

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TOURIST ATTITUDES TOWARDS CULINARY TOURISM IN SPAIN AND SLOVENIA

Abstract

Purpose – This article aims to determine the role of gastronomy as a destination attraction, tourists' perception of culinary tourism, its influence on satisfaction with the trip, and the economic value tourists attach to the opportunity to try traditional cuisine. The article also examines possible sociocultural differences between different tourist segments according to how they rate gastronomy in their motivations for travel.

Design/methodology/approach – Data were collected by means of 392 questionnaires distributed in Ljubljana (Slovenia) and Cordoba (Spain). Various bivariate and multivariate statistical techniques are used to perform a comprehensive econometric study.

Findings – Tourists exhibit greater interest in gastronomy as a travel motivation in the Spanish city, where they value aspects related to this activity more positively. However, the willingness to pay more to try traditional food is similar in both cities. No sociodemographic differences were found between the segments regarding the importance of gastronomy as a travel motivation.

Research limitations/implications – Restaurateurs, hospitality associations, and other public or private stakeholders engaged in culinary tourism can benefit from this type of analysis. The study reveals the need to improve language skills, human capital formation and the innovation of traditional dishes in the Spanish sample. It also shows that the future of culinary tourism in Slovenia will depend on enhancing the international visibility of this emerging tourism sector.

Originality/value – Successful strategies to promote culinary tourism must take into account the views of its main target group, tourists. Many studies analyzing tourist profiles are mainly qualitative, with few providing a cross-country comparison. This analysis provides a comprehensive, quantitative econometric approach to tourists' opinions, and compares two different countries that differ in terms of their international visibility regarding this type of activity; specifically, Spain, which is a consolidated and world-renowned culinary tourism destination, and Slovenia, which is in the process of developing a culinary tourism project. Segmenting tourists based on their interest in culinary tourism also allows designing promotional strategies specifically tailored to each segment.

Keywords Culinary tourism, Gastronomy, Tourist perception, Spain, Slovenia

1. INTRODUCTION

Dining out is a universal pleasure, and although the frequency may vary by age, culture, social class or geographical area, it is clearly an important form of recreation (Smith, 1983). Precisely because it is a very commonplace, everyday activity, it is only recently that food-related activities while traveling has begun to receive attention in the tourism literature. However, it is almost unthinkable to conceive of a trip without consuming food and beverages outside the home, making food an essential element of the tourist product (Reynolds, 1994) that is not limited to the need to feed oneself, but may respond to the desire to eat interesting products in pleasant surroundings (Pillsbury, 1990; Hjalager and Corigliano, 2000). The research problem of this phenomenon is to determine the specific motivations of tourists when eating out, that is, if the main reason for the trip is to try typical food or if it is a secondary reason. Indeed, it seems that increasing numbers of people travel for food-related reasons (Hall and Sharples, 2003; Long, 2004).

Any study of the role of food in tourism must analyze this phenomenon as both an attraction and a basic necessity on the trip that is crucial to tourist satisfaction, because while tourists can choose what to do during their visit, they cannot avoid eating and drinking at the destination even though the available food is unfamiliar to them (Cohen and Avieli, 2004). In fact, there are studies which confirm that eating is the activity where tourists are less likely to reduce their holiday spending (Pyo *et al.*, 1991). Richards (2002) found that tourists place special emphasis on how they experience their visit to a destination, carefully selecting restaurants or foods that will satisfy their personal preferences. Indeed, trying certain dishes can be a pleasurable sensory experience that makes the cuisine of a destination a “pull” factor and a tourism marketing tool that should not be underestimated.

According to Culinary Tourism (2011), in the United Kingdom alone, culinary tourism is estimated to be worth almost 8 billion dollars per year, while the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) predicts an exponential growth of this tourism sector by 2020. Indeed, the importance of food and drink in travel is widely recognized by authors such as Telfer and Wall (2000), who reported that food spending accounts for around one third of total tourist expenditure. The World Food Travel Association (2014)¹ estimates the percentage of global tourist spending on food and drink at 25%, and highlights that eating is an experience available to tourists any day of the year that affects the senses, unlike other cultural activities. It also lists the many advantages of gastronomic tourism for the different stakeholders engaged in tourism (higher incomes, greater influx of travelers, sense of pride and belonging to a local community, increased revenues for governments, etc.).

The purpose and research question of this paper is, therefore, to determine the role of gastronomy as a destination attraction. To address this question, the empirical analysis examines a series of secondary objectives, namely tourists’ perception of gastronomic tourism; the importance of the traditional food of a region as a tourist attraction; the opinion of tourists about the quality of the cuisine and its influence on travel satisfaction; and the economic value tourists attach to the opportunity to try traditional and typical dishes. Finally, we discuss the possible sociocultural differences of the tourist segments according to how tourists rank gastronomy as a motivation for travel. If there is a segment of tourists for whom food is the essential reason for choosing the destination, this should be taken into account by tourism stakeholders when designing strategies targeted at each group and their particular gastronomic motivations.

To carry out the empirical analysis, we have selected two tourism destinations that engage in gastronomic tourism: the city of Cordoba, Spain, which is the Iberoamerican Capital

¹ <http://www.worldfoodtravel.org/benefits-of-food-tourism/>

of Gastronomic Culture 2014; and Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, where the country's culinary diversity has been promoted by different government agencies in recent years.

The article is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the recent literature on culinary tourism. Section 3 provides an overview of the most characteristic features related to culinary tourism in the two study areas. The fieldwork methodology is described in section 4. Finally, the most salient results are discussed in section 5 and conclusions are drawn in section 6.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, we provide a review of the literature on the relationship between food and tourism. We first look at the definition of culinary tourism to then examine its relationship with the development of a tourism destination. Finally, we analyze the influence of gastronomy on the way tourists experience their trip.

2.1. The culinary tourism concept

Tikkanen (2007) and Smith and Costello (2009) maintain that local food has recently emerged as a means to attract tourists, with those seeking culinary experiences and new flavor sensations growing in importance (Gyimóthy and Mykletun, 2009). Food and drink of the destination are becoming a major area of interest in the specialized literature on tourism (Hall *et al.*, 2003; Long, 2004; Honggen and Smith, 2008; Mason and Paggiaro, 2012). Food is fast becoming the basis for different types of tourism, not only those related to gastronomy, because it combines all the requirements to be considered a cultural tourism product (Scarpato, 2002). On the one hand, it is an alternative for those destinations that cannot benefit from sun, sea, and sand tourism or those lacking historical or natural resources, while on the other it adds value to the tourism experience and can generate tourism demand for short trips.

Enteleca Research Consultancy defines local food and drink as those produced in a given area. According to Nummedal and Hall (2006), culinary specialties possess a local identity, that is, local food and/or drink which require raw materials from other areas but are processed locally, thus acquiring their identity. For Richards (2002), gastronomy is not only difficult to define but the meaning of the term has expanded over time. According to Gacnik (2012: 40), the word "gastronomy" entails "culinary heritage as well as modern culinary creativity, wine heritage, and present wine creativity".

A variety of terms have been used to express the linkage between food and tourism: food tourism, culinary tourism, gastronomic tourism. The term "culinary tourism" was coined in 1998 and refers to international tourists who plan their travels on the basis of a desire to experience culinary specialties and traditions (Long, 2004). Since then, several authors have defined food tourism, gastronomic tourism and/or culinary tourism. Everett and Slocum (2013) argued that the vast array of food tourism initiatives makes defining "food tourism" problematic. There are some distinguishing nuances between the other terms. While 'gastronomy' is often used in a general sense, referring to the dishes, meals, methods and techniques of food preparation in a specific region or area that shape its distinctive cuisine, 'culinary' is actually a broader term encompassing food, drink, and culinary experience (Kivela and Crofts, 2006). According to Ignatov and Smith (2006) 'culinary' tends to emphasize the actual practice and style of food preparation and consumption as well as the social context in which food is acquired and eaten; these authors argue "culinary" can refer to food tourism itself. Therefore, in this article the concept of "culinary tourism" will be used.

Centrando la atención entonces en este término, se pueden apreciar dos grandes grupos de definiciones. Por un lado los autores que entienden la gastronomía como un factor de motivación para el viaje. Así, Smith (2001: 3) referred to motivational factors to explain the concept: “culinary tourism occurs when the appreciation of regionally produced foods and beverages is a significant motivator or activity during the trip”. Wolf (2002, 2006) followed this idea to define either gastronomic or culinary tourism as a type of tourism in which the traveler is motivated to seek and enjoy food and drink at the destination and develop memorable dining experiences. Thus, tourists may travel to a destination to try the food of a restaurant that has obtained a Michelin star, or be attracted to specialties and typical dishes from an area (Björk and Kaupinnen-Räisänen, 2014). Through these experiences, tourists are imbued with the culture of the area they visit (Johns and Clarke, 2001; Kivela and Johns, 2002), as we will see below. Ignatov and Smith (2006) defined culinary tourism as tourism in which travelers buy or consume local food or observe the process of local food production, such that these activities are an important reason to travel. Smith and Xao (2008; 289) defined culinary tourism as “any tourism experience in which one learns about, appreciates, or consumes branded local culinary resources”.

