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1. Introduction

Since Belisle's (1983) exploration of food and tourism, the subject of food tourism, or the close relationship between food and tourism, has been a visible tourism research area for the past three decades, but its unprecedented growth and popularisation in the tourism literature has witnessed in the more recent years (2008–2015). This increased prominence is demonstrated through a series of recent special issues of tourism academic journals such as the special edition of Journal of Heritage Tourism (2013) concerning food heritage, and the special edition of Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism (2014) exploring food and tourism synergies. Major international publications such as the United Nations World Tourism Organisation's (2012) Global Report on Food Tourism, and popular academic books such as Food Tourism around the World (Hall, Sharples, Michell, Macionis, & Cambourne, 2003), Foodies & Food Tourism (Getz, Robinson, Andersson, & Vujicic, 2014), and The Future of Food Tourism (Yeoman, McMahon-Beattie, Fields, Albrecht, & Meethan, 2015) further illustrate this point. It is also important to note that there have been increasing numbers of major international conferences exploring food and tourism including: 2005 Second International Conference on Culinary Tourism held in San Francisco, 2013 World Food Tourism Conference held in Gothenburg, and 2015 World Food Travel Summit and Expo in Portugal. All these scholarly and industrial activities further illustrate the increased interest in food and tourism. Whilst food tourism represents a growing field of tourism research, there remains much debate over what this phenomenon is, hence this paper is to critically review the literature and conceptualise food tourism.

What is food tourism? As a starting point, from a definition perspective Hall and Sharples (2003, p.10) provides an excellent preliminary understanding of food in tourism which is the major motivation, describing food tourism as “visitation to primary and secondary food producers, food festivals, restaurants and specific locations for which food tasting and/or experiencing the attributes of specialist food production region are the primary motivating factor for travel”. Many authors such as Chang and Yuan (2011), Park, Reisinger, and Kang (2008), Presenza and Iocca (2012), Sanchez-Canizares and Lopez-Guzman (2012), and Smith and Costello (2009) are seen to adopt this definition. As food tourism literature began to develop, the field experienced a shift, that is, a ‘cultural turn’ from those early management-focussed studies to more wholesome and exploratory discussions of food and culture (Everett, 2012). Not only did the frequency or volume of the studies significantly increase, but so did the variety of research approaches and concepts being explored.

Despite the invaluable previous attempt of Henderson (2009) which is the only existing review of food tourism literature, the authors find that his approach lacks a holistic view of food tourism as an area of tourism research in its own right. Therefore, the authors urge that there exists a critical gap in a wholesome understanding of food tourism literature especially for the following research aspects: its definitions,
perspectives, approaches, themes, and conceptualisation. Food as a tourism research subject appears likely to increase in prominence. It can further be assumed that there will be a continuing growth in studies considering the cultural, social, geographical and political significance of food in various tourism and business contexts. A timely research on synthesis and critical review of literature is necessary to assess the progress and evolution of research on food tourism in order to establish what the phenomena is. This paper has two research objectives in order to answer the research question, ‘what is food tourism?’: (1) to critically appraise and review the literature in order to identify the series of concepts that represent the issues, themes and discourses of the subject; (2) to conceptualise food tourism using the process of cognitive mapping in order to construct a meaning about the nature of food tourism.

2. Methods

2.1. A critical review

For a comprehensive understanding of food tourism as a subject area of tourism research, this paper conducted a critical review of peer-reviewed academic journal articles published in numerous international tourism and hospitality journals and systematically analysed them. The peer-reviewed journal articles were considered one of the best sources of information for this study, as they provide the most current, stable and reliable academic source of information. Furthermore, these journal articles are a cost-effective means of information collection, as well as providing a method that remains unaffected and unaltered by the process of research, or presence of the researcher (Bowen, 2009).

Data was obtained from international tourism and hospitality journals listed by the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) of the Australian Research Council (ARC). There are many journal ranking systems used in critical literature review studies, but the ERA ranked journals were only included in the research given that Hall (2011) highlighted the significance of this Australian national government body in terms of bibliometric analysis, journal ranking and the assessment of research quality in tourism and hospitality. While some previous studies of literature review on other tourism subjects, for example residents’ attitudes to tourism (Nunkoo, Smith, & Ramkissoon, 2013) and Chinese outbound tourism (Jin & Wang, 2016), mainly reviewed a selection of so-called top-tier journals of relevant subject areas, this study attempts to more exclusively cover a segment of around 50 tourism and hospitality journals listed by the ERA. It is noted that other tourism and hospitality journals written in other languages other than English, and those deemed inappropriate (e.g., Gambling Research, Service Industries Journal) were excluded from the list of journals.

