Provided by Central University Of Technology Free State - LibraryCUT, South Africa





Advances in Hospitality and Leisure

Ceding to Their Appetites: A Taxonomy of International Tourists to South Africa Lisa-Mari Coughlan, Melville Saayman,

Article information:

To cite this document: Lisa-Mari Coughlan, Melville Saayman, "Ceding to Their Appetites: A Taxonomy of International Tourists to South Africa" *In* Advances in Hospitality and Leisure. Published online: 13 Nov 2018; 3-22.

Permanent link to this document:

https://doi.org/10.1108/S1745-354220180000014001

Downloaded on: 17 November 2018, At: 15:14 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 0 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 1 times since 2018*



Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm: 428790 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

CEDING TO THEIR APPETITES: A TAXONOMY OF INTERNATIONAL TOURISTS TO SOUTH AFRICA

Lisa-Mari Coughlan and Melville Saayman

ABSTRACT

Tourism is a key source of income to South Africa. Food and beverages is a key part of tourism and the literature reveals that tourists spend up to a quarter of their budget on cuisine. South Africa has, however, been rated as the least-prepared culinary travel destination and the travel destination with the greatest potential for growth. Therefore, a segmentation taxonomy based on culinary preferences of international tourists to South Africa is put forth which can be used to prepare South Africa as a culinary travel destination. The 627 international tourists surveyed were divided into five segments with the use of factor analyses, t-tests, Spearman rank correlations and analysis of variance. The segments were named conservationists, experience seekers, devotees, explorers and socialisers (CEDES taxonomy). Multiple results and implications are discussed in the paper.

Keywords: CEDES taxonomy; culinary preferences; international tourists; South Africa; segmentation; culinary travel destination

INTRODUCTION

In 2015, tourism directly contributed 3% to the gross domestic product (GDP) of South Africa (Statistics South Africa, 2016b), and 8903, 773 tourists visited the country (Statistics South Africa, 2016b). Tourism has many subcategories, of which one is cultural tourism. Food and beverages are an integral part of cultural tourism (Ignatov & Smith, 2006; Perkins, 2014), adding to the appeal of destinations (Visser, 2007) and resulting in important economic benefits

Advances in Hospitality and Leisure, Volume 14, 3–22 Copyright © 2019 by Emerald Publishing Limited All rights of reproduction in any form reserved (Perkins, 2014; South African Tourism, 2014). Cultural tourism can become a tool of socio-economic development through job creation and poverty alleviation among historically disadvantaged communities in South Africa (Ivanovic, 2008). South Africa has, however, been rated as the least-prepared culinary travel destination and the travel destination with the greatest potential for growth (Phillips, 2010).

There is a general scarcity of studies that examine culinary tourism (Chang, Kivela, & Mak, 2010; Cohen & Avieli, 2004; Ignatov & Smith, 2006; Torres, 2002; Williams, Williams, & Omar, 2014), with du Rand and Heath (2006) stating that very little has been published regarding culinary tourism in developing countries, such as South Africa. This has motivated the requirement for the current study.

Segmentation is useful in identifying the characteristics of different consumer types of the global tourism market. Since tourists' interests differ, it is difficult to attract all potential visitors. Segmentation strategies are therefore important for tourism organisations and businesses (Molina, Gómez, González-Díaz, & Esteban, 2015). Furthermore, segmentation taxonomies assist tourism planners to better understand culinary tourists and guide them in developing culinary products (Yun, Hennessey, & Macdonald, 2011).

BACKGROUND

Cultural and culinary tourism have the capacity to redistribute benefits throughout South Africa (Ivanovic, 2008). Culinary tourism is defined as any tourism experience in which one learns about, appreciates or consumes local culinary resources. The culinary resources referred to include raw ingredients, as well as the food and beverages reflective of the destination and traditional methods of preparing these items (Smith & Xiao, 2008). Food and beverages are essential to the tourist experience (Torres, 2002). A study by Saayman and Scholtz (2012) indicated that tourists to national parks in South Africa spent 24% of their total expenditure on food. It is also estimated that foreign tourists spent R2.1 billion (approximately $\mathfrak E$ 1.4 million or US\$ 1.7 million) on food in South Africa in 2015 (South African Tourism, 2016a). This translates into 12.57% of the total amount international tourists spent during their stay in South Africa, highlighting the importance of tourists' culinary experiences and preferences.

According to Rozin and Vollmecke (1986), food preference assumes the availability of at least two different items, and a decision being made to choose the one item over the other. The beverage component of tourists' food experience should, however, not be ignored. Consequently, for the purposes of this study, the term culinary preference is applied. Not much is known about the profile of culinary tourists (Sánchez-Cañizares & López-Guzmán, 2012), including their preferences, as culinary tourism is a complex and diverse set of motivations and experiences (Ignatov & Smith, 2006).

PURPOSE

The ultimate purpose of this paper is to put forth a taxonomy of international tourists to South Africa, based on the culinary preferences of these tourists. The taxonomy can be used to the benefit of government, destination marketers and industry.

More specifically, government can unlock South Africa's tourism potential by identifying the importance of different culinary tourism aspects to each segment in the taxonomy. Tourism marketers could likewise enhance strategies as a result of knowing what each segment of international tourists to South Africa values when making culinary decisions. Lastly, individual businesses in the tourism and hospitality industry could adjust their offerings according to the needs of each segment. If, for example, a specific segment tends to make use of a certain type of establishment, the establishment can cater to their particular needs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

'Africa is a continent of unparalleled opportunity, and tourism is where the greatest untapped opportunity lies', Former Minister of Tourism, Derek Hanekom, has stated (Moodley, 2016). Although South Africa is rich in culinary resources and opportunities, the country has not capitalised on its culinary tourism potential (du Rand & Heath, 2006). Du Rand and colleagues studied the utilisation of food in destination marketing in South Africa (du Rand & Heath, 2006; Du Rand, Heath, & Alberts, 2003) and determined that food was a vital supportive tourism attraction in South Africa. Nonetheless, very few destinations and tour operators promote local food, its cultural heritage and culinary tourism in South Africa, confirming that culinary tourism in the country lacks a focused marketing strategy.

The tourism market is made up of many different consumer types (Croce & Perri, 2010). Tourism segmentation studies that have been conducted in a South African context include nine market segments being identified by Kim, Crompton, and Botha (2000) at a South African resort. Their segmentation took into consideration the benefits visitors sought during their visit to the resort. Bloom (2005) proposed three segments of international tourists to Cape Town, namely the vibrant and energetic segment, the pleasure seekers and the established and settled segment. The typology was based on 15 variables, which can broadly be grouped under tourist trip characteristics, perceptions of Cape Town and demographics.

A number of techniques have been utilised specifically in the culinary tourism domain in order to segment tourists. Typical typologies and taxonomies used to segment tourists based on their culinary involvement are discussed in this section.

The 3-S typology of South African culinary festival visitors segmented culinary visitors at a cheese festival based on five motivational factors (Viljoen, Kruger, & Saayman, 2017). The authors named the segments social, serious and selective epicureans. Selective epicureans were the largest of the three segments and selected escape, socialisation and uniqueness as their most important

motives for visiting the cheese festival. Serious epicureans were the secondlargest segment and were motivated by the entire experience. Social epicureans were the smallest segment and their main motivation for attending the festival was to escape and socialise.