In contrast, Lee et al. (2015) have suggested that the definitions of food tourism, gastronomy tourism, and gourmet tourism have to consider food as the primary motivating factor for travel. Other authors go further and define food not only as a motivating or relevant factor in the decision to travel, but as the primary reason. For Hall and Mitchell (2000), for example, it involves “visiting food exhibitions, food festivals, restaurants and specific locations for which food tasting and experiencing are the primary factor for travel”. According to Culinary Tourism (2011: 1), “gastronomic tourism refers to trips made to destinations where the local food and beverages are the main motivating factors for travel”. In short, the local cuisine must involve an environment in which restaurant cuisine of the destination is a source for tourists to obtain pleasurable experiences and emotions that recall the trip (Kivela and Chu, 2001).

In examining different aspects of culinary tourism, several authors agree that gastronomy is a complex and multidisciplinary activity (Kivela and Crofts, 2006; Gacnik, 2012) that combines sciences as diverse as sociology, chemistry, history, anthropology, biology, and others. As such, studies on food and tourism have analyzed a wide range of topics. A summary of the most recent studies on the topic is provided in Table 1.

Table 1

2.2. Culinary tourism and tourism destination development

Planning a culinary tourism experience requires an interdisciplinary and holistic analysis in which different epistemological perspectives must be considered (Hjalager, 2002). However, there is general agreement on the benefits of using culinary tourism as a source of regional tourism development (Hall *et al.*, 2003; Fox, 2007; Sims, 2009). Hillel *et al.* (2013: 201) defined the culinary appeal of a destination as “the ability to satiate tourist appetites for authentic products and experiences, which convincingly communicate a link between food, place and community”. Thus, as we already mentioned, gastronomy can be a sign of the cultural identity of a region. For this reason, Kivela and Crofts (2009) argued that a gastronomic trip not only involves an experience or adventure but also an encounter with culture. Okumus *et al.* (2007) considered local cuisine to be a testament to the intangible heritage of the destination, so by tasting the typical food of the area, tourists can enjoy an authentic cultural experience. To do so, however, food must have a complementary relationship with the local tourism image and tradition/history (Horng and Tsai, 2012). Presenza and Del Chiappa (2013) highlighted the possibility of gaining differential advantages between destinations offering distinctive local products that enhance their local identity. In this way, the consumption of local food can lead to a multiplier effect which benefits the community. Mak et al. (2011) suggested that the effects of

globalization can affect the gastronomic identity and image but should be interpreted as a motivating force for reinventing the local cuisine and culinary identity.

As a result, tourism organizations are now recognizing the potential of culinary tourism as an important tool to promote destinations. Several studies have found that consuming the typical food and drink of a particular region may be a key motivation in tourists' decision to travel, thereby contributing to economic development (Telfer and Wall, 2000; Kivela and Crofts, 2006; Kim *et al.*, 2009). Indeed, Wolf (2006) argued that a pleasant experience with the food or drink of an area not only contributes to the motivation to travel, but also influences the way tourists appreciate the destination. Although culinary tourism is not a new phenomenon, it has grown significantly in the tourism industry in recent years (Billups, 2007; Ottenbacher and Harrington, 2013). In fact, many tourist destinations are beginning to consider local food and cuisine as a niche market and a pull factor for promoting tourism (Boniface, 2003; du Rand *et al.*, 2003; Hall and Sharples, 2003; Kivela and Crofts, 2005; Okumus *et al.*, 2007). Horng and Tsai (2012) also maintained that cuisine can be a crucial element in the cultural heritage of these destinations and that culinary tourism is an emerging segment in multiple countries and regions where it is a unique competitive advantage. Indeed, there is growing interest in promoting culinary tourism in certain areas of the world that have yet to be recognized for their cuisine or gastronomic identity (Ottenbacher and Harrington, 2013)

In this sense, given that not all tourist destinations have the capacity to provide authentic gastronomic experiences, several studies have proposed models to assess the potential gastronomic attraction of a destination (Hjalager and Corigliano, 2000; Hillel *et al.*, 2013). In their study of Hong Kong, Kivela and Crofts (2006) noted that destinations with greater opportunities to develop culinary tourism as a product are those that have distinctive ingredients or foods to create a gastronomic strategy. Although it is possible to associate a style of food (which is normally segmented by nationalities: Chinese, Italian, Mexican, etc.) with a destination, not all places that attempt to capitalize on the opportunities that gastronomy provides are doing so effectively by incorporating it in their tourism marketing activities (Okumus *et al.*, 2007).

It is also important to emphasize that the relationship between gastronomy and the tourist destination is symbiotic (Fields, 2002, Richards, 2002) since the destination provides recipes, foods, chefs, and the cultural baggage that make gastronomy an ideal product for tourism consumption and an inseparable part of the travel experience (Kivela and Crofts, 2006).

2.3. Culinary tourism: influence on the travel experience and types of tourists

Although the literature establishes a clear link between tourism and gastronomy (Hall and Mitchell, 2005; Wolf, 2006; Ottenbacher and Harrington, 2013), many issues remain to be explored in relation to the consumption of local food by tourists (Kim *et al.*, 2009). Authors such as Kivela and Crofts (2006) believe that there are still too few studies of culinary tourists, and questions such as the possible influence of gastronomy on the quality of the tourist experience in the destination, or the existence of a market segment of food tourism are not yet clear. Ottenbacher and Harrington (2013) proposed a future research line to gain a better understanding of the perspective and opinion of tourists as end users of activities related to culinary tourism, which can provide valuable data and results for organizations linked to this industry. Okumus *et al.* (2007) noted that there is not yet sufficient knowledge of the food consumption behavior of tourists. Hjalager and Corigliano (2000) reinforced this idea in arguing that a good gastronomy-based project to promote tourism must take careful account of the attitudes and roles that tourists have in relation to this activity.

Mak *et al.* (2012) have two opinions regarding tourists' relationship with food. Firstly, that food is an attraction (Hjalager and Richards, 2002); and secondly, that the current "food

neophobia” (Cohen and Avieli, 2004), in which food is perceived as an impediment, can deter tourists from visiting the destination since many travelers may require some familiarity with the cuisine; especially Western tourists visiting developing countries who view the food as foreign.

As regards the relationship between gastronomy and the way tourists experience the trip, Long (1998) defined culinary tourists as those who engage in exploring the foodways of others. Although several factors are involved in tourists’ opinion (hygiene, accessibility, quality of service), a key element is their perception of the authenticity of the local food. For Mason and Paggiaro (2012), culinary tourism has many important effects on tourist behavior with respect to territories: greater knowledge, loyalty, emotional connection, more involvement, and brand differentiation. Fields (2002) and Sparks (2007) argued that typical local food introduces tourists to new flavors and brings them in closer contact with local traditions.

An additional segment of tourists that merits attention is the Slow Food Movement. This non-profit association was started over 20 years ago and now has some 100,000 members in 150 countries. The movement’s philosophy is to acquire clean, good, and healthy food linked to the local culture and geography that does not harm the environment. Moreover, the food must be produced sustainably on the basis of social justice and fair wages (Schneider, 2008). Lee et al. (2015) found differences between the members of this movement, who were more interested in the local culture on their trips, and non-member tourists, who expressed a preference for activity and adventure. Interestingly, food was not the primary reason for traveling among members of the Slow Food Movement, but they were found to have an open mind to try new ingredients, eat at local restaurants, and buy food at local markets.

On the other hand, tourist satisfaction regarding local food has been analyzed in some studies such as that of Enteleca Research and Consultancy (2000) in Britain, where approximately 72% of visitors to the country had expressed interest in trying the local food and drink during their holiday and were pleased with the experience. In a similar line, Kivela and Crofts (2006) found a clear relationship between gastronomy and the tourist’s experience at the destination, such that some travelers expressed their willingness to return to the same place to sample the unique cuisine again.

Studies such as that of Cohen and Avieli (2004) distinguished different tourist profiles in terms of their approach to food at the destination. “Recreational tourists”, who are seeking to relax and enjoy themselves, care little about authenticity and will look for familiar foods or those which are easy to acquire without concern for the more authentic, typical or traditional food of the destination. In contrast, MacCannell (1973) stated that “experiential tourists” seek to experience the authentic life of local residents, meaning that from a culinary standpoint they will be interested in local dishes and food habits.

Quang and Wang (2004) considered that food can act as a primary motivation or be a less important factor for tourists (Okumus *et al.*, 2007), but which nevertheless adds value to the destination image. Hall and Sharples (2003) also cautioned of the difference between culinary tourists for whom food is the main purpose of the visit and others who eat the local cuisine as part of their travel experience, but for whom food is a secondary or less relevant motivation. Studies such as Boyne *et al.* (2003) classified tourists on a continuum ranging from the most committed to food as a primary reason for travel to tourists who have no interest in the local cuisine.