This study takes the form of a qualitative systematic review, referring to a review that follows a certain protocol or system when conducting research, using a more scientific approach (Sandelowski, 2008), as such it ensures the most accurate and thorough image of academic tourism literature discussing food and tourism. This form of review is preferable in this case over other qualitative literature reviews as Dixon-Woods (2011) argues that the systematic review reduces certain issues (e.g., arguments of objectivity) often associated with general literature reviews, as a set of rules are followed when gathering and analysing information, thus limiting researchers’ bias.

The systematic review process refers to the process of both information collection, as well as information analysis (Sandelowski, 2008). For this study, the systematic review process was implemented in the search of the ERA listed tourism and hospitality journals in order to collect every article relevant to the field of food tourism using a list of key words: cuisine, culinary tourism, food and tourism, food consumption, food production, food tourism, gastronomy tourism, geography, and taste tourism. Exclusions were made for articles that dealt singularly with hospitality, agriculture, wine and beer, and any other subjects where food was a minor point of discussion. Where possible, the journal search engine was utilised using these key words, and if this was not an option, each volume and issue was meticulously examined to obtain relevant articles. Articles were included based on the presence of any of the key words in the title or abstract of each article; this indicating whether the topic was a significant part of the overall article. Only those articles published during the chosen time frame (1994–2017) were included for this time frame represented the period in which the highest concentration of food tourism articles were published. A total of 164 articles were gathered and used for analysis.

While the selected journals were systematically searched through to obtain relevant journal articles, so too were the articles in these journals, in order to extract required information. Each paper was read in full, and information extracted and noted throughout, as well as notes made on reflection as the reading process continued. The collected research data was recorded in a specially created database. The first stage of data analysis that is a critical review provides an overview of issues and discourses in the food tourism literature taken by various perspectives and disciplinary approaches, and the finding of concepts engaged in food tourism literature is a basis of the second stage of cognitive mapping analysis.

2.2. Cognitive maps

The second objective of this paper is to conceptualise food tourism using the process of cognitive maps. Cognitive maps (also known as mental maps, mind maps or cognitive models) are a type of mental processing composed of a series of psychological transformations by which an individual can acquire, code, store, recall and decode information about the relative locations and attributes of phenomena in their everyday or metaphorical spatial environment (Eden & Ackerman, 1998). Applied as a research methodology they are used to represent cognition of the researched thoughts through a series of links or pictures. Jones (1993, p. 17) addressed cognitive map

...is a collection of ideas (concepts) and relationships in the form of a map. Ideas are expressed by short phrases which encapsulate a single notion and, where appropriate, its opposite. The relationships between ideas are described by linking them together in either a causal or connotative manner

These are short phrases or words which represent a verb in which linked through as ‘cause/effect’, ‘means/end’ or ‘how/why’, meaning a cognitive map is a representation of a particular person’s perceptions about a situation in the terms. This method is well documented in the qualitative research literature (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Jackson, 2008), however the application of cognitive mapping is bastardized by researchers based upon their own skills and research philosophies (Yeoman, 2004).

2.2.1. Decision explorer

A Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis (CAQDAS) approach assists in the automation processing of processing data, speeding and capturing the concepts (Grzegorz, 2014). A CAQDAS approach helps the researcher view the relationships of the phenomena and data through the ability to trace and track the data. DECISION EXPLORER (DE) is an interactive tool for assisting and clarifying problems using the principles of cognitive mapping within the realm of CAQDAS. DE allows a visual display and analysis of cognitive maps in such a manner that it permits ‘multiple viewpoints’, ‘holding of concepts’, ‘tracing of concepts’ and a ‘causal relationship management’. DE is a rich interactive tool that allows for the movement of concepts and connections in order to make sense of the concepts and phenomena of food tourism. This allows the researcher to draw conclusions and attribute meaning based upon the patterns of concepts emerging from the literature review. This approach to qualitative model building has been used by a number of studies in tourism including policy making (Farsari, Butler, & Szivas, 2011), sustainable tourism (Meliadou et al., 2012), family tourism (Schänzel & Yeoman, 2014) and demography (Yeoman, Hsu,
2.2. Constructing a cognitive map of emerging themes in food tourism

The constructing a map of food tourism is both an art (interpretation) and a science (analysis) as this involves a degree of subjectivity. There is no starting or finishing point, it is a process of searching, feeling, interpretation, construction and reconstruction to a point of theoretical saturation. The remaining sections demonstrate how DE was used in order to guide readers through the construction and interpretation process of the research.

