32.
- Ignatov E (2003) *The Canadian Culinary Tourists: How Well do we Know Them?*. Waterloo, ON: University of Waterloo.
- Ignatov E and Smith S (2006) Segmenting Canadian culinary tourists. *Current Issues in Tourism* 9(3): 235–255.
- Josiam BM, Mattson M, and Sullivan P (2004) The historaunt: heritage tourism at Mickey's dining car. *Tourism Management* 25(4): 453–461.
- Kim YG, Eves A, and Scarles C (2009) Building a model of local food consumption on trips and holidays: a grounded theory approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 28(3): 423–431.
- Kivela J (1997) Restaurant marketing: selection and segmentation on Hong Kong. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 9 (2–3): 116–123.
- Kivela J and Chu CYH (2001) Delivering quality service: diagnosing favourable and unfavourable servicemen counter in restaurants. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 25(3): 257–271.
- Kivela J and Crotts JC (2006) Tourism and gastronomy: gastronomy's influence on how tourists experience a destination. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 30(3): 354–377.

- Kivela J, Inbakaran R, and Reece J (2000) Consumer research in the restaurant environment. Part 3: analysis, findings and conclusions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 12(1): 13–30.
- Kivela J, Reece J, and Inbakaran R (1999) Consumer research in the restaurant environment. Part 2: research design and analytical methods. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 11(6): 269–286.
- Law R and Au N (2000) Relationship modeling in tourism shopping: a decision rules induction approach. *Tourism Management* 21(3): 241–249.
- Mack R, Blose J, and MacLaurin T (2009) Segmenting the culinary tourist market: an American and Australian comparison. In: *Proceedings of the 2009 Oxford Business & Economics Conference Program*. June 24–26 2009. St. Hugh's College, Oxford, UK: Oxford University.
- Mehta SS and Balasundram M (2002) Marketing determinants of customers' attitude towards selecting a restaurant. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal* 6(1): 27–44.
- Ministry of Tourism (2008), Annual Report 2007-08. Available at: <http://tourism.gov.in/AnnualReport07-08.pdf> (accessed 15 June 2012).
- Nield K, Kozak M, and LeGrys G (2000) The role of food service in tourist satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 19(4): 375–384.
- Nummedal M and Hall CM (2006) Local food in tourism: an investigation of the New Zealand South Island's bed and breakfast sector's use and perception of local food. *Tourism Review International* 9(4): 365–378.
- Nunnally JC (1978) *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd edn., New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Okumus B, Okumus F, and McKercher B (2007) Incorporating local and international cuisines in the marketing of tourism destinations: the cases of Hong Kong and Turkey. *Tourism Management* 28(1): 253–261.
- Pendergast D (2006) Tourist gut reactions: food safety and hygiene issues. In: Wilks J, Pendergast D, and Leggat P (eds) *Tourism in Turbulent Times: Towards Safe Experiences for Visitors*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier, pp.143–154.
- Punj G and Stewart DW (1983) Cluster analysis in marketing research: review and suggestions for application. *Journal of Marketing Research* 20(2): 134–148.
- Rand G, Heath E, and Alberts N (2003) The role of local and regional food in destination marketing: a South African situation analysis. In Hall CM (eds) *Wine, Food, and Tourism Marketing*. New York, NY: The Haworth Hospitality Press, pp. 77–96.
- Ravenscroft N and Westering J V (2002) Gastronomy and intellectual property. In: Hjalager AM and Richards G (eds) *Tourism and Gastronomy*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 153–165.
- Richards G (2002) Gastronomy: an essential ingredient in tourism production and consumption. In: Hjalager AM and Richards G (eds) *Tourism and Gastronomy*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 3–20.
- Rimington M and Yüksel A (1998) Tourist satisfaction and food service experience: results and implications of an empirical investigation. *Anatolia* 9(1): 37–57.
- Rusher K (2003) The Bluff oyster festival and regional economic development: festivals as culture commodified. In: Hall CM, Sharples L, Mitchell R, Macionis N, and Cambourne B (eds) *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 192–205.
- Ryan C (1997) *Recreational Tourism: A Social Science Perspective*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Ryu K and Jang SCS (2006) Intention to experience local cuisine in a travel destination: the modified theory of reasoned action. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 30(4): 507–516.
- Scarpato R and Daniele R (2003) New global cuisine: tourism, authenticity and sense of place in postmodern gastronomy. In: Hall CM, Sharples L, Mitchell R, Macionis N, and Cambourne B (eds) *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 298–313.
- Sharples L (2003) Food tourism in the peak district national park, England. In: Hall CM, Sharples L, Mitchell R, Macionis N, and Cambourne B (eds) *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Sims R (2009) Food, place and authenticity: local food and the sustainable tourism experience. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 17(3): 321–336.
- Smith A and Hall CM (2003) Restaurants and local food in New Zealand. In: Hall CM, Sharples L, Mitchell R, Macionis N, and Cambourne B (eds) *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 248–268.
- Smith SLJ (1988) Defining tourism a supply-side view. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15(2): 179–190.
- Sparks B (2007) Planning a wine tourism vacation? Factors that help to predict tourist behavioural intentions. *Tourism Management* 28(5): 1180–1192.
- Sparks B, Bowen J, and Klag S (2003) Restaurants and the tourist market. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 15(1): 6–13.

- Symons M (1999) Gastronomic authenticity and sense of place. In: Molloy J. and Davies J. (eds) *Proceedings of the 9th Australian Tourism and Hospitality Research Conference, Council for Australian University Tourism and Hospitality Education – Part Two*, pp. 333–340, Canberra, Australia: Bureau of Tourism Research.
- Tourism Statistics (2011) India tourism statistics at a glance 2011. Available at: [http://tourism.gov.in/writereaddata/CMSPagePicture/file/marketresearch/INDIATOURISMSTATICS\(ENGLISH\).pdf](http://tourism.gov.in/writereaddata/CMSPagePicture/file/marketresearch/INDIATOURISMSTATICS(ENGLISH).pdf) (accessed on 10 January 2012).
- Upadhyay Y, Singh SK, and Sharma D (2009) Consumers preferences towards restaurants: examining their homogeneity. In: Samu S, Vaidyanathan R, and Chakravarti D (eds) *Asia-Pacific Advances in Consumer Research*. Vol. 8. Duluth, MN: Association for Consumer Research. Available online at: <http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/display.asp?id=14866> (accessed on February 05, 2010).
- Yuksel A and Yuksel F (2002) Market segmentation based on tourists' dining preferences. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 26(4): 315–331.
- Yun D, Hennessey SM, and MacDonald R (2011) Understanding culinary tourists: segmentations based on past culinary experiences and attitudes toward food-related behaviour. In: *International CHRIE Conference-Refereed Track*, Denver, Colorado, USA, 27-30 July 2011. Available at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/refereed/ICHRIE_2011/Friday/15 (accessed on 14 January 2012).