This study will therefore focus on tourists’ connection with the gastronomy in the selected destinations, as well as their characteristics and motivations according to their degree of commitment to the gastronomy. To achieve this aim, we will distinguish between different segments in the samples analyzed.

3. STUDY AREAS

The empirical part of this research examines culinary tourism in two geographical areas which are traditionally known as cultural tourism destinations. Specifically, Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, which is an area that is gaining increasing attention for its gastronomic development; and the city of Cordoba, Spain, a more consolidated destination as far as gastronomy is concerned and one which is well known in tourist circuits for its culinary offering. These two destinations were selected to perform the fieldwork as they permit comparing the significance of culinary tourism in urban environments, unlike other studies carried out in rural areas. It is also interesting to examine the possible disparities between an established tourist destination such as Cordoba and another destination, Ljubljana, which is currently undergoing a process of market repositioning. In what follows, we characterize each of these areas with regard to the development of culinary tourism.

3.1. Ljubljana-Slovenia

Since gaining independence in 1991, the Republic of Slovenia, a relatively small country whose capital is Ljubljana, covers an area of 20,273 square kilometers with a population of just over 2 million. Tourism development in the country has increased, with the tourism sector now accounting for about 12.8% of the country's GDP according to the most recent World Economic Forum (WEF) Competitiveness Report (Blanke and Chiesa, 2013:316).

Although authors such as Gomezelj and Mihalic (2008) argued that the country is less competitive in terms of tourism management than with regard to other natural and cultural resources, Slovenia is working to enhance the competitiveness of its tourism sector in international markets. Since 2010, several pro-tourism resolutions have been passed to grant a priority status which allows the sector to have a priority treatment in future, including priority access to research financing (Costa *et al.*, 2014). As a result, there is growing interest in the cultural heritage of its towns and cities, and the country's gastronomic specialties have begun to form an integral part of the tourist experience, thus increasing the visibility of this destination in the international tourism market, especially since the country's entry into the European Union in 2004.

The National Tourism Organization has developed several strategies for Slovenia's most important tourism products, including gastronomy. In this regard, the Strategy of Gastronomy Development (2008) has been widely applied. The Tourist Association of Slovenia has played a key role in the protection and promotion of Slovene culture and culinary heritage through the organization of wine festivals and a large number of culinary innovations as reflected in the Gastronomic Strategy of Slovenia, which lists 23 gastronomic regions and 170 representative dishes of the country's cuisine (Gacnik, 2012). Lebe *et al.* (2006) emphasized that gastronomy contributes to enhancing the visibility of Slovenia as a tourism destination.

One of the efforts being made in this direction is the introduction of certified quality labels. According to the European Commission (2014: 8),² "since September 2011 traditional Slovene restaurants that satisfy strict criteria and standards of the Quality Label "Gostilna Slovenia" are in a position to acquire the "Gostilna Slovenia" Quality Label Award". This trademark of the Slovene catering industry respects the cultural heritage and traditions of Slovene cuisine and hospitality". The standards to be met to achieve this recognition are traditional local architecture, traditional internal and external ambient design, food and beverages of local and regional origin with an emphasis on organic food and local vines

²http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/tourism-business-portal/documents/business/internationalisation/slovenia_country_report.pdf

provided by local producers, traditional music and folklore scenery, high quality service, and a variety of other required components that justify the “Gostilna Slovenia” certificate.

In the opinion of Lysaght (2002), Slovenia has geographically recognizable culinary cultures and regions. Traditional Slovene cuisine today is a compendium of innovation, the influence of various historical moments, and tradition. As regards foods classified as PDO, that is, foods that are produced or prepared only within a given geographical area – while prohibiting foods produced or prepared outside the area – Slovenia has protected five foods within this group. These include the Bovec (Bovški sir), Tolmin (Tolminc), and Nanos (Nanoški sir) cheeses; Kočevje wild honey; and extra virgin olive oil produced in the Slovenian Istria region.

According to the SWOT analysis conducted by Lebe *et al.* (2006), among the country’s strengths is its enormous variety of dishes and regional wines, with more than 100 kinds of soup, several types of *štruklji*, or some 50 versions of *potica*. Among the weaknesses are the shortage of suppliers willing to take risks or culinary innovations in excess of conservatism. In any case, Gacnik (2012) believes that there is growing international interest in Slovene cuisine and wines that are making the country one of the most dynamic and gastronomically interesting destinations in Europe.

However, the country’s gastronomic heritage and culture is still an incipient research field, with a significant shortage of scientific articles on gastronomic tourism in Slovenia (Gacnik, 2012). This research aims to reduce this gap through an empirical analysis of the capital city of Ljubljana, a gastronomic area of reference and also the Slovene cultural centre.

3.2. Cordoba-Spain

According to Culinary Tourism (2011), Spain is a competitive culinary tourism destination. The stable position Spain has maintained over time as one of the three most visited international destinations and global knowledge of traditional Spanish cuisine are strategic competitive advantages for the country. Given that the geographical extension and the population of Spain is larger than that of the Republic of Slovenia, and its cuisine differs across the country’s numerous regions, the empirical analysis of culinary tourism focuses specifically on Cordoba, which is located in the Autonomous Community of Andalusia, in the most southern part of the country.

Cordoba is currently a major destination for cultural tourism, not only nationally, but also at the European level due to its historic center, which was declared a World Heritage Site, as well as its most important monument, the Mosque Cathedral. Cordoban cuisine is a compendium of dishes characterized by a strong Arab influence; a civilization that settled in the city for decades in past centuries. Olive oil is one of the main ingredients in the local cuisine, which includes dishes such as *salmorejo*, a thick gazpacho-like dip; breaded pork and cured ham rolls known as *flamenquines*, oxtail stew, fried eggplant, and *pastel cordobés*, a puff pastry tart made with a pumpkin filling. Four local products of exceptional quality boast several PDOs: olive oil, Iberian cured ham, Montilla-Moriles wine, and Montilla-Moriles vinegar.

The importance of gastronomy in Cordoba is such that the city launched the Córdoba Gastronómica program in 2010, and organized the first “Córdoba Gastronómica” Tapas Competition in 2011. This program aims to promote the city as a quality culinary destination, publicize typical local products, and support the stakeholders involved in the program (public and private tourism sector enterprises and stakeholders).

Another characteristic element of the gastronomy of Cordoba, like other Andalusian cities, are the typical establishments known as *tabernas* or taverns, which are located in traditional houses decorated in the regional style. López Guzmán and Sánchez-Cañizares (2012:

172) noted that “Tabernas are important places locally for meeting and socialising, where the historical and cultural heritage of the city is integrated with its culinary traditions. Tabernas are generally located in the historic centre of the city which means that tourists visiting the city’s historical sites can also experience, through the use of their other senses, its culinary traditions as well”. According to the Tourism Observatory of Cordoba (2012), these typical tabernas, alongside the city’s restaurants and bars, have experienced a nearly 10% growth in the last decade.³

An additional culinary concept found throughout the region of Andalusia is the presentation of certain dishes in the form of *tapas*, which are small portions of a variety of dishes. Eating tapas is a tradition that dates back to ancient times in Andalusia and many other regions of Spain, and provides tourists the opportunity to experience a greater number of flavors and dishes, which is precisely the reason for the enormous success of tapas in numerous countries around the world.

Finally, the tourists who visit Cordoba can enjoy a wide variety of gastronomic tours, tavern routes, and wine tours to experience this sector in greater depth.

4. METHODOLOGY

To conduct the empirical analysis, we used a quantitative methodology following studies such as Björk and Kaupinnen-Räisänen (2014) and Lopez-Guzman and Sanchez-Cañizares (2012). Statistical methods were applied to analyze tourists’ perceptions of the gastronomy of the destination and its effect on overall satisfaction with the trip.

To collect the data, a closed questionnaire was designed and distributed to a sample of tourists in Ljubljana and Cordoba. A series of interviewers, who had received previous training in how to administer the survey, were distributed among tourist enclaves within both cities. Tourists were chosen randomly in order to cover a wide and representative sociodemographic spectrum (both sexes, different ages, nationalities, etc.). A total of 192 valid questionnaires were obtained in Cordoba and 200 in Ljubljana. Data were collected in the spring of 2014; a season marked by a high tourist influx at both destinations. In addition to Spanish and Slovenian, the questionnaires were translated into several languages to facilitate tourist responses.

The measurement instrument consisted of several blocks of questions:

- ✓ A ranking of the motivations that led the tourist to choose the destination
- ✓ Evaluation of various aspects related to the local cuisine
- ✓ Opinion of the importance of gastronomy in the destination and satisfaction with the gastronomy
- ✓ Sociodemographic variables (sex, age, educational level, nationality and income), characteristics of the visit (length, aspects of travel, number of visits to the same destination), source of information used to select the destination, and overall satisfaction with the trip.