Hjalager (2004) outlined a theoretical tourism and gastronomy model which was inspired by the work of sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. Sociology is about social constraints inducing preferences. According to the author, Bourdieu's (1984) work has affected much tourism research at a theoretical level and is a stepping stone to better understand tourism lifestyles. People are said to form part of one of four basic lifestyles based on their expressed tastes and self-determined preferences and behaviours. Hjalager (2004) also states that Dahl and Aagaard (1997) used Bourdieu's (1984) theories to show that the four lifestyles emphasise different values. People are grouped into being existentialists, experimentalists, recreationalists and diversionaries. Hjalager (2004) notes that the tourism context creates new challenges for this segmentation typology. For example, lifestyles across national borders are not identical, and although the lifestyle of a person tends to be enduring, it is not static.

This having been stated, there are however many practical implications of lifestyle segmentation for marketing decisions. For example, the recreational segment relies greatly on word of mouth and down-to-earth television personalities may be helpful when marketing to this segment. Fancy chefs will likely only appeal to the experimental segment. Brochures may appeal to the diversionary segment whereas the existential segment finds information in extensive (literary) travel books and guides more reliable. Accordingly, Bourdieu's (1984) approach can be helpful in explaining why tourists' food habits cannot be treated uniformly, and why marketing strategies have to reflect the differences integrated into tourists' lifestyles.

Kivela and Crotts (2006) studied tourists at select Hong Kong restaurants. The authors used Hjalager's (2003, 2004) theoretical segmentation typology, accordingly stating that culinary tourists are either recreational, existential, diversionary or experimental. Recreational culinary tourists are conservative, seeking familiar food and beverages and do not regard food and beverages as important whilst on holiday. Diversionary culinary tourists actively seek familiar food and prefer quantity over quality. These tourists dislike exotic food and are likely to consult travel agents, tourist brochures and tour leaders. Lastly, for these tourists, sharing a beverage or meal is an excellent way to get together with others.

Existential culinary tourists actively seek opportunities to be involved in culinary activities such as harvesting grapes and other fruits and vegetables, taking a cooking class or engaging with food producers. These tourists pay little attention to claims made by travel brochures. Finally, experimental tourists symbolise their lifestyle through food and beverages. They actively seek designer restaurants and keep up to date with the latest fashionable food. Prestige is gained by keeping up with culinary trends. To highlight, in this taxonomy, existential and experimental tourists take cuisine very seriously, with the consumption of good food being the main reason for their travels.

In another Hong Kong study, McKercher, Okumus, and Okumus (2008) categorised respondents into one of five food tourist segments. The participants were categorised based on their response to the question, 'I would consider myself to be a culinary tourist, someone who travels to different places to try different foods'. The participants were categorised as being definite culinary tourists, likely culinary tourists, possible culinary tourists, unlikely culinary tourists or non-culinary tourists.

Still in Asia, Updhyay and Sharma (2014) conducted a study on foreign tourists at restaurants in India in order to understand trends amongst them, with the aim of ensuring that efficient and effective marketing could be done. The authors state that the study of Kivela and Crotts (2006) partially supports their evoked segmentation structure. They segmented tourists based on their preferences into three groups, namely 'localisation seekers', 'taste seekers' and 'experience seekers'. 'Localisation seekers' enjoy experiencing the local ingredients and dining etiquette and are value conscious. They comprised the largest number of tourists. 'Taste seekers' are interested in cuisine but indifferent about the cuisine's traditional and historical connection. Variables related to 'taste seekers' are quality, method of cooking, ambiance and taste. 'Experience seekers' enjoy learning about the historical connections of cuisine, appreciate the nutrition, aroma and flavour of meals and are concerned with hygiene and health.

According to Mack, Blose, and MacLaurin (2009), an established approach to market segmentation is based on consumer values. The list of values has been utilised in several tourism studies. The authors aimed to develop the profile of culinary tourists in terms of their most important social values and to compare their profile to that of general tourists. No significant differences in the social value structures of culinary tourists and general tourists were observed in Australia or America, but once the culinary tourism segment was further divided into 'non-innovators' and 'innovators', social value structures became useful. Culinary tourists were divided into 'innovators' and 'non-innovators' based on culinary tourism innovativeness items included in the survey. 'Innovators' were those respondents who displayed the highest level of innovativeness. Culinary tourist 'innovators' in America rated values of excitement and warm relationships with others to be significantly more important to them than the noninnovators did. These aspects of the travel experience could easily be used as the focal point in destination marketing. These values could also be focused on during the actual consumer travel experience to enhance the attractiveness of new destination offerings to those persons most likely to try them first – the 'innovators' in the culinary tourism market.

Kim, Duncan, and Jai (2014) also conducted research in America. The authors studied attendees of an Oxford, Mississippi, food festival. Tourists were segmented based on their demographics, their satisfaction of the event and the nature of their visit to the festival, including the motivation for their attendance and their previous attendance. 'Apathetic attendees' mainly stated that their purposes for attending the food festival were business or task related. These attendees reported medium levels of expenditure and the lowest levels of perceived value and satisfaction. The largest segment was named 'satisfied spenders' as

these tourists reported the highest satisfaction, perceived value and spending. The satisfied spenders are likely to have been motivated by experiencing the event and to have decided to attend the event at the previous year's food festival. 'Tentative tag-a-longs' indicated perceived value and satisfaction levels which are between those of the 'apathetic attendees' and 'satisfied spenders'. 'Tentative tag-a-longs' spent the least, were also mainly motivated by experiencing the event and had recently decided to attend.

Yun et al. (2011), similarly to Kim et al. (2014), was of the opinion that the past should be taken into consideration when studying tourists. Respondents were individuals who had requested a visitor information package from Tourism Prince Edward Island (Canada). Culinary tourists were segmented based on their past culinary experiences at travel destinations. The authors used two different segmentation techniques to categorise taxonomies of culinary tourists. For the first segmentation, an analysis was performed based on past culinary experiences. The analysis considered participation in 13 food-related activities and whether these activities served as motivation for travel over the preceding two years. Firstly, respondents were categorised into two groups based on whether the food-related activities were their leading reasons for travel. The group for whom food-related activities served as travel motivator was termed to be 'deliberate culinary tourists'. These culinary tourists are often identified as foodies and participate in more food-related activities than other tourists. Secondly, the group to whom foodrelated activities were not travel motivators was further divided into three clusters based on their degree of participation in food-related activities.

The cluster who reported high involvement in food-related activities when travelling was termed 'opportunistic culinary tourists'. Even though culinary experiences do not motivate this group to travel, they participate in food-related activities at a similar frequency as the deliberate culinary tourists. Participation in activities such as dining at highly rated restaurants, dining at restaurants known for offering local ingredients, attending farmers' markets, visiting farms/ orchards and attending country fairs was higher for both groups when compared to the other groups.

The next cluster reported fairly low participation in food-related activities when travelling. This was the largest segment and was termed 'accidental culinary tourists'. This segment occasionally participated in food-related activities, but without making an active effort to do so. The final and smallest cluster was 'uninterested culinary tourists'. These tourists had not engaged in any food-related activities whilst travelling in the preceding two years.

Ignatov and Smith (2006) also conducted a study on segmenting Canadian culinary tourists. The authors segmented the tourists into three groups: food tourists, wine tourists, and food and wine tourists. Findings from the research include that the culinary tourism segment is over six times larger than the wine segment, the demographic profile of the segments differs and different marketing strategies should be employed in order to appeal to each segment. The authors recommend that much more research is required on the food aspect of culinary tourism.