The first stage, as explained in the previous section involved digesting the literature review undertaken by co-authors. The modeller (author responsible for constructing the cognitive maps via DE) entered concepts into DE based upon expertise, recognition of key words, words and phrases with meaningful attribution guided by the reflexive questions ‘what are the central concepts pertaining to food tourism?’ and ‘how do these concepts link with each other?’ Fig. 1 identifies the concepts generated from the literature using the LIST ALL command in DE.

The next stage involved the modeller mapping the concepts searching through literature for connectivity. In order to identify the inductive validity of the maps, the modeller used a variety of tools. For example, the DE command of ‘domain’ and ‘central’ are significant. The ‘domain’ command performs a hierarchical analysis which lists each concept in descending order of linked density around the concept. The analysis examines each concept and calculates how many concepts are immediately related to it. Through this it is possible to identify which concepts are best elaborated or have a high density of links around them thus providing the modeller with some idea of which concepts are key issues and warrant further exploration. Fig. 2 demonstrates this view.

The ‘central’ command looks at specified band levels which are connected to the concepts taking an input set at its second parameter, with each concept in turn, analyses the concepts away from each band of the central concept. The analysis looks at concepts to the specified band that are linked to each preceding concept irrespective of the direction. Each concept is weighted according to how many concepts are transverse in its band level. Fundamentally, the central command shows how many concepts are dependent upon one concept. Fig. 3 demonstrates this view.

Fig. 4 shows a DE screen shot with an example of the ‘motivations’ concept displayed surrounded with unseen links in the form of numbers. By using the command ‘show unseen links’, links are displayed with a particular number thus allowing the modeller to construct a view. Fig. 4 shows the concepts ‘authenticity’ and ‘tourist’ linked to ‘motivations’. Other commands are used to generate new views. For example, the command ‘explore’ generate a view of surrounding links or the command ‘cotails’ traces the path from each tail concept until a branch point is reached. The use of DE allows the modeller to build viewpoints and examine relationships to the point of theoretical saturation.

3. Defining food tourism

3.1. Terminology

Within the tourism literature discussing food, numerous terms, namely ‘food and wine tourism’, ‘tasting tourism’, ‘gourmet tourism’, and most commonly ‘culinary tourism’, ‘food tourism’ or ‘gastronomic tourism’ are evident (Horng & Tsai, 2012; Sanchez-Canizares & Lopez-Guzman, 2012). It is argued by some academics that the latter three terms are very similar and, in fact, used interchangeably in some instances (Horng & Tsai, 2012). However, these terms do commonly appear to be used in slightly different contexts, and the meaning of each term represents different perspectives within the host-guest structure of tourism.

‘Culinary tourism’ is the most popularly adopted term to describe a
form of tourism that significantly emphasizes a relationship between the insider and outsider created via food as culture. The term throughout the relevant literature is used to suggest an undeniable and intrinsic link between food and culture, which differentiates it from other similar terms. For example, Horng and Tsai (2010) claim culinary tourism is the experience of the ‘other’ through food related activities, whereby cultural learning and knowledge transfer of the destination and its people are facilitated. Food in culinary tourism is viewed as a medium of cultural experiences; accordingly, ‘culinary tourism’ is defined by the experience of food activities and consequent cultural consumption, as well as by the desire behind the individual’s involvement (Horng & Tsai, 2010; Silkes, Cai, & Lehto, 2013; Smith & Xiao, 2008).