The data were tabulated and analyzed using a database designed specifically for this purpose in SPSS 20.0. Univariate (frequencies and descriptive statistics), bivariate (contingency tables, ANOVA, Chi-square test and correlations), and multivariate (multiple regression) statistical techniques were used.

³ http://www.turismodecordoba.org/84/gdocumental/16_a27_c1/informe_anual2012.pdf

5. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

A total of 392 valid questionnaires were obtained, 192 for Cordoba and 200 for Ljubljana. Table 2 presents the main demographic characteristics of the sample for each city. The distribution by sex, age, and monthly income is fairly homogeneous, although there is a predominance of tourists under the age of 30 with relatively low incomes. Interestingly, the level of education is quite high among visitors to both the Spanish and Slovene city, with more than 50% of tourists at both destinations having a college education. This profile correlates closely to that of the cultural tourist.

As regards nationality, the majority of visitors in the Cordoba sample are Spanish nationals, Central and South American, and European. This is in line with the most recent statistics⁴ available on tourism demand in the city, which show a predominance of domestic tourists (62.45%).

In the case of Ljubljana, the respondents are mainly from other parts of Slovenia, Central Europe (especially Austria), Italy (due to its proximity to the country), and the United Kingdom, while there is also a significant percentage of Asian visitors. Statistics of visitors to Slovenia⁵ reveal a predominance of foreign tourists, mainly from Russia, Austria, Germany, and Italy. In addition, more than 40% of tourists who travel to Slovenia visit Ljubljana.

Table 2

5.1. Characteristics and motivation for visit

We analyzed a series of questions concerning the characteristics of the visit (who the tourist was traveling with, if they had already visited the destination, and source of information). Table 3 shows the response frequencies for both cities.

Table 3

Regarding travel aspects, most tourists were accompanied by a partner or friends in both Cordoba and Ljubljana, although in the opposite order for Ljubljana. As can be seen, the Internet was the main source for obtaining information on the destination in both samples, although the percentages were higher for the Ljubljana sample.

The frequency of visits is higher in the Spanish sample, with a difference of almost ten percentage points for those who had visited the city more than 2 times (46.6% versus 37.8% in Ljubljana). This result is logical given that there is more domestic tourism in Cordoba so the proximity factor makes it easier to repeat the trip.

As regards reasons for the visit, Table 4 shows the mean score, on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1 is not important and 5 is very important), of the available tourist attractions in each destination. The mean scores for Cordoba are sorted by decreasing importance, while the mean scores for Ljubljana are accompanied by a number in parenthesis representing the order of importance to facilitate the comparison. The last column includes the results of a Student's t-test to determine whether there are significant differences between the means of the two cities.

Table 4

While the main reason for visiting Cordoba is to experience its culture and heritage, this aspect is second to fun and entertainment in Ljubljana. Moreover, the opportunity to try typical food and drink ranks second as the most important attraction in Cordoba followed by entertainment or other reasons. However, there are significant differences with regard to Ljubljana, where gastronomy ranks fourth place.

⁴ http://www.turismodecordoba.org/84/gdocumental/16_a27_c2/1trimestre2014boletinobservatorio.pdf.

⁵ http://www.stat.si/eng/novica_prikazi.aspx?id=6253

Numerous studies in the specialized literature have highlighted activities related to local food and drink as the primary motivation for the trip (Bessiere, 1998; Long, 2004). Studies on other destinations, such as that of Remington and Yuksel (1998) in Turkey, reported that food was the fourth most important factor in explaining tourist satisfaction and the most important reason for returning to the destination. In a study conducted by Enright and Newton (2005), food was the second most important attraction in Hong Kong, the fourth in Bangkok, and the fifth in Singapore. In their study on Finland, Björk and Kaupinnen-Räisänen (2014) found that gastronomy is a motivation of almost equal importance to other options such as culture or new experiences.

5.2. Tourists' perception of cuisine and its relationship to satisfaction with the visit

Table 5 shows the results of questions regarding how tourists relate to the gastronomy of the destination (i.e., how often they eat out, knowledge of foreign languages of restaurant staff, if they have tried local food and drink, and willingness to pay more to try the traditional cuisine of the area). The last column shows the result of the chi-square test between each of the variables by city.

Table 5

A significant statistical association with the city analyzed was observed in three of the four variables. Specifically, a higher percentage of tourists has tried the local food and drink in Cordoba than in Ljubljana (68.6% versus 40%). This is important because it may reflect to some extent the greater knowledge and/or interest in Spanish cuisine as it is more recognized worldwide, while Slovenia can be defined as an emerging culinary tourism destination.

However, the perceived knowledge of foreign languages among staff at eating establishments is much higher in Ljubljana, where more than 90% of tourists considered the staff to have high or intermediate language skills. Previous studies in Cordoba (López Guzmán and Sánchez Cañizares, 2012) have revealed this structural weakness, which must be one of the main priorities to take into account in future actions aimed at enhancing the image of this Spanish city as a culinary tourism destination.

In contrast, the question regarding tourists' willingness to pay more for local food showed no association with the city analyzed. Although a larger percentage of tourists in Cordoba than in Ljubljana responded negatively to this question, over 50% of respondents in both locations stated they would be willing to pay from 10%–40% more for a traditional meal over other types of food or drink. This is consistent with other empirical evidence showing that consumers are willing to pay a higher price to get positive tourist experiences (Morgan, 2006).

Using this last question as the dependent variable, we developed a multiple regression model (Table 6) only with the tourists who responded affirmatively to the question. The objective is to analyze which variables influence the willingness to pay more to try the local cuisine. The independent variables were sociodemographic factors of gender (1-male), age, educational level, and monthly net income; the number of times the tourist had visited the same destination; the importance of local food and drink in travel motivation; if the tourist had tried the traditional food and drink of the destination (dichotomous variable: 1 affirmative response); the level of satisfaction with the gastronomy and with the visit, and the importance of gastronomy in the destination image. The last three variables were measured on a 5-point Likert scale.

Table 6

As the results reveal, tourists in the city of Cordoba tend to pay more for local food and drink the higher their degree of satisfaction with the gastronomy, their educational level, and age. Nevertheless, those who have had the opportunity to taste the local food and wines are less inclined to make this additional financial effort (negative coefficient). One possible reason could be that they did not find the local cuisine to be of better quality than other less traditional foods to justify the higher price. However, it is more likely that those who have sampled

Cordoban cuisine are domestic tourists who have more opportunity to try these dishes, and hence are less inclined to pay more for them.

In Ljubljana, however, the significant variables of the model are monthly net income and satisfaction with the visit. In both cases, the relationship is direct, thus indicating that tourists in Slovenia are willing to pay more for typical food the higher their purchasing power and satisfaction with the trip.

The respondents were also asked to rate attributes related to the gastronomy of each of the cities. Table 7 shows the mean scores of the responses measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1-very poor to 5-excellent). As Hjalager and Corigliano (2000) stated, the gastronomic experience of tourists not only has to do with food and drink, but is also a matter of adequate infrastructure and good service.

The most highly valued attributes in the city of Cordoba are precisely the city's traditional food, good service, and hospitality, which is in turn related to the good rating given to the quality of the dishes and the friendly atmosphere of the establishments. In Ljubljana, the most highly rated aspects are the same but appear in a different order. However, the mean results are always lower with the exception of "facilities", which is significantly different between the two cities in all variables. Moreover, innovative dishes obtains the lowest score in both cities, although it is higher in Ljubljana. This is an obvious weakness that should be taken into close consideration in Cordoba, where tourists may perceive that the cuisine has not evolved over time; a factor which could certainly affect their perception that the food is often overpriced.

Table 7

To conclude this section, we discuss the results for tourists' opinions on the importance of gastronomy in the destination, their mean satisfaction with the gastronomy and the visit (Table 8), as well as correlations between these variables in each of the two cities. These three variables were previously used in the multiple regression model and, as noted, are measured on a 5-point Likert scale (5-very important or very satisfied, respectively).

Table 8

It should first be noted that the mean results are always higher in Cordoba and are significantly different with respect to Ljubljana, although the three variables obtained scores above 3.5 points in both cities. Similar scores are also found for satisfaction with the visit, which is the most highly scored variable for both cities. In Cordoba, however, satisfaction with the gastronomy and its role in the city's destination image is higher than in Ljubljana. In fact, the annual tourist satisfaction survey in this Andalusian city showed that restaurants are one of the most highly valued elements of the trip.

A significant correlation was also found between all the variables in the two cities, with the exception of the importance tourists attach to gastronomy in the destination image and satisfaction with the visit in Ljubljana.

This would seem to support that the cuisine and gastronomy of the two cities have considerable weight and clearly correlate with how tourists perceive their travel experience. This result is in line with a comparative study of Italy and Denmark conducted by Hjalager and Corigliano (2000), who reported that 40% of tourists visiting Denmark state that experience with food is crucial to a satisfactory trip. The same occurred in Italy, where travelers related their perception of their cuisine with their views on the country.