Sánchez-Cañizares and López-Guzmán (2012) analysed the profile of tourists visiting a city in Spain. Based on these profiles, the tourists were grouped into

three categories. The first having individuals who regard food as a fundamental aspect of their trip; the second group regarded food as an important, but not as the main reason for their trip; while the third group regarded food as the secondary reason for the visit. Significant differences in each segment were found on the appreciation of attractions in the city, knowledge of local wine, satisfaction with the food and satisfaction with the overall visit.

Molina et al. (2015) specifically segmented wine tourists who visited Spanish wineries. The authors established four segments based on the tourist's interest in and knowledge of wine, types of tourism, prior visits, frequency of wine consumption and demographic information. The segments were 'interested', 'experts', 'potentials' and 'novices'. The 'interested' group has great knowledge of and interest in wine. They have experience in wine tourism and enjoy wine on holiday. The 'experts' main type of tourism is wine tourism, followed by culture and then by cuisine. They have the highest expenses, enjoy wine and are generally not part of an organised trip. 'Potentials' are less active in wine tourism, have the lowest expenses and their experience of wine tourism is low. Even though these tourists do not have a vast knowledge of or interest in wine and wine tourism, they do state that wine-related activities serve as good motives for travel and that it is important to promote wine culture in Spain. 'Novices' also do not have a great knowledge of and interest in wine and wine tourism. They generally have not engaged in wine tourism before and many do not consume wine whilst on holiday.

Croce and Perri (2010) proposed that the food and wine tourism market can be broken down into many different segments or types of tourists. The authors considered variables such as specialisation of interests and knowledge and awareness of the food and wine sector. Taxonomies were created based on observations and surveys conducted in many international destinations with different tourism stakeholders. Each segment is positioned in relation to three extreme profiles. The extreme profiles can be explained as follows:

- Novices: These tourists have no specific culinary knowledge, are often unaware of opportunities offered by a multifaceted tourism experience and are not particularly driven to explore on their own.
- Experts: These tourists are exceptionally knowledgeable about the culinary domain and tend to refrain from combining their food and wine interest with other activities.
- Multi-interest visitors: These tourists predominantly enjoy combining different elements into their holidays, such as combining food with sport or art. They may have expertise in one of the activities, but not necessarily in food or wine.

Hjalager (2004) states that continual market segmentation is pivotal for most businesses and destinations and is a source of knowledge for practical action. The methodology used to segment international tourists to South Africa is discussed in the following section.

METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire

The instrument used to gather the quantitative data was a newly developed, structured questionnaire based on the literature review. Existing questionnaires, including, but not limited to, those of Amuquandoh (2011), McKercher et al. (2008), Sánchez-Cañizares and López-Guzmán (2012) and Torres (2002), were also scrutinised in the questionnaire development process. The aim was to include determinants of culinary preferences identified in theories, existing questionnaires, models and literature, as well as to include questions that could be useful in the development of tourist taxonomies.

A two-step pilot study was conducted. First, two international students studying at the North-West University were asked to check if the questionnaire was understandable and to comment on the questionnaire. After initial refinement the questionnaire was piloted in the same environment as that in which the data collection would take place as advised by Altinay and Paraskevas (2008). Minor adjustments were made to the questionnaire after the pilot study and it was established that approximately 10 to 15 minutes were required to complete the questionnaire. The results obtained in the pilot study were not used in the final study.

The questionnaire had three sections. Section A captured the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, Section B focused on the respondents' culinary preferences and Section C focused on the respondents' culinary satisfaction while in South Africa. Construct and content validity were proved for the questionnaire. Reliability was established with the use of Cronbach α .

Sample

International tourists departing South Africa via O. R. Tambo International Airport were the sample. In 2015, foreign departures from O. R. Tambo International Airport were 2,327,429 or 77.8% of all airport departures of foreigners from South Africa (Statistics South Africa, 2016a). For a population exceeding 1 million, a sample size of 384 is proposed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). To ensure that a representative sample was acquired, a larger sample than proposed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) was aimed for. Random sampling was used in order to give each international tourist an equal opportunity to be selected.

Statistical Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA), *t*-tests, Spearman rank correlations and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were utilised to analyse the data. Factor analysis was used to identify groups of highly interrelated culinary preference determinants (Leedy & Ormrod, 2014). The names of each group of international tourists in the taxonomy were based on the culinary preference factors. The *t*-test was employed to reveal whether there were significant differences in tourists' determinants of culinary preference and culinary satisfaction in terms of the sociodemographic and travel profile variables, which only had two answer categories (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Spearman's rank-order correlation was

used to determine whether correlations exist between the ranked sociodemographic and travel profile variables and the culinary preference factors (Kline, 2016). As ANOVA compares the differences between three or more means (Leedy & Ormrod, 2014), it was used to compare the remaining sociodemographic and travel profile variables with the culinary preference factors.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The socio-demographic and travel profile of the sample has been summarised in Table 1. The sample was relatively young, with the majority (78.66%) being under the age of 46. Almost half (49.28%) of the respondents were from African countries and the majority had not visited South Africa often (85.34% visited between one and five times, including this trip). Hotels (48.55%) as well as homes of friends or relatives (26.69%) were popular forms of accommodation. The main purpose of the trip was quite balanced between leisure (20.70%), visiting friends or relatives (20.70%) and other (20.89%), while business was stated as the main reason for the visit by 37.71% of respondents. Many respondents (50.43%) regarded themselves as adventurous eaters with only a few respondents (12.66%) following any type of diet. About two-thirds of respondents (68.86%) indicated that they ate local food during this trip to South Africa.

Quan and Wang (2004) state that it is necessary to segment tourism markets in terms of their different food habits and preferences. The factor analysis was used in determining five segments which international tourists to South Africa belong to, based on their culinary preferences.

A principal component factor analysis with oblique rotation (Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation) was undertaken for determining the culinary preference factors. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.886, indicating an adequate sample size for factor analysis (Field, 2013), and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant (p < 0.000). The five factors obtained explained 60.74% of the variance. Table 2 displays the items and their loadings onto the factor on which it showed the strongest loading. The five factors were named as follows: Social influence, Culture and religion, Exploration, The culinary experience and Environmental sensitivity.

Social influence consists of nine items, including two relating to the variable marketing (loadings of 0.702 and 0.651) and two relating to the variable social influences (loadings of 0.651 and 0.650). The other items related to the variables communication gap (0.653), taste and availability, quality and variety (0.620), lifestyle (0.538) and global trends: buying local (0.492) and rejection of low-cost mass-produced food (0.320). The Cronbach α for this factor is 0.824

Culture and religion contains five items, four of which relate to the variable culture and religion (vegan = -0.827, vegetarian = -0.795, halal = -0.751 and kosher = -0.729). The last item, organic cuisine, with a factor loading of -0.663 relates to the variable global trends: functional, organic and animal welfare—oriented products, which clearly relate to the other items encompassed in this factor. The Cronbach α for this factor is 0.898.