Following the term ‘culinary tourism’ in frequency of use, is the term ‘food tourism’. One of the most commonly used definitions that demonstrates the use of the term ‘food tourism’, is that of Hall and Sharpley (2003), and the similar definitions seen in other studies by Hall (Hall & Mitchell, 2001; Hall, 2006). While ‘culinary tourism’ refers to food related activities in terms of cultural consumption, ‘food tourism’ refers to those as physical experiences, motivated by a desire to engage with local foods (Bertella, 2011; Cohen & Avieli, 2004; Everett & Slocum, 2013; Hall & Sharpley, 2003). In other words, the importance of ‘food tourism’ lies in the physical embodied and sensual experience itself, whereas the meaning of ‘culinary tourism’ centres on the cultural information gained through this physical experience. Both terms are used to understand tourists’ desires and activities of food.

The term ‘gastronomic tourism’ or ‘gastronomy’, was witnessed far less than both ‘culinary tourism’ and ‘food tourism’. Hegarty and O’Mahony (1999) discuss ‘gastronomy’ in terms of the place of food within the culture and lifestyle of the society. While culture is central to the associated meaning of this term, as was the case with ‘culinary tourism’, this presents a more host-driven focus. That is to say while ‘culinary tourism’ refers to the cultural experience had by the tourists, ‘gastronomic tourism’ concerns the place of food in the culture of the host. Others adopting the use of this term also seek to include and acknowledge the importance of beverages in defining ‘gastronomic tourism’ (Sanchez-Canizares & Lopez-Guzman, 2012).

What can be understood from the above is that there is a preference for terms with a consumer focus, which encompasses ideas of culture and food itself. Terminology that places value on the relationship between food and culture, and tourists as can be considered valuable in exploring tourist experiences at this stage of research which is linked to the research undertaken from the tourist’s perspective in the following section.

3.2. Perspectives

As well as numerous different terms for food tourism being evident, there are also multiple perspectives describing what food in tourism truly means. Perspectives refer to the different type of definition adopted within research discussing food and tourism, while the discussion of terminological refers to the different expressions used to describe the phenomenon. It is clear, however, that there are multiple intersects between these perspectives as Fig. 5 demonstrates.

Definitions used by academics can be categorised into the following perspectives: ‘activity-based perspective’, ‘motivation-based
3.2.1. Activity-based perspective

The activity-based perspective defines food tourism based on the involvement of the tourist in food-related experiences (whether they are peak or supporting experiences), but can more specifically refer to sensory and cultural experiences (Abdelhamied, 2011; Albrecht, 2011; Alonso & O’Neill, 2012; Bjork & Kauppinen-Raisanen, 2016; Che, 2006; Cohen & Avieli, 2004; Everett, 2009; Hashimoto & Telfer, 2006; Jacobsen & Haukeland, 2002; Presenza & Chiappa, 2013; Quan & Wang, 2004; Smith & Xiao, 2008; Teixeira & Ribeiro, 2013). Presenza and Chiappa (2013) claim that food tourism is any experience in relation to a destination’s culinary resources. From this perspective, food tourism can be both physical experience of food and tourists’ involvement in wider food-related activities such as visitation to sites of food production, cooking classes, or food-theme events (Che, 2006).

The activity-based perspective in some cases relates less to the understanding of what the involved activity is, but is more concerned with what types of experience are being facilitated through the activity (Bjork & Kauppinen-Raisanen, 2016). Jacobsen and Haukeland (2002), Cohen and Avieli (2004) and particularly Everett (2009) demonstrate this perspective in relation to the food experience being a sensory experience. Others adopting this perspective discuss the food tourism experience as a cultural activity (Teixeira & Ribeiro, 2013; Timothy & Ron, 2013). The popularity of this perspective in defining food tourism indicates a trend in the relevant literature where the definition is based on the physical activities the tourist engages with. It should, however, be acknowledged that while frequently used, this perspective is very broad in nature, and thus has the potential to suggest any food experience in any destination could be classed as food tourism. That is why McKercher, Okumus, and Okumus (2008) criticise that a generic definition focusing on food activities can lead to unrealistic representations of food tourism. As a result, food tourism may appear more significant and popular, in terms of tourist involvement and tourist numbers suggested by the industry, which may not represent the actual food tourism’s significance (McKercher et al., 2008).
3.2.2. Motivation-based perspective