5.3. Segmentation of tourist attitudes towards gastronomy

Björk and Kaupinnen-Räisänen (2014) distinguished between travelers for whom culinary experiences influence their choice of destination, other tourists who perceive gastronomy and culinary experiences as an important but not decisive activity for the trip, and

finally those who simply consider food as a necessity to be satisfied without entailing a commitment to choosing the destination (Tikkanen, 2007).

Following this classification, we segmented the tourists in each sample according to their view of gastronomy as a reason to travel, which resulted in three groups:

1. Tourists who consider gastronomy as the most important or one of the most important reasons for choosing a destination (G1)
2. Tourists who consider gastronomy a good but not the primary reason for choosing a destination (G2)
3. Tourists who think that the gastronomy of the destination is a secondary motivation for choosing a destination (G3)

In what follows, we analyze the possible association between several sociodemographic characteristics of tourists and the group to which they belong (Table 9).

Table 9

The variables sex, age, education, and income are factors that, according to Kim *et al.* (2009), influence the decision to consume local food and beverages. In their study, the authors found that women were especially interested in trying the local cuisine while on holiday. Their study sample comprised a majority of tourists with a high educational level, which was associated with a greater interest in cultural aspects during the visit, including food. According to Franklin and Crang (2001), higher incomes are related to the type of tourism demand, while Glanz *et al.* (1998) reported that with increasing education or income, tourists perceive food as an experience to savor new flavors rather than simply satisfying a need. Flynn *et al.* (1994) found differences in attitudes between men and women as to the reasons for choosing one or another type of food. Culinary Tourism (2011) also defines the profile of potential culinary tourists as couples with above-average incomes and professionals aged 30 to 50 years. This profile correlates closely to the demographic characteristics of cultural tourists.

In our empirical study, however, we did not find a clear association between sex, age, educational level, and monthly income of the tourists and the segment to which they belong in terms of their assessment of local food and drink as a primary or secondary motivation for the trip. This result is in line with Björk and Kaupinnen-Räisänen (2014), who did not find significant differences regarding these variables and how tourists experience food and drink in the destination.

In contrast, we observed a statistically significant association between having tried the typical food of the area and the group to which the tourist belonged for the city of Cordoba. According to our results, 40.2% of tourists who have tried the typical food consider the gastronomy to be the most important reason for their visit. However, among those who stated that they had sampled the specialties of the region, 49.1% belong to the third group, which considers food a secondary aspect of the visit. A relationship was also found with frequency of eating out as a greater percentage of tourists belonging to the first group (G1) regularly eat out in local restaurants or bars.

In the Ljubljana sample, a relationship was found between the group and characteristics of the trip. For those who travel alone, gastronomy is mostly a secondary motive (64.1%), while the importance of gastronomy increases among tourists traveling with family or friends. For families, gastronomy is an important but not the primary reason in 56.3% of cases.

Among those who consider gastronomy the most important reason for the trip, 67.5% were visiting Slovenia for the first time. This result is exactly the opposite to that obtained by Kivela and Crotts (2006) for tourists visiting Hong Kong. They reported that food was more important for those who repeated the visit than for those traveling to the destination for the first time. This result also differs from Tse and Crotts (2005), who found a positive correlation with

the frequency of the visit, and from Ryu and Jang (2006), for whom past experience was a predictor of tourists' intention of returning to consume the local cuisine at the destination.

No association with nationality was found in either of the destinations studied. This contrasts with Culinary Tourism (2011), which states that international culinary tourism is less significant than domestic tourism when traveling outside one's country of residence, and although food can be an important consideration when choosing a destination, it is not the primary one. According to the study, there are estimated to be no more than one million international culinary tourists travelling each year.

Finally, as regards the mean score of the three groups with respect to various gastronomy-related aspects, satisfaction with the gastronomy, and overall satisfaction with the visit, Table 10 shows the ANOVA analysis and the Scheffe's test in cases where the mean differences of these three variables are statistically significant.

Table 10

Group 1 (tourists who consider gastronomy as one of the main motivations of the trip) rates most aspects higher than the other two groups in both cities. The perception of prices, facilities, and atmosphere of the establishments is statistically significant in the Cordoba sample. As regards atmosphere of the establishments, G2 shows a significantly higher score than the group for which gastronomy is a secondary motivation (G3). There are also significant differences between the groups regarding the perception of the importance of gastronomy and satisfaction with it, with G1 showing the highest mean score.

In the Ljubljana sample, the results are different for groups G1 and G3, with the first group showing a higher score for atmosphere of the establishments, innovative dishes, and traditional gastronomy. There are also statistically significant differences among the three groups regarding the importance of gastronomy in the destination. This result is of particular interest given that, as the work of Björk and Räsänen-Kaupinnen (2014) has shown, innovative dishes, the atmosphere of the restaurants, and traditional food are crucial aspects that tourists highlight when experiencing the gastronomy of a destination.

As we have shown, despite finding no sociodemographic differences between the three tourist segments, those who consider gastronomy an essential motivation in their choice of destination have a more favorable perception of the local cuisine. Although overall satisfaction with the visit does not differ among the groups, it is slightly higher in the first group in both two cities.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Local cuisine is an important tourist attraction and an essential element in the way people experience a destination. It is also a non-seasonal activity that can help reactivate the economies of certain regions.

Nonetheless, for a tourism activity to achieve market success, it must provide value added to tourists and will depend on how resources related to the activity are managed in the destination. For this reason, it is essential to develop and promote culinary tourism in regions or countries whose gastronomy is not yet perceived as a primary tourist attraction. To do so, it is necessary to identify the resources and typical products of the region and incorporate them into the broader cultural offering of the area to ensure that they form part of its history and identity.

This study examined tourists' perceptions of two culinary tourism destinations: the city of Cordoba, Spain, which has made enormous efforts to promote culinary tourism in recent years; and the capital city of Ljubljana, Slovenia, which is an emerging culinary tourism destination. The applicability of the empirical findings to business practice is diverse as insight

into tourists' perception is essential for tourism providers to develop appropriate marketing and management strategies targeted at the needs of potential customers. For this reason, restaurateurs, hospitality associations, and other public or private stakeholders engaged in culinary tourism can benefit from applied studies of this type, especially in the case of Slovenia, which still lacks visibility in the international market.

Our results show that visitors to Cordoba exhibit a greater interest in gastronomy as a reason for travel and value aspects related to culinary tourism more positively. This should come as no surprise given that Spanish food is internationally renowned in tourist circuits. The willingness to pay more to try traditional food, however, is similar in both regions. While this factor is influenced by level of income and satisfaction with the visit in Ljubljana, it mainly depends on the educational level, satisfaction with the country's own food, and having previously experienced this type of food in the Spanish case.

Moreover, as Kivela and Crotts (2009) stated, the local gastronomy is a valid construct when segmenting the tourism market and may be essential in creating a brand image for the destination. Therefore, in this study we have segmented both tourist samples into three groups in terms of the importance of gastronomy as a motivation for the trip. We found no sociodemographic differences between the three groups in any of the two cities, but have shown how tourists for whom the local food and drink is an essential motivation to travel value attributes related to the cuisine and eating establishments more highly.

Several recommendations can be made based on the results of the study. As regards the Spanish sample, it is important that those engaged in the culinary tourism sector improve their language skills and human capital formation to ensure that tourists receive the service they expect, while a greater degree of innovation is needed in traditional dishes. Slovenia, on the other hand, must develop thematic gastronomic routes to ensure the success of this emerging culinary tourism destination. Active marketing strategies are also needed to positively motivate tourists to consume the local food. The lack of cooperation between stakeholders is a threat as tourists' expectations may not be met. With a view to ensuring a high quality and sophisticated offering for demanding tourists, cooperation must therefore be reoriented to increase the added value of the food service at a relatively unknown destination of a small European country.

The results of the study can aid destination managers and operators to identify specific types of activities and events that attract tourists who are most closely linked to food (certain gastronomic projects can stimulate greater interest among "freelance" tourists than those traveling with tour operators or tourist guides). Thus, it is necessary for destination managers to develop the appropriate marketing mix strategies for each segment of tourists in terms of how they relate to the local cuisine. A better understanding of tourists' lifestyles can provide deeper insight into their activities and interests at the destination. When promoting and developing gastronomic products and segmenting the tourist market, it is necessary to understand the cultural values and preferences of the tourists who visit the destination. By doing so, it is possible to distinguish those who are really interested in trying the typical food and traditional products from other groups of tourists who prefer more global or familiar foods that they usually consume in their place of origin. In designing differentiated marketing strategies, we must not forget that the Internet and government or official tourism websites are particularly important media to promote the local cultures and cuisines of culinary tourist destinations.