Table 1. Socio-demographic and Travel Profile.

| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Characteristic | Detail | Percentage and ZAR | |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| 36-45 25.24% 46-55 11.07% 56+ 10.26% Male 58.49% Female 41.51% Africa 49.28% Americas 18.66% Australia and Oceania 2.39% Europe 17.38% Asia 10.53% Adventurous 50.43% Slightly adventurous 36.35% Not at all adventurous 36.35% | Age (n = 614) | 18-25 | 25.90% | |
| $ \begin{array}{c} 46-55 \\ 56+ \\ 10.26\% \\ 56+ \\ 10.26\% \\ 6 \\ 6 \\ 6 \\ 6 \\ 6 \\ 6 \\ 6 \\ 6 \\ 6 \\$ | | 26-35 | 27.52% | |
| Gender $(n = 624)$ $56 +$ 10.26% Gender $(n = 624)$ Male 58.49% Female 41.51% Nationality $(n = 615)$ Africa 49.28% Americas 18.66% Australia and Oceania 2.39% Europe 17.38% Asia 10.53% Neophilic versus neophobic Adventurous 50.43% tendency $(n = 575)$ Slightly adventurous 36.35% Not at all adventurous 13.22% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ No 87.34% Frequency of dining out $(n = 511)$ More than once a week 27.22% Once a week 34.66% 34.66% Once a week 34.66% 34.66% Once a month 23.96% 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa $1-5$ 85.34% $(n = 607)$ $6-10$ 9.88% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $21+$ 1.48% | | 36-45 | 25.24% | |
| Gender $(n = 624)$ Male 58.49% Female 41.51% Nationality $(n = 615)$ Africa 49.28% Americas 18.66% Australia and Oceania 2.39% Europe 17.38% Asia 10.53% Neophilic versus neophobic Adventurous 50.43% tendency $(n = 575)$ Slightly adventurous 36.35% Not at all adventurous 13.22% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ Yes 12.66% Frequency of dining out $(n = 551)$ More than once a week 27.22% $(n = 551)$ Once a week 34.66% Once a month 23.96% 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa 1-5 85.34% $(n = 607)$ 6-10 9.88% 11-15 1.98% 16-20 1.32% 21 + 1.48% Type of accommodation Hotels 48.55% $(n = 517)$ Resorts 2.90% Less than once a month <td></td> <td>46-55</td> <td colspan="2">11.07%</td> | | 46-55 | 11.07% | |
| Nationality (n = 615) Female 41.51% Africa 49.28% Americas 18.66% Australia and Oceania 2.39% Europe 17.38% Asia 10.53% Neophilic versus neophobic Adventurous 50.43% Itendency $(n = 575)$ Slightly adventurous 36.35% Not at all adventurous 13.22% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ No 87.34% Frequency of dining out ($n = 551$) More than once a week 27.22% $(n = 551)$ Once a week 34.66% Once a month 23.96% Less than once a month 61.7% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa ($n = 607$) $1 - 5$ 85.34% $(n = 607)$ $6 - 10$ 9.88% $11 - 15$ 1.98% $16 - 20$ 1.32% $21 +$ 1.48% Type of accommodation Hotels 48.55% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed a | | 56 + | 10.26% | |
| Nationality (n = 615) Africa 49.28% Americas 18.66% Australia and Oceania 2.39% Europe 17.38% Asia 10.53% Neophilic versus neophobic tendency $(n = 575)$ Adventurous 50.43% Europe 17.38% 10.53% Asia 10.53% 10.53% Neophilic versus neophobic tendency $(n = 575)$ Adventurous 50.43% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ Yes 12.66% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ Yes 12.66% Frequency of dining out $(n = 551)$ More than once a week 27.22% No 34.66% 34.66% Once a week 27.22% Once a month 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Image: The folion of the self-or se | Gender $(n = 624)$ | Male | 58.49% | |
| Americas Australia and Oceania 2.39% Europe 17.38% Asia 10.53% Neophilic versus neophobic tendency $(n = 575)$ Slightly adventurous 50.43% Slightly adventurous 36.35% Not at all adventurous 13.22% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ No 87.34% Frequency of dining out $(n = 551)$ More than once a week 27.22% Once a week 34.66% Once a month 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa $(n = 607)$ 6-10 9.88% $(n = 607)$ 6-10 9.88% $(n = 517)$ Resorts 1.1-15 1.98% $(n = 517)$ Resorts 2.90% Resorts 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | Female | 41.51% | |
| Australia and Oceania 2.39% Europe 17.38% Asia 10.53% Neophilic versus neophobic tendency $(n = 575)$ Slightly adventurous 50.43% Slightly adventurous 13.22% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ No 87.34% Frequency of dining out More than once a week 27.22% Once a month 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa $(n = 607)$ $(n = 551)$ $(n = 607)$ $(n = 517)$ $(n = 517)$ $(n = 563)$ $(n = 563)$ $(n = 563)$ $(n = 563)$ $(n = 607)$ $(n = 563)$ $(n = 607)$ | Nationality $(n = 615)$ | Africa | 49.28% | |
| Europe | | Americas | 18.66% | |
| Neophilic versus neophobic tendency $(n = 575)$ Slightly adventurous 50.43% Not at all adventurous 36.35% Not at all adventurous 13.22% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ No 87.34% Prequency of dining out More than once a week 27.22% $(n = 551)$ Once a week 34.66% Once a month 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa $1-5$ 85.34% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $21+$ 1.48% Type of accommodation Hotels 48.55% $(n = 517)$ Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation 2.20% Racommodation Rake 2.20% Racommoda | | Australia and Oceania | 2.39% | |
| Neophilic versus neophobic tendency $(n = 575)$ Adventurous 50.43% tendency $(n = 575)$ Slightly adventurous 36.35% Not at all adventurous 13.22% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ Yes 12.66% No Frequency of dining out $(n = 551)$ More than once a week 27.22% Once a week Once a week $(n = 551)$ Once a month 23.96% Less than once a month Less than once a month $(n = 607)$ $6-10$ 9.88% Times visited South Africa $(n = 607)$ $6-10$ 9.88% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $21+$ 1.48% 48.55% ($n = 517$) Resorts 2.90% 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 11.03% R2 802.31 Frood and beverages R3 080.22 11.00% R2 802.31 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | Europe | 17.38% | |
| tendency $(n = 575)$ Slightly adventurous 36.35% Not at all adventurous 13.22% Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ Yes 12.66% Frequency of dining out $(n = 551)$ More than once a week 27.22% Once a week 34.66% 34.66% Once a month 23.96% 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa $1-5$ 85.34% $(n = 607)$ $6-10$ 9.88% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $21+$ 1.48% Type of accommodation Hotels 48.55% $(n = 517)$ Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Frood and beverages R3 080.22 | | Asia | 10.53% | |
| Not at all adventurous 13.22% | Neophilic versus neophobic | Adventurous | 50.43% | |
| Following any religious, health-, or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ No 87.34% Frequency of dining out $(n = 551)$ More than once a week 27.22% $(n = 551)$ Once a week 34.66% Once a month 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa $(n = 607)$ 6-10 9.88% $(n = 607)$ 6-10 9.88% $(n = 607)$ 11-15 1.98% $(n = 607)$ 16-20 1.32% $(n = 517)$ Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | tendency $(n = 575)$ | Slightly adventurous | 36.35% | |
| or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ No 87.34% Frequency of dining out $(n = 551)$ More than once a week 27.22% Once a week 34.66% Once a month 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa $(n = 607)$ $6-10$ 9.88% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $21+$ 1.48% Type of accommodation $(n = 517)$ Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation $88.863.54$ Sight-seeing tours $83.080.22$ Packaged tours 87.34% R25 430.84 | | Not at all adventurous | 13.22% | |
| Frequency of dining out $(n = 551)$ More than once a week 27.22% $(n = 551)$ Once a week 34.66% Once a month 23.96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa $(n = 607)$ $6-10$ 9.88% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $21+$ 1.48% Type of accommodation $(n = 517)$ Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | Following any religious, health-, | Yes | 12.66% | |
| $(n = 551) \qquad \text{Once a week} \qquad 34.66\% \\ \text{Once a month} \qquad 23.96\% \\ \text{Less than once a month} \qquad 6.17\% \\ \text{Seldom} \qquad 7.99\% \\ \text{Times visited South Africa} \qquad 1-5 \qquad 85.34\% \\ (n = 607) \qquad 6-10 \qquad 9.88\% \\ 11-15 \qquad 1.98\% \\ 16-20 \qquad 1.32\% \\ 21+ \qquad 1.48\% \\ \text{Type of accommodation} \qquad \text{Hotels} \qquad 48.55\% \\ (n = 517) \qquad \text{Resorts} \qquad 2.90\% \\ \text{Homes of friends and relatives} \qquad 26.69\% \\ \text{Campgrounds} \qquad 2.90\% \\ \text{Bed and breakfasts} \qquad 7.93\% \\ \text{Other} \qquad 11.03\% \\ \text{Average spending } (n = 563) \qquad \text{Accommodation} \qquad \text{R8 863.54} \\ \text{Sight-seeing tours} \qquad \text{R3 516.14} \\ \text{Transport} \qquad \text{R2 802.31} \\ \text{Food and beverages} \qquad \text{R3 080.22} \\ \text{Packaged tours} \qquad \text{R25 430.84} $ | or weight-related diet $(n = 616)$ | No | 87.34% | |
| Once a month 23,96% Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7,99% Times visited South Africa $1-5$ 85,34% $(n=607)$ 6-10 9,88% $11-15$ 1,98% $16-20$ 1,32% $21+$ 1,48% Type of accommodation Hotels 48,55% $(n=517)$ Resorts 2,90% Homes of friends and relatives 26,69% Campgrounds 2,90% Bed and breakfasts 7,93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n=563)$ Accommodation R8 863,54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516,14 Transport R2 802,31 Food and beverages R3 080,22 Packaged tours R25 430,84 | Frequency of dining out | More than once a week | 27.22% | |
| Less than once a month 6.17% Seldom 7.99% Times visited South Africa $1-5$ 85.34% $(n=607)$ $6-10$ 9.88% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $21+$ 1.48% Type of accommodation $(n=517)$ Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n=563)$ Accommodation $(n=563)$ Resorts $(n=517)$ Resorts $(n$ | (n = 551) | Once a week | 34.66% | |
| Times visited South Africa $1-5$ 85.34% $(n=607)$ $6-10$ 9.88% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $21+$ 1.48% Type of accommodation $(n=517)$ Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n=563)$ Accommodation 2.90% R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours 2.90% R2 802.31 Food and beverages 2.90% R3 080.22 Packaged tours 2.90% R2 430.84 | | Once a month | 23.96% | |
| Times visited South Africa $1-5$ 85.34% $(n=607)$ $6-10$ 9.88% $11-15$ 1.98% $16-20$ 1.32% $21+$ 1.48% Type of accommodation $(n=517)$ Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n=563)$ Accommodation 1.03% Resorts 1.03% Resorts 1.03% Resorts 1.03% Region 1.03% Regio | | Less than once a month | 6.17% | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | Seldom | 7.99% | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Times visited South Africa | 1-5 | 85.34% | |
| $ \begin{array}{c} 16-20 & 1.32\% \\ 21+ & 1.48\% \\ \hline \text{Type of accommodation} & \text{Hotels} & 48.55\% \\ (n=517) & \text{Resorts} & 2.90\% \\ \hline \text{Homes of friends and relatives} & 26.69\% \\ \hline \text{Campgrounds} & 2.90\% \\ \hline \text{Bed and breakfasts} & 7.93\% \\ \hline \text{Other} & 11.03\% \\ \hline \text{Average spending } (n=563) & \text{Accommodation} & \text{R8 863.54} \\ \hline \text{Sight-seeing tours} & \text{R3 516.14} \\ \hline \text{Transport} & \text{R2 802.31} \\ \hline \text{Food and beverages} & \text{R3 080.22} \\ \hline \text{Packaged tours} & \text{R25 430.84} \\ \hline \end{array} $ | (n = 607) | 6-10 | 9.88% | |
| Type of accommodation Hotels 48.55% ($n = 517$) Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending ($n = 563$) Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | 11-15 | 1.98% | |
| Type of accommodation Hotels 48.55% $(n=517)$ Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n=563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | 16-20 | 1.32% | |
| ($n=517$) Resorts 2.90% Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending ($n=563$) Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | 21 + | 1.48% | |
| Homes of friends and relatives 26.69% Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | Type of accommodation | Hotels | 48.55% | |
| Campgrounds 2.90% Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | (n = 517) | Resorts | 2.90% | |
| Bed and breakfasts 7.93% Other 11.03% Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | Homes of friends and relatives | 26.69% | |
| Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | Campgrounds | 2.90% | |
| Average spending $(n = 563)$ Accommodation R8 863.54 Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | Bed and breakfasts | 7.93% | |
| Sight-seeing tours R3 516.14 Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | Other | 11.03% | |
| Transport R2 802.31 Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | Average spending $(n = 563)$ | Accommodation | R8 863.54 | |
| Food and beverages R3 080.22 Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | Sight-seeing tours | R3 516.14 | |
| Packaged tours R25 430.84 | | Transport | R2 802.31 | |
| - | | Food and beverages | R3 080.22 | |
| Other R6 201.37 | | Packaged tours | R25 430.84 | |
| | | Other | R6 201.37 | |