From the motivation-based perspective, the desire to experience cuisine or food related experiences of a specific destination is an important motive for destination choice (Bertella, 2011; Hall & Sharples, 2003; Lee, Alexander, & Kim, 2014; Presenza & Iocca, 2012; Smith & Costello, 2009; Su, 2013). For example, Presenza and Iocca (2012) describe food tourism as travel behaviour motivated by a desire to experience certain foods. Similarly, Smith and Costello (2009) define food as being a ‘principle resource’, which encourages “individuals to travel and visit a destination specifically for the unique food products offered” (p. 49). From this perspective, food can also be positioned as an important secondary motivation. Bertella (2011, p. 355) claims that food tourism is “a form of tourism in which food is one of the motivating factors”, while Su (2013, p. 574) suggests that tourists can be “partly or largely” motivated by the food experience. Food is ‘one’ motivating factor, but it is not necessarily always the main motivating factor.

When compared to the activity-based perspective, the motivation-based perspective is more internally focused. This understanding of food tourism is based on the internal desires of tourists, as opposed to the physical activity they engage in. This perspective implies that experiences of food that tourists may have as an accompaniment on a trip motivated by other factors, cannot be classed as food tourism, regardless of the engagement with food. This is somewhat exclusive, in that those tourists with alternative motivations are excluded from being termed a food tourist. Both a relatively narrow definition, witnessed in this motivation-based perspective and a broad definition, provided by the activity-based perspective are favoured in the reviewed food tourism literature.

3.2.3. Mixed perspective

From the mixed perspective, the integration of two or more of the established perspectives forms a new category of definition, for example, a definition of food tourism based on both motivation and activity (Adeyinka-Oji & Khoo-Lattimore, 2013; Hall, 2006). Hall’s (2006) early reflection of food tourism in the tourism industry defined food tourism as “tourist and visitor activity that is primarily motivated by an interest in food” (p. 303). Intersection between the motivation-based perspective and the activity-based perspective is undeniable, as not only is food consumption a ‘tourist and visitor activity’, but it is the activity that is ‘motivated by an interest in food’.

This perspective, albeit the least voluminous category, presents a viable frame of thought for future discussions on what truly constitutes food tourism. Each category was identified as having associated issues that influenced the significance of the perspective, however by combining these perspectives, these issues may potentially be minimised.

3.2.4. Food and food tourism in the destination context

The fourth major perspective presents vastly different approaches to defining food tourism that presents the destination’s standpoint. Food is often viewed as a unique element that continues to the tourism industry in a destination. Food tourism, positioned as either one element contributing to larger forms of tourism (e.g., heritage tourism/rural tourism) or food as independent from tourism, is discussed as one factor within a culture, society, tourism offer, economy or a set of pulling factors (Alonso & O’Neill, 2012; Pratt, 2013; Robinson & Clifford, 2012; Ron & Timothy, 2013; Spilkova & Fialova, 2013; Updhyay & Sharma, 2014; Wan & Chan, 2013). Some claim that rather than being a distinct form of tourism, food tourism is “one of the subcategories of cultural tourism” (Updhyay & Sharma, 2014, p. 30). Food tourism is further positioned as an element or category of rural tourism in some cases, whereby local food products, food experiences or food culture are suggested to be an appropriate means of developing a rural tourism product, rather than developing a food tourism product (Spilkova & Fialova, 2013).

From this perspective, food can further be considered as an element of larger concepts such as a destination’s offer of a tourist experience (e.g., Robinson & Clifford, 2012; Wan & Chan, 2013). Although food is one element among many of destination’s offer, destinations have begun to truly understand the importance of food as a selling point of the marketing and management of tourism strategies (du Rand & Heath, 2006; du Rand, Heath, & Alberts, 2003).

While food is important and of value, it is still considered a factor in the wider context of destination experience and attraction. The presence of this perspective suggests that there is an ongoing debate on whether or not food tourism can be considered a distinct and valuable form of tourism, or whether it is a significant contributor to more established forms of tourism. Some academics claim food tourism may even be a type of tourism ‘fad’, implying that it holds a temporary place in tourism research (McKercher et al., 2008).