Given that the study was conducted in two traditional cultural tourism destinations, certain limitations must be taken into account. Specifically, the analysis should be repeated in other locations in future research to compare the role of gastronomy among tourists of different profiles (e.g., sun, sea, and sand destinations, mountain or sports tourism areas). Likewise, it would be desirable to monitor and track tourists' perception in Ljubljana in a parallel manner to Slovenia's progress in promoting the country as an emerging culinary destination.

To conclude, it is important to highlight that good culinary tourism management practices require implementing strategies that enhance cooperation between all the stakeholders engaged directly or indirectly in this activity: restaurants, taverns, bars, wineries, travel agencies, hotels, the public sector, consumers (residents and tourists), and professional associations, among others, as the ultimate goal is to increase the competitiveness of the destination and thus contribute to improving the economic and social conditions of citizens. Eating establishments, in particular, are crucial in promoting local food as they act as a link between local producers and tourists. Therefore, the use of local foods and the quality of the relationship between restaurants and other stakeholders are essential in creating a sense of identity in the destination image. Destination management organizations should take advantage of networking opportunities and present an effective culinary tourism market offering. Unified culinary tourism campaigns are necessary in all those destinations where the cultural identity linked to traditional food may benefit the community and industry in general. In this regard, it is worth establishing links between food products and the activities and experiences available at the destination in order to intensify tourists' perceptions related to the local culinary tradition.

7. REFERENCES

- Bernard, A., & Domingues, P. (2000). Gastronomy: The Neglected Heritage. In *Tourism and Heritage Relationships: Global, National, and Local Perspectives*, edited by M. Robinson, N. Evans, P. Long, R. Sharpley, and J. Swarbrooke. Newcastle: University of Northumbria at Newcastle and Sheffield Hallam University.
- Bessiere, J. (1998). Local development and heritage: traditional food and cuisine as tourist attractions in rural areas. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38 (1), 21–34
- Billups, A. (2007). Travelers hungry for culinary tourism? Inspired by tasty vacation, couple leads trips to South America. In *The Washington Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-171032455.html>.
- Blanke, J. & Chiesa, T. (eds). (2013). *The travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2013. Reducing Barriers to Economic Growth and Job Creation*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- Boniface, P. (2003). *Tasting Tourism: Travelling for Food and Drink*, Ashgate Publishing: Aldershot
- Boyne, S.; Hall, D. & Williams, F. (2003). Policy, support and promotion of food-related tourism initiatives: A marketing approach to regional development. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 14 (3–4), 131–154.
- Björk , P. & Kauppinen-Räsänen, H. (2014). Culinary-gastronomic tourism – a search for local food experiences. *Nutrition & Food Science*, 44 (4), 294 – 309.
- Cohen, E. & Avieli, N. (2004). Food in tourism: attraction and impediment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (4), 755-78.
- Costa, C.; Panyik, E. & Buhalais (eds). (2014). *European Tourism Planning and Organizational Systems: the EU member states*. Channel View Publications: Bristol.
- Culinary Tourism. (2011). Culinary (Gastronomic) Tourism. Retrieved from <http://www.onecaribbean.org/content/files/CulinaryCaribbeanNicheMarkets.pdf>
- Du Rand, G.E.; Heath, E. & Alberts, N. (2003). The role of local and regional food in destination marketing: a South African situation analysis. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 14 (3/4), 97-112.

- Enright, M.J. & Newton, J. (2004). Tourism destination competitiveness: a quantitative approach. *Tourism Management*, 25 (6), 777-788.
- Enteleca Research Consultancy (2000). Tourist's Attitudes Towards Regional and Local Food. The Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, and The Countryside Agency by Enteleca Research and Consultancy Ltd.
- Everett, S. & Slocum, S. (2013). Food and tourism: an effective partnership? A UK-based review. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21 (6), 789-809.
- Fields, K. (2002). Demand for the gastronomy tourism product: motivational factors. In: Hjalager, A., Richards, G. (Eds.), *Tourism and Gastronomy*. Routledge, London, pp. 37-50.
- Flynn, J.; Slovic, P. & Mertz, C.K. (1994). Gender, race and perception of environmental health risks. *Risk Analysis*, 14 (6), 1101-1108.
- Fox, R. (2007). Reinventing the gastronomic identity of Croatian tourist destinations. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(3), 546-559.
- Franklin, A. & Crang, M. (2001). The trouble with tourism and travel theory. *Tourist Studies*, 1 (1), 5-22.
- Gacnik, A. (2012). Gastronomy heritage as a source of development for gastronomy tourism and as a means of increasing Slovenia's tourism visibility. *Academia Turistica*, 5 (2), 39-60.
- Getz, D. (2000). *Explore Wine Tourism: Management, Development and Destinations*. Cognizant Communication Corporation, New York, NY.
- Glanz, K.; Basil, M.; Maibach, E.; Goldberg, J. & Snyder, D. (1998). Why Americans eat what they do. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 98 (10), 1118-1126
- Gomezelj, D. O. & Mihalic, T. (2008). Destination competitiveness- Applying different models, the case of Slovenia. *Tourism Management*, 29, 294-307.
- Gyimóthy, S. & Mykletun, R. (2009). Scary food: Commodifying culinary heritage as meal adventures in tourism. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15 (3), 259-273.
- Hall, C. M., & Mitchell, R. (2000). We are what we eat: Food, tourism and globalization. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, 2(1), 29-37.
- Hall, C. M., & Mitchell, R. (2005). Gastronomic tourism: Comparing food and wine tourism experiences. In M. Novelli (Ed.), *Niche tourism: Contemporary issues, trends and cases* (pp. 73-88). Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hall, M. & Sharples, L. (2003). The consumption of experiences or the experience of consumption? An introduction to the tourism of taste. In: M. Hall, L. Sharples, R. Mitchell, N. Macionis, and B. Cambourne (eds.), *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets* (pp. 1-24). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hall, M.C.; Sharples, L.; Mitchell, R.; Macionis, N. & Cambourne, B. (2003). *Food Tourism around the World*. Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford.
- Hashimoto, A. & Telfer, D.J. (2006). Selling Canadian culinary tourism: branding the global and the regional product. *Tourism Geographies*, 8(1), 31-55.
- Hillel, D.; Belhassen, Y. & Shani, A. (2013). What makes a gastronomic destination attractive? Evidence from the Israel Negev. *Tourism Management*, 36, 200-209.
- Hjalager, A. M. (2002). A typology of gastronomy tourism. In: Hjalager, A-M. and Richards, G. (eds.). *Tourism and Gastronomy* (pp. 21-35). London: Routledge.
- Hjalager, A. M. & Corigliano, M. A. (2000). Food for tourists- Determinants of an image. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2, 281-293.

- Hjalager, A. M. & Richards, G. (Eds) (2002). *Tourism and gastronomy*. London: Routledge
- Honggen, X., & Smith, S. (2008). Culinary tourism supply chains: a preliminary examination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(3), 289-299.
- Hong, J. S. & Tsai, C. T. (2012). Culinary Tourism Strategic Development: an Asia-Pacific Perspective. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 14, 40-55
- Ignatov, E. & Smith, S. (2006). Segmenting Canadian culinary tourists. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9 (3), 235-55.
- Johns, N., & Clarke, V. (2001). Mythology analysis of boating tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 334-359.
- Kim, Y. G.; Eves, A. & Scarles, C. (2009). Building a model of local food consumption on trips and holidays: a grounded theory approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28, 423-431.
- Kivela, J., & Chu, C. Y. H. (2001). Delivering quality service: Diagnosing favourable and unfavourable service encounters in restaurants. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 25(3), 251-271.
- Kivela, J. & Crotts, J. (2005). Gastronomy tourism: A meaningful travel market segment. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, 4(2/3), 39-55.
- Kivela, J. & Crotts, J.C. (2006). Tourism and gastronomy: gastronomy's influence on how tourists experience a destination. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 30 (3), 354-77.
- Kivela, J. & Crotts, J. (2009). Understanding travelers' experiences of gastronomy through etymology and narration. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 33 (2), 161-192.
- Kivela, J., & Johns, N. (2002). A mythological approach in analysing dining out experiences: Implications for remaking of tourist destinations. Paper presented at an International Tourism Research Conference, *Reinventing a tourism destination*, Institute for Tourism Zagreb and the Croatian National Tourism Board, Dubrovnik, Croatia.
- Lebe, S. S. et al. (2006). Strategija razvoja gastronomije Slovenije (Slovene gastronomy development strategy). Ljubljana: Multidisciplinarni raziskovalni inštitut Maribor, Slovenian tourist board.
- Lee, K. H.; Packer, J. & Scott, N. (2015). Travel lifestyle and destination activity choices of Slow Food members and non-members. *Tourism Management*, 46, 1-10.
- Lin, Y. C.; Pearson, T. & Cai, L. (2011). Food as a form of destination identity: A tourism destination brand perspective. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(1), 30– 48.
- Long, L. M. (1998). Culinary tourism: a folkloristic perspective on eating and otherness. *Southern Folklore*, 55(3), 181-204.
- Long, L. (2003). *Culinary Tourism*. University Press of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.
- Long, L. (2004). Culinary tourism: A folkloristic perspective on eating and otherness. In: Long, L. (ed.). *Culinary Tourism*. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.
- López-Guzmán, T. & Sánchez-Cañizares, S. (2012). Culinary tourism in Córdoba (Spain). *British Food Journal*, 114 (2), 168–179.
- Lysaght, P. (2002). Introduction. In P. Lysaght (Ed.), *Food and celebration: from fasting to feasting* (pp. 13–25). Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.
- MacCanell, D. (1973). Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79,589–603.