12.50%

2.59%

6.47%

| Characteristic | Detail | Percentage and ZAR |
|--|---|--------------------|
| Main purpose of trip | Leisure | 20.70% |
| (n = 541) | Business | 37.71% |
| | Visiting friends or relatives | 20.70% |
| | Other | 20.89% |
| Consumed local cuisine during trip $(n = 607)$ | Yes | 68.86% |
| | No | 24.22% |
| | Not sure | 6.92% |
| Reasons for not trying | I did not know which items are local | 53.88% |
| South African local cuisine $(n = 232)$ | I was not sure about the health and safety of the local cuisine | 7.33% |
| | I was not sure which ingredients the | 17.24% |

local dishes or beverages contain I was not interested in trying local

The local cuisine did not look

cuisine

appetising Other

Table 1. (Continued)

ZAR, South African Rand.

Exploration contains seven of the items, with three items (craft beer = -0.872, garage wines = -0.858 and gourmet cuisine = -0.599) relating to different global trends. The other items were wine routes with a factor loading of -0.893, food routes with a loading of -0.763 (both part of the availability, quality and variety variable), culinary events with a loading of -0.731 (social influence and self-development variables) and culinary activities to enhance my knowledge with a loading of -0.685 (self-development variable). The Cronbach α for this factor is 0.919.

The culinary experience factor comprised of items such as the availability of traditional cuisine, the opportunity to experience a new culture through their cuisine (both related to the desire for authentic food experience variable with respective factor loadings of -0.827 and -0.777), the availability of restaurants close to attractions and the availability of child-friendly restaurants (both derived from the variable dining establishments and with respective factor loadings of -0.775 and -0.644). The last item which loaded onto the factor was the availability of esteemed restaurants (-0.694), which relates to the variables social influences and global trends: celebrity chefs. The Cronbach α for this factor is 0.842.

The last factor, *environmental sensitivity*, contained six items, four relating to different global trend variables, one to affordability and one to availability, quality and variety. The items were the availability of sustainably caught seafood (0.735), availability of cuisine that is produced using sustainable methods (0.734), cuisine that is 100% natural (0.696), cuisine that is reasonably priced

LISA-MARI COUGHLAN AND MELVILLE SAAYMAN

Table 2. Culinary Preference Factors.

| Item | Variable | Factors and Loadings | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| | | Social Influence | Culture and Religion | Exploration | The Culinary Experience | Environmental Sensitivity | |
| Availability of information | Marketing | 0.702 | | | | | |
| Understandable menu | Communication gap | 0.653 | | | | | |
| Pictures of cuisine | Marketing | 0.651 | | | | | |
| Good ratings | Social influences | 0.651 | | | | | |
| Friends recommended | Social influences | 0.650 | | | | | |
| Appeal to senses | Taste and availability, quality and variety | 0.620 | | | | | |
| Allowed in diet | Lifestyle, and culture and religion | 0.538 | | | | | |
| Supporting local | Global trends: buying local | 0.492 | | | | | |
| Availability of franchises | Global trends: rejection of low-cost mass-produced food | 0.320 | | | | | |
| Vegan | Culture and religion | | -0.827 | | | | |
| Vegetarian | Culture and religion | | -0.795 | | | | |
| Halal | Culture and religion | | -0.751 | | | | |
| Kosher | Culture and religion | | -0.729 | | | | |
| Organic | Global trends: functional, organic and animal- welfare-oriented products | | -0.663 | | | | |
| Wine routes | Availability, quality and variety | | | -0.893 | | | |
| Craft beer | Global trends: craft beer | | | -0.872 | | | |
| Garage wines | Global trends: garage wine | | | -0.858 | | | |
| Food routes | Availability, quality and variety | | | -0.763 | | | |

| Culinary events | Social influences and self-development | | | -0.731 | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Enhance my knowledge | Self-development | | | -0.685 | | |
| Gourmet cuisine | Global trends: trading up | | | -0.599 | | |
| Traditional cuisine | Desire for authentic food experience | | | | -0.827 | |
| Experience a new culture | Desire for authentic food experience | | | | -0.777 | |
| Close to attractions | Dining establishments | | | | -0.775 | |
| Esteemed restaurants | Social influences and global trends: celebrity chefs | | | | -0.694 | |
| Child-friendly | Dining establishments | | | | -0.644 | |
| Sustainable seafood | Global trends: environmental sustainability | | | | | 0.735 |
| Sustainable methods | Global trends: environmental sustainability | | | | | 0.734 |
| 100% natural | Global trends: clean eating and whole food | | | | | 0.696 |
| Reasonably priced | Affordability | | | | | 0.657 |
| Animal welfare | Global trends: functional, organic and animal-welfare-oriented products | | | | | 0.619 |
| Variety of cuisine | Availability, quality and variety | | | | | 0.516 |
| Cronbach α reliability coefficient | | 0.824 | 0.898 | 0.919 | 0.842 | 0.834 |
| Inter-item correlations | | 0.351 | 0.638 | 0.616 | 0.525 | 0.453 |
| Mean value (standar | d deviation) | 3.281 (0.677) | 2.290 (1.112) | 2.631 (0.988) | 3.022 (0.916) | 3.205 (0.829) |

(0.657), cuisine that is orientated towards animal welfare (0.619) and a wide variety of cuisine (0.516). The Cronbach α for this factor is 0.834.

It was decided to refer to groups who valued (had the highest statistically significant relationship) *Environmental sensitivity* as Conservationists, those who valued *The culinary experience* as Experience seekers, those who valued *Culture and religion* as Devotees and, likewise, *Exploration* as Explorers and *Social influence* as Socialisers. The CEDES typology (ceding to one's culinary preferences) was thus formed. Although each respondent would definitely not fall clearly into one segment, the data were used to draft broad profiles for the different segments according to culinary preference. Each segment will be described in terms of their socio-demographic and travel profile, which was determined with the use of Spearman rank correlations, *t*-tests and ANOVA calculations. Only statistically significant relationships will be drawn from. Each segment can be described as follows:

Conservationists

Conservationists value a variety of cuisine, the availability of sustainably caught seafood, cuisine produced using sustainable methods, the availability of cuisine that is orientated towards animal welfare and cuisine that is 100% natural and reasonably priced. ANOVA revealed that nationalities had a statistically significant relationship with environmental sensitivity (p < 0.05). Of all nationalities, Australians regarded environmental sensitivity as the most important (mean = 3.452), and many Australians were therefore regarded as conservationists. ANOVA also indicated that the environmental sensitivity factor had a statistically significant relationship with type of accommodation with a p value of 0.016. Environmental sensitivity was the most important to tourists who made use of campgrounds (mean = 3.667) and bed and breakfasts (mean = 3.304); conservationists are said to have preferred these types of accommodation. Conservationists were satisfied with their personal preferences being met whilst in South Africa (Spearman rho = 0.192) as well as the dining environment (Spearman rho = 0.132).

Experience Seekers

Experience seekers value the availability of traditional cuisine, the opportunity to experience a new culture through their cuisine, restaurants close to attractions and esteemed and child-friendly restaurants. Updhyay and Sharma (2014) named a cluster of tourists who valued the traditional and historical relevance of the cuisine as experience seekers.

Among the nationalities in the current studies, the culinary experience factor was the most important to Asians (mean = 3.216), Africans (mean = 3.074) and Europeans (mean = 3.014) as revealed through ANOVA (p = 0.042). The largest Spearman rank correlation between spending on package tours and any of the segments was rho = 0.262. This correlation was between experience seekers and

spending on packaged tours, indicating that the more inclined an international tourist was to be an experience seeker the more they spent on packaged tours.

The *t*-tests revealed that knowledge of which items are local had a statistically significant (p = 0.035) and a practically significant (d = 0.22; small effect) relationship with the culinary experience factor. Experience seekers who did not consume local food therefore did so because they did not know which items were local. Experience seekers were satisfied with their personal preferences being met whilst in South Africa (rho = 0.165) as well as the dining environment (rho = 0.159).

Devotees

Devotees value the availability of vegan, vegetarian, halal, kosher and organic cuisine. ANOVA (p < 0.001) indicated that the culture and religion factor was regarded as the most important to tourists who stayed in the homes of friends and relatives (mean = 2.453), campgrounds (mean = 2.831) and bed and breakfasts (mean = 2.687). Devotees are therefore considered to have often stayed in these types of establishments. Devotees did not dine out frequently (rho = 0.126) or consider themselves to be adventurous eaters (rho = 0.133). When conducting the *t*-tests, there was a statistically and practically significant difference between being on a diet or not and the factor of culture and religion (p = 0.001; d = 0.43). Respondents who at the time of data collection were following a religious, health- or weight-related diet regarded the factor of culture and religion to be a more important influence (mean = 2.684) on their culinary preferences than those not following a diet (mean = 2.212). Devotees are therefore stated to often follow a religious, health- or weight-related diet.