- Mason, M. C. & Paggiaro, A. (2012). Investigating the role of festivalscape in culinary tourism: The case of food and wine events. *Tourism Management*, 33, 1329-1336.
- Mak, A. H. N.; Lumbers, M. & Eves, A. (2012). Globalisation and food consumption in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39 (1), 171-196.
- Morgan, M. (2006). Making space for experiences. *Journal of Retail and Leisure Property*. 6 (4), 305–313
- Nummedal, M. & Hall, M. (2006). Local food and tourism: an investigation of the New Zealand South Island'd bed and breakfast section's use and perception of local food. *Tourism Review International*, 9, 365-378.
- Okumus, F.; Kock, G.; Scantlebury, M.M.G. & Okumus, B. (2013). Using local cuisines when promoting small Caribbean Island destinations. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 30 (4), 410–429.
- Okumus, B.; Okumus, F. & McKercher, B. (2007). Incorporating local and international cuisines in the marketing of tourism destinations: The cases of Hong Kong and Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 28, 253-261.
- Ottenbacher, M. C. & Harrington, R. J. (2013). A case study of a culinary tourism campaign in Germany: implications for strategy making and successful implementation. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 37 (1), 3-28.
- Pillsbury, R. (1990). *From Boarding House to Bistro*. Unwin Hyman: Cambridge, MA.
- Prezenza, A. & Del Chiappa, G. (2013). Entrepreneurial strategies in leveraging food as a tourist resource: a cross-regional analysis in Italy. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 8 (2-3), 182-192
- Pyo, S., Uysal, M., & McLellan, R. (1991). A linear expenditure model for tourism demand. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 443–454.
- Quan, S. & Wang, N. (2004). Towards a structural model of the tourist experience: an illustration from food experiences in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 25, 297– 305.
- Remington, M. & Yuksel, A. (1998). Tourist satisfaction and food service experience: Results and implications of an empirical investigation. *Anatolia*, 9 (1), 37-57.
- Reynolds, P. (1994). Culinary heritage in the face of tourism. *Progress in Tourism. Recreation and Hospitality Management*, 6, 189-194.
- Richards, G. (2002). Gastronomy: an essential ingredient in tourism production and consumption?. In Hjalager, A.M. and Richards, G. (Eds), *Tourism and Gastronomy*, Routledge, London, pp. 3-20.
- Rozin, E. (1982). The Structure of Cuisine. In *The Psychobiology of Human Food Selection*, edited by L. M. Baker. AVI: Westport, CT: 189–203
- Ryu, K. & Jang, S. (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.
- Sánchez Cañizares, S. M. & López-Guzmán, T. (2012). Gastronomy as a tourism resource: profile of the culinary tourist. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15 (3), 229-245.
- Scarpato, R. (1999). Food Globalization, New Global Cuisine, and the Quest for a Definition. In *Cuisines: Regional, National, or Global*, edited by R. Dare. Adelaide, Australia: Adelaide Research Centre for the History of Food and Drink.
- Scarpato, R. (2002). Sustainable gastronomy as a tourist product. In A.-M. Hjalager, & G. Richards (Eds.), *Tourism and gastronomy* (pp. 132-152). London: Routledge.

- Schneider, S. (2008). Good, clean, fair: the rhetoric of the slow food movement. *College English*, 70 (4), 384-402
- Sharples, A. (2003). Cider and the Marketing of the Tourism Experience in Somerset, England. In *Wine, Food, and Tourism Marketing*, edited by C. M. Hall. Haworth Hospitality. Routledge. London.
- Sims, R. (2009). Food, place and authenticity: Local food and the sustainable tourism experience. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17, 321-336.
- Smith, S. (1983). Restaurants and dining out. *Geography of a Tourism Business. Annals of Tourism Research*, 10, 515-549.
- Smith, S. (2001). Draft proposal for a chair of culinary tourism. Ontario: University of Waterloo.
- Smith, S. & Costello, C. (2009). Culinary tourism: Satisfaction with a culinary event utilizing importance-performance grid analysis. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15, 99-110.
- Smith, S. & Xiao, H. (2008). Culinary tourism supply chains: a preliminary examination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46 (3), 289-299
- Sparks, B. (2007). Planning a wine tourism vacation? Factors that help to predict tourist behavioral intentions. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1180–1192.
- Telfer, D.J. & Wall, G. (2000). Strengthening backward economic linkages: local food purchasing by three Indonesian hotels. *Tourism Geographies*, 2 (4), 421–447.
- Tellstrom, R.; Gustafsson, I. & Mossberg, L. (2005). Local food cultures in the Swedish rural economy. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 45 (4), 346–359.
- Tikkanen, I. (2007). Maslow's hierarchy and food tourist in Finland: five cases. *British Food Journal*, 109 (9), 721-34.
- Tse, P. & Crofts, J. C. (1995). Antecedents of novelty seeking: International visitors' propensity to experiment across Hong Kong's culinary traditions. *Tourism Management*, 26, 965-968.
- Wolf, E. (2002). Culinary tourism: A tasty economic proposition. Portland: International Culinary Tourism Task Force.
- Wolf, E. (2006). Culinary tourism: The hidden harvest. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Yurtseven, R. & Kaya, O. (2011). Local food in local menus: The case of Gokceada. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 6 (2), 263–275.

Table 1. Summary table of authors and topics

Topic	Authors
Link between culture and gastronomy	Rozin, 1982; Scarpato, 1999; Bernard and Domínguez, 2000; Long, 2003
Food neophobia, food as an impediment for tourism	Cohen & Avieli, 2004
Development of planning and marketing strategies to promote culinary tourism (products and destinations)	Sharples, 2003; Hashimoto and Telfer, 2006; Horng and Tsai, 2012
Strategies for developing cuisine as an attraction for visitors	Fields, 2002; Cohen and Avieli, 2004
Restaurants offering local food and menus	Yurtseven and Kaya, 2011
Local food as a means of differentiating tourist destinations	Boyne <i>et al.</i> , 2003
Economic benefit and tourism development from gastronomy as a pull factor in the destination	Tellstrom <i>et al.</i> , 2005
Local food as a means to build a brand identity	Lin <i>et al.</i> , 2011; Okumus <i>et al.</i> , 2013
Success factors of culinary tourism in destination marketing	Getz, 2000; Okumus <i>et al.</i> , 2007
Determinants of the image of gastronomy for tourists from a cross-country comparative approach	Hjalager and Corigliano, 2000
Globalization and gastronomy	Mak <i>et al.</i> 2012
Effects of gastronomy on the tourist's experience in the destination	Quan and Wang, 2004; Kivela and Crotts, 2006
Motivations of tourists to consume local food and beverages in the destination	Kim <i>et al.</i> , 2009
Profile and characteristics of culinary tourists in a destination	Sánchez Cañizares and López Guzmán, 2012
Slow-food movement	Lee <i>et al.</i> 2015
Model to assess the potential gastronomic attraction of a destination	Hillel <i>et al.</i> 2013
How to obtain competitive advantages in tourism destinations with typical local food products	Prezenza & Del Chiappa 2013

Source: Own source

Table 2. Sociodemographic profile of the sample

Variable	Cordoba	Ljubljana
Sex		
- Male	50.0%	50.2%
- Female	50.0%	49.8%
Age		
- Under 30	37.2%	48.8%
- 30-39 years	19.4%	17.4%
- 40-49 years	15.7%	15.4%
- 50-60 years	16.7%	12.4%
- Over 60	11.0%	6.0%
Educational background		
- Elementary/primary school	8.2%	0.5%
- Secondary school or vocational education	25.7%	29.9%
- Higher diploma/university degree	50.3%	50.2%
- PhD/Master	15.8%	19.4%
Country of origin		
- Spain	51.6%	6.0%
- United Kingdom	7.8%	11.9%
- France	5.7%	8.0%
- USA	4.7%	3.5%
- Italy	4.2%	19.4%
- Rest of UE (including Slovenia)	9.8%	32.5%
- Latin America	10.4%	4.7%
- Asia	4.7%	14.0%
- Africa	1.0%	0.0%
Net monthly income		
- <500 euros	25.9%	23.5%
- 501-1000 euros	16.8%	19.9%
- 1001-1500 euros	14.0%	10.7%
- 1501-2000 euros	11.9%	13.8%
- 2001-2500 euros	11.2%	8.2%
- 2501-3000 euros	13.2%	6.6%
- > 3000 euros	7.0%	17.3%