ANOVA (p < 0.001) revealed that Asian tourists regarded culture and religion as the most important between the nationalities (mean = 2.843). Many Asians are therefore said to be devotees. This is not surprising as half of the Asian population are either Hindu or Muslim (Keck, 2014). Devotees were satisfied with their personal preferences being met while in South Africa (rho = 0.310) but dissatisfied with the affordability of cuisine in South Africa (rho = -0.162).

Explorers

Explorers value the availability of craft beer, garage wines, wine routes, food routes, culinary events, gourmet cuisine and the opportunity to enhance their knowledge. This segment therefore seems to be adventurous foodies looking to explore trendy, unique and educational culinary opportunities. These opportunities do not need to be focused on traditional cuisine or culture, which sets them apart from the experience seeker segment. The explorer segment had a significant correlation with total spending while in South Africa. The more inclined a tourist was to be an explorer, the more they spent on their overall trip (rho = 0.164). This segment generally visited South Africa for leisure purposes; this is deduced via ANOVA (p = 0.005) as tourists who stated that leisure was their

main purpose for travelling to the country regarded the exploration factor to be the most important (mean = 2.757) of all the tourists.

Explorers are said to have often stayed in campgrounds (ANOVA p-value of 0.035) as the exploration factor was the most important to tourists who stayed in campgrounds (mean = 3.088) and hotels (mean = 2.740). Explorers were satisfied with their personal preferences being met whilst in South Africa (rho = 0.248). They were also satisfied with the dining environment (rho = 0.106).

Hjalager's (2004) experimentalists displayed similar characteristics to the explorers in the current study. They valued achievement and prestige and the authors state that fancy chefs will likely appeal to this group of tourists. Kivela and Crotts (2006) agree that experimental tourists gain prestige by keeping up with culinary trends. They seek fashionable food, boutique wines, the latest ingredients and innovative menus. The authors state that these tourists' main purpose for the trip is to experience and savour exquisite gastronomy.

Socialisers

Socialisers value the availability of information, an understandable menu, the availability of pictures of cuisine, dining mostly at establishments with good ratings on travelogues, dining mostly where friends or family recommend, supporting local culinary stakeholders, the availability of franchises, cuisine which appeals to their senses and cuisine that is allowed in their diets. Hjalager's (2004) recreational segment was quite similar to the current study's socialisers, relying on word of mouth in order to make decisions. The authors recommended the use of down-to-earth television personalities in order to market to this segment. Kivela and Crotts (2006) further state that recreational tourists seek out familiar cuisine, take pleasure in eating together with family, often stay in self-catering establishments and tended to be Australian and European.

ANOVA results (p = 0.043) indicated that socialisers in the current study tended to be Africans (mean = 3.371). They were also respondents who did not regard themselves as adventurous eaters (rho = 0.100) and respondents who had visited South Africa before (rho = 0.109). Socialisers were satisfied with their personal preferences being met whilst in South Africa (rho = 0.270) as well as the dining environment (rho = 0.113).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In conclusion, it is possible to use culinary preferences to segment international tourists. The segments show similarities with certain points, especially considering accommodation, as conservationists, devotees and explorers frequently make use of campgrounds, and all of the segments were satisfied with their culinary personal preferences being met whilst in South Africa. This having been said, numerous differences exist and therefore the CEDES taxonomy assists with the formulation of clear guidelines to industry. These differences include that many conservationists are Australian, experience seekers tend to purchase packaged tours, devotees do not dine out frequently, explorers visited South

Africa for leisure purposes and socialisers are Africans who consider themselves to be adventurous eaters and have visited South Africa before.

Tourism marketers could enhance strategies as a result of knowing what each segment of international tourists to South Africa value when making culinary decisions. For example, in bed and breakfasts, the availability of sustainably caught seafood, cuisine produced using sustainable methods, the availability of cuisine that is orientated towards animal welfare, etc. could be marketed as conservationists often stay in bed-and-breakfast establishments. Likewise, since Australians tended to be conservationists, tourism marketing campaigns directed at Australians could focus on South Africa's eight Slow Food convivia (Slow Food, 2015) as well as other sustainable and animal welfare—oriented cuisine. Conserving South Africa's food resources, native ingredients and traditional cooking methods is pivotal to ensure that tourists get a true taste of the country's seas, land, cultures and history (South African Tourism, 2016b), and the development of more culinary products geared towards this conservation may even draw more tourists to the country.

In hotels, craft beer, garage wines, wine routes, food routes, culinary events, gourmet cuisine and opportunities to enhance culinary knowledge can be advertised as explorers often stay in hotels. Since explorers tend to be big spenders, the development of more activities for these tourists to explore may be of economic benefit to specific areas. For example, the well-known South African traditional cooking courses are mostly found in the Western Cape province (Cape Fusion Tours, 2011; ExpatCapeTown, 2016; Leopard's Leap, 2015). This does not do justice to South African cuisine as 'each part of the country bears evidence of its own type of traditional cuisine' (Pluke, Emond, & Gielink, 2014). Durban (in the KwaZulu-Natal province) curry classes and classes on other areas' traditional dishes and beverages may benefit the specific area's and country's tourism.

In order to satisfy the needs of experience seekers, local cuisine should be easily identifiable. The lack of pre-consumption knowledge should be addressed in the marketing of cuisine (Fields, 2002). It is therefore recommended that the Department of Trade and Industry make the Proudly South African logo available for use in menus (Proudly South African, 2015).

Lastly, culinary establishments should not inflate the prices of culinary items which are suitable for the consumption of religious tourists (as is often the case), such as vegetarian dishes. This might improve devotees' satisfaction with the affordability of cuisine in South Africa.

Future research into refining the taxonomy of international tourists to South Africa could therefore enhance the research methodology by translating the questionnaires into more languages and collecting at more international points of departure.

LIMITATIONS

Limitations for the study include that only English-speaking international tourists could participate in the research and that the data were only collected at

O. R. Tambo International Airport and not also at Cape Town International Airport or King Shaka International Airport (in Durban), which might have resulted in a more diverse sample of international tourists to South Africa.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Funding was received from the Department of Higher Education and Training (South Africa), the Central University of Technology and North-West University.