Table 3.Characteristics of the visit

Variable	Cordoba	Ljubljana
Who are you traveling with		
- Alone	12.6%	19.4%
- With my partner	35.6%	19.9%
- With business colleagues	3.7%	10.0%
- With my family	19.9%	8.0%
- With friends	27.7%	38.8%
- Others	0.5%	4.0%
What source of information did you use to choose this destination		
- brochures	10.5%	9.2%
- media advertising	3.3%	3.9%
- guide books	12.7%	7.7%
- the Internet	28.3%	43.5%
- from relatives and friends	17.8%	17.6%
- tourism office	8.7%	4.5%
- tourism fair	1.5%	1.2%
- no need for information	10.5%	9.8%
- others	6.6%	2.7%
How many times have you been in the destination before		
- First visit	53.4%	62.2%
- 2-3 times	30.9%	20.9%
- four times or more	15.7%	16.9%

Table 4. Order of importance of attractions as reason for visit. Student's t-test Cordoba-Ljubljana

Reason	Mean Cordoba	Mean Ljubljana	t-test (p-value)
Culture and heritage	4.19	3.64 (2)	4.859 (0.000)*
Eating and drinking	3.82	3.44 (4)	3.008 (0.003)*
Fun and entertainment	3.44	3.86 (1)	-0.197 (0.844)
Relaxing	3.40	3.48 (3)	-0.624 (0.533)
See relatives and friends	3.07	2.79 (5)	1.713 (0.088)***
Wellness	2.52	2.71 (6)	-1.419 (0.157)
Education	2.33	2.54 (8)	-1.512 (0.131)
Just passing through	2.19	1.64 (11)	4.002 (0.000)*
Business or work	1.92	2.61 (7)	-4.628 (0.000)*
Sunbathing	1.84	1.80 (10)	0.342 (0.732)
Sports	1.75	2.53 (9)	-6.363 (0.000)*
Medical treatment	1.45	1.27 (12)	2.006 (0.046)**
Others	1.36	--	--

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.10

Table 5. Tourists' relation with local gastronomy. Chi-square test

Variable	Cordoba	Ljubljana	Chi-square test (p-value)
Frequency of eating out at restaurants in the destination	14.1%	2.5%	38.330 (0.000)*
- Never eat outside the hotel	12.0%	33.3%	
- Once a week	23.9%	15.9%	
- 2-3 times a week	50.0%	48.3%	
- Regularly			
Has tried local food and drink			32.137 (0.000)*
- Yes	68.6	40.0	
- No	31.4	60.0	
Foreign language skills of restaurant staff			161.43 (0.000)*
- high	3.2%	36.8%	
- intermediate	28.3%	54.2%	
- low	25.1%	5.5%	
- I couldn't check it	43.3 %	3.5%	
Pay extra for typical food or wine			12.106 (0.147)
- No	22.6%	13.4%	
- Yes, 10%	11.8%	11.4%	
- Yes, 20%	12.4%	21.9%	
- Yes, 30%	18.3%	15.9%	
- Yes, 40%	10.2%	10.4%	
- Yes, 50%	8.1%	12.4%	
- Yes, 60%	8.6%	8.0%	
- Yes, 70%	3.8%	3.0%	
- Yes, more than 70%	4.3%	3.5%	

Table 6. Multiple regression model of willingness to pay more for typical food or wine in the destination

Dependent Variable: pay extra for typical food or wine	Cordoba		Ljubljana	
	Coeff	Student's t-test	Coeff	Student's t-test
Constant	-1.925	-0.831	1.866	1.121
Sex	-0.472	-1.284	-0.100	-0.316
Age	0.451	2.928*	-0.149	-1.188
Educational background	0.644	2.572**	-0.160	-0.714
Reason for eating & drinking	-0.182	-1.014	-0.169	-1.346
Number of visits	-0.104	-0.402	-0.168	-0.781
Have tried typical food or wine	-1.026	-2.005**	0.452	1.460
Net monthly income	0.153	1.316	0.174	2.233**
Level of satisfaction with gastronomy	0.968	3.068*	0.046	0.202
Level of satisfaction with visit	-0.408	-1.207	0.710	2.670*
Gastronomy is important for tourism image	0.136	0.523	0.089	0.603

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.10

Table 7. Mean score of attributed related to gastronomy.
Student's t-test for Cordoba and Ljubljana.

Variable	Mean Cordoba	Mean Ljubljana	t-test (p-value)
Traditional gastronomy	4.27	3.86 (3)	3.773 (0.000)*
Service and hospitality	4.20	3.90 (2)	3.248 (0.001)*
Quality of dishes	4.11	3.94 (1)	1.990 (0.047)**
Atmosphere establishments	4.03	3.81 (4)	2.400 (0.017)**
Facilities	3.63	3.74 (5)	-1.201 (0.231)
Prices	3.60	3.44 (6)	1.662 (0.097)***
Innovative dishes	2.98	3.41 (7)	-3.148 (0.002)*

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.10

Table 8. Importance of gastronomy for the destination image. Satisfaction with gastronomy and visit. Student's t-test and Spearman's correlation coefficient.

Variable	Mean Cordoba	Mean Ljubljana	t-test (p-value)
Gastronomy is important for tourism image	4.01	3.63	3.908 (0.000)*
Satisfaction with gastronomy	3.96	3.75	2.450 (0.015)**
Satisfaction with visit	4.39	4.25	2.073 (0.039)**
Spearman's Correlation Coefficient (p-value)		Cordoba	Ljubljana
Gastronomy important for tourism image- Sat gastronomy		0.406 (0.000)*	0.211 (0.003)*
Gastronomy important for tourism image- Sat visit		0.342 (0.000)*	0.071 (0.316)
Sat-gastronomy-Sat visit		0.421 (0.000)*	0.491 (0.000)*

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.05

Table 9. Chi-square test between sociodemographic variables and group according to the opinion of gastronomy as a reason to travel

Chi-square (Variable-group)	Cordoba	Ljubljana
Sex	3.528 (0.474)	0.996 (0.608)
Age	3.018 (0.933)	10.099 (0.258)
Educational background	4.892 (0.558)	7.251 (0.298)
Country of origin	52.626 (0.450)	79.487 (0.205)
Net monthly income	15.552 (0.213)	20.012 (0.130)
How do you travel	7.282 (0.698)	20.836 (0.022)**
Number of times visited destination previously	3.018 (0.555)	8.367 (0.079)***
Tried typical food or wine in destination	8.229 (0.016)*	0.133 (0.936)
Number of times that eat out	10.897 (0.092)***	2.096 (0.911)
Pay extra money for typical food or wine	12.929 (0.678)	18.690 (0.285)

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.10

Table 10. Mean score for gastronomy in each group and destination. ANOVA and Scheffe's test

Variable	Córdoba					Ljubljana				
	G1	G2	G3	F (p-value)	Scheffe test (p < 0.10)	G1	G2	G3	F (p-value)	Scheffe's test (p < 0.10)
Quality of dishes	4.22	4.15	3.94	1.781 (0.172)		4.19	3.88	3.88	2.149 (0.120)	
Prices	3.79	3.54	3.42	2.752 (0.067)***	G1>G3	3.36	3.51	3.42	0.370 (0.691)	
Facilities	3.87	3.61	3.40	3.283 (0.04)**	G1>G3	3.84	3.79	3.66	0.967 (0.382)	
Atmosphere of the establishment	4.23	4.13	3.69	6.063 (0.003)*	G1>G3 G2>G3	4.00	3.88	3.66	2.530 (0.082)***	G1>G3
Innovative dishes	3.04	2.90	3.00	0.123 (0.884)		3.77	3.37	3.30	2.658 (0.073)***	G1>G3
Service and hospitality	4.36	4.14	4.04	1.805 (0.168)		3.89	3.99	3.82	0.680 (0.508)	
Traditional gastronomy	4.45	4.11	4.23	2.307 (0.103)		4.29	3.83	3.72	2.907 (0.058)***	G1>G3
Gastronomy is important	4.29	4.07	3.60	10.773 (0.000)*	G1>G3 G2>G3	4.05	3.72	3.36	7.278 (0.001)*	G1>G3 G2>G3
Satisfaction with gastronomy	4.19	3.94	3.70	5.138 (0.007)*	G1>G3	3.85	3.83	3.65	1.544 (0.216)	
Satisfaction with visit	4.48	4.38	4.25	1.962 (0.143)		4.43	4.21	4.20	1.787 (0.170)	

*p < 0.01; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.10

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: [Sandra M. Sánchez- Cañizares, Ana M. castillo-Canalejo, (2015) A comparative study of tourist attitudes towards culinary tourism in Spain and Slovenia, *British Food Journal*, 117:9, 2387-2411. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-2015-0008>], which has been published in final form article and may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Emerald terms and conditions.