REFERENCES

- Altinay, L., & Paraskevas, A. (2008). Planning research in hospitality and tourism. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Amuquandoh, F. E. (2011). International tourists' concerns about traditional foods in Ghana. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 18(1), 1–9. doi:10.1375/jhtm.18.1.1.
- Bloom, J. Z. (2005). Market segmentation. A neural network application. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(1), 93–111. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2004.05.001.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste. London: Routledge.
- Cape Fusion Tours. (2011). Get your hands dirty and come and experience African cooking in Cape Town. Retrieved from https://capefusiontours.com/tag/traditional-south-african-cooking-in-cape-town/. Accessed on November 22, 2016.
- Chang, R. C. Y., Kivela, J., & Mak, A. H. N. (2010). Food preferences of Chinese tourists. Annals of Tourism Research, 37(4), 989-1011. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2010.03.007.
- Cohen, E., & Avieli, N. (2004). Food in tourism Attraction and impediment. Annals of Tourism Research, 31(4), 755–778. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2004.02.003.
- Croce, E., & Perri, G. (2010). Food and wine tourism. Oxfordshire: CABI.
- Dahl, H., & Aagaard, C. D. (1997). Hvis din nabo var en bil. Křbenhavn: Akademisk forlag.
- du Rand, G. E., & Heath, E. (2006). Towards a framework for food tourism as an element of destination marketing. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(3), 206–234. doi:10.2164/cit/226.0.
- 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 & Tourism Marketing*, 14(3-4), 97-112. doi:10.1300/J073v14n03.
- ExpatCapeTown. (2016). South African cooking with Cass Abrahams. Retrievedfrom http://www.expatcapetown.com/south-african-cooking.html. Accessed on November 22, 2016.
- Field, A. (2013). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (4th ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fields, K. (2002). Demand for the gastronomy tourism product: motivational factors. In A. Hjalager & G. Richards (Eds.), *Tourism and gastronomy* (pp. 36–50). London: Routledge.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis: a global perspective. (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.
- Hjalager, A. M. (2003). What do tourists eat and why? Towards a sociology of gastronomy and tourism. In J. Collen & G. Richards (Eds.), Gastronomy and tourism (pp. 54–74). Gravenwezel: Academie voor de streekgebonden gastronomie.
- Hjalager, A. M. (2004). What do tourists eat and why? Towards a sociology of gastronomy and tourism. *Tourism*, 52(2), 195–201.
- Ignatov, E., & Smith, S. (2006). Segmenting Canadian culinary tourists. Current Issues in Tourism, 9(3), 235–255. doi:10.2167/cit/229.0.
- Ivanovic, M. (2008). Cultural tourism. Cape Town: Juta & Company.
- Keck, Z. (2014). Asia leads world in religious diversity. Retrieved from http://thediplomat.com/2014/ 04/asia-leads-world-in-religious-diversity/. Accessed on November 17, 2016.
- Kim, S. S., Crompton, J. L., & Botha, C. (2000). Responding to competition: a strategy for Sun/Lost City, South Africa. Tourism Management, 21(1), 33–41. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00094-1.

- Kim, Y. H., Duncan, J. L., & Jai, T.-M. (Catherine). (2014). A case study of a southern food festival: using a cluster analysis approach. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 25(3), 457–473. doi:10.1080/13032917.2014.912245.
- Kivela, J., & Crotts, J. C. (2006). Tourism and gastronomy: gastronomy's influence on how tourists experience a destination. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 30(3), 354–377. doi:10.1177/1096348006286797.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30(3), 607–610.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2014). Practical research: planning and design (10th ed.). Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited.
- Leopard's Leap. (2015). Learn to cook the South African way! Retrieved from http://www.leopard-sleap.co.za/2015/09/04/learn-to-cook-the-south-african-way-2/. Accessed on November 22, 2016.
- Mack, R., Blose, J., & MacLaurin, T. (2009). Segmenting the culinary tourist market: an American and Australian comparison. In Oxford Business & Economics Conference Program. Oxford. Retrieved from http://t.gcbe.us/2009_OBEC/data/Rhonda Mack, Julia Blose, Tanya MacLaurin.doc
- McKercher, B., Okumus, F., & Okumus, B. (2008). Food tourism as a viable market segment: it's all how you cook the numbers! *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 25(2), 137–148. doi:10.1080/10548400802402404.
- Molina, A., Gómez, M., González-Díaz, B., & Esteban, Á. (2015). Market segmentation in wine tourism: strategies for wineries and destinations in Spain. *Journal of Wine Research*, 26(3), 192–224. doi:10.1080/09571264.2015.1051218.
- Moodley, C. (2016). SA must brace for bumper tourism year. Accessed on June 10, 2016.
- Perkins, C. (2014). Britain's culture and heritage still major tourist draw. Retrieved from http://www.packagedfacts.com/Food-Formulation-Trends-8024542/. Accessed on April 7, 2016.
- Phillips, J. (2010). Culinary tourism industry report released. Retrieved from http://www.tourismup-date.co.za/home/detail?articleid=21128&article=culinary-tourism-industry-report-released. Accessed on January 19, 2016.
- Pluke, K., Emond, M., & Gielink, T. (2014). The heritage list: where to eat traditional South African food. Retrieved from http://www.eatout.co.za/article/heritage-list-eat-traditional-south-african-food/. Accessed on November 22, 2016.
- Proudly South African. (2015). Proudly South African annual report 2014/15. Johannesburg.
- Quan, S., & Wang, N. (2004). Towards a structural model of the tourist experience: An illustration from food experiences in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 297–305. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00130-4.
- Rozin, P., & Vollmecke, T. A. (1986). Food likes and dislikes. Annual Review of Nutrition, 6(1), 433–456. doi:10.1146/annurev.nutr.6.1.433
- 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. doi:10.1080/ 13683500.2011.589895.
- Saayman, M., & Scholtz, M. (2012). Visitors' perceptions of the non-consumptive value of selected species and game-viewing experiences in South African national parks. Potchefstroom: Tourism Research in Economic Environs and Society.
- Slow Food. (2015). Convivia in South Africa. Retrieved from http://www.slowfood.com/nazioni-con-dotte/south-africa/. Accessed on February 3, 2016.
- Smith, S. L. J., & Xiao, H. G. (2008). Culinary tourism supply chains: a preliminary examination. Journal of Travel Research, 46(3), 289–299. doi:10.1177/0047287506303981.
- South African Tourism. (2014). 2013 annual tourism performance report. Retrievedfrom http://www.southafrica.net/research/en/landing/research-home. Accessed on June 10, 2015.
- South African Tourism. (2016a). Quarterly performance (Jul to Sep 2016). Retrieved from http://www.southafrica.net/uploads/files/SA_Tourism_Index_Q3_2016_-_2017_02_28.pdf

- South African Tourism. (2016b). South African food conservation. Retrieved from http://www.south-africa.net/za/en/articles/entry/article-south-african-food-conservation. Accessed on January 19, 2016.
- Statistics South Africa. (2016a). Tourism, 2015. Retrieved from http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/Report-03-51-02/Report-03-51-022015.pdf. Accessed on September 4, 2016.
- Statistics South Africa. (2016b). Tourism satellite account for South Africa, final 2013 and provisional 2014 and 2015. Pretoria. Retrieved from http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/Report-04-05-07/Report-04-05-072015.pdf
- Torres, R. (2002). Toward a better understanding of tourism and agriculture linkages in the Yucatan: tourist food consumption and preferences. *Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment*, 4(3), 282–306. doi:10.1080/14616680210147436.
- Updhyay, Y., & Sharma, D. (2014). Culinary preferences of foreign tourists in India. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 20(1), 29–39. doi:10.1177/1356766713486143.
- Viljoen, A., Kruger, M., & Saayman, M. (2017). The 3-S typology of South African culinary festival visitors. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(6), 1560–1579. doi:10.1108/IJCHM-09-2015-0464.
- Visser, G. (2007). The geography of tourism. In R. George (Ed.), Managing tourism in South Africa (pp. 34–55). Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Williams, H. A., Williams, R. L., & Omar, M. (2014). Gastro-tourism as destination branding in emerging markets markets. *International Journal of Leisure and Tourism Marketing*, 4(1), 1–18. doi:10.1504/IJLTM.2014.059257.
- Yun, D., Hennessey, S. M., & Macdonald, R. (2011). Understanding culinary tourists: segmentations based on past culinary experiences and attitudes toward food-related behaviour. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sean_Hennessey/publication/264471091_Understanding_Culinary_Tourists_Segmentations_based_on_Past_Culinary_Experiences_and_Attitudes_toward_Food-related_Behaviour/links/53e0c9c50cf24f90ff60b552.pdf. Accessed on December 1, 2015.