4. Disciplinary approaches to food tourism

Tourism is largely recognized as a multi-disciplinary field, which is both “greatly influenced by other disciplines and research traditions” as well having “close relationships with parent disciplines” (Benckendorff & Zehrer, 2013, p. 122). It is therefore not surprising that different disciplinary approaches are evident in such a subject area of food tourism. In the context of food tourism research, three major disciplinary approaches, differing in style of research and subject, are evident: management and marketing, social and cultural studies, and geography. This evidence is supported by wider analysis of tourism studies, for example Benckendorff and Zehrer (2013), who similarly identified tourism literature as having a “split personality” with major approaches being business and social sciences. It is important to note that some studies fall outside of these major approaches were in fact a mixture of both, or representative of different disciplines such as environmental ecology (Goosling, Garrod, Aall, Hille, & Peeters, 2011; Kuo, Hsiaob, & Lan, 2005), and biology and psychology (Koc, 2013). However, as these approaches were present in a very small number of papers, they are not yet considered an indication of any trend.

4.1. Management and marketing approach

The management and marketing approach to food tourism is the most common approach. This is seen through the application of
marketing, management and general business principles to the discussion of food and food tourism. For example, studies adopting this approach concentrate on target marketing and market segmentation as well as destination promotion, branding and product development (Hashimoto & Telfer, 2006; Ignatov & Smith, 2006; Lee, Lee, & Lin, 2008; Rimmington & Yuksel, 1998). One of the largest applications of the marketing principle is demonstrated through the multitude of studies discussing the tourist as a consumer in terms of consumer behaviour, satisfaction and motivation (Guan & Jones, 2015; Ignatov & Smith, 2006; Lin & Chen, 2014; Rimmington & Yuksel, 1998). Alternatively, other authors approach the use of marketing and management far more blatantly, by directly discussing marketing concepts in regards to food tourism such as promotion of gastro-tourism destination, changing image of a destination using local foods and creating a market far more blatantly, by directly discussing marketing concepts in regards to food tourism such as promotion of gastro-tourism destination, changing image of a destination using local foods and creating a market

The high frequency of this approach in the food tourism research prefers to suggest practical implications for tourism businesses by reporting the attributes of food products and food-related markets with their satisfaction and behaviour. For instance, food tourist profiles are provided and related to the concepts such as satisfaction or motivation (Au & Law, 2002; Cohen & Aivi, 2004; Larsen et al., 2011; Lin & Chen, 2014), perception and attitudes (Guan & Jones, 2015; Lin & Chen, 2014; Mynttinen, Logren, Sarkka-Tirkkonen, & Rautiainen, 2015), or travel lifestyle and preferences (Falconer, 2013; Getz & Robinson, 2014; Ignatov & Smith, 2006; Sohn & Yuan, 2013). Research on food tourist satisfaction is commonly linked to the intention or re-visit/re-purchase (Bjork & Kauppinen-Raisanen, 2016; Rigatti-Luchini & Mason, 2010; Wan & Chan, 2013; Yuksel & Yuksel, 2002). As such, this type of research confirms a strong relationship between the disciplines of tourism and business.

Despite the most widely taken approach, it is noticed that food tourism research within the management and marketing discipline showed relatively little advancement in terms of research innovation and methods during the last three decades. Topics and methods tend to adopt the existing research frameworks used for consumer behaviour, destination image, tourists' perception and satisfactions, and more. The central concept was readily replaced with food in those research, and thus, it is viewed that food tourism research is branched out from the generic research on tourist, and destination management and marketing.

### 4.2. Social and cultural studies approach

The social and cultural studies approach is the second major approach, and is slightly less prevalent in the field of food tourism, but it branches out centred on ‘culture’. While there are undoubtedly multiple intersects between the management and marketing and social and cultural approaches, they can broadly be considered two distinct schools of thought. Where the management and marketing approach is fundamentally grounded in theories of business, the social and cultural studies approach has strong ties to the humanities and social sciences, and is seen to consider relationships between sociological concepts of culture, identity, and cuisine (Everett & Aitchison, 2008; Mak, Lumbers, & Eves, 2012; Stringfellow, MacLaren, Maclean, & O’Gorman, 2013). One of the most apparent examples of this is the study of Stringfellow et al. (2013) who adopted and applied Bourdieu’s renowned sociological theory of culture and taste to food and tourism. In this situation, Bourdieu’s theory is applied as an effort to identify if taste in food choice is an indicator of wider culture in terms of social status, nationality, and so forth (Stringfellow et al., 2013). The term ‘geography of taste’ or the idea of food as a representation of a place used for deeper understanding of a relationship between food and place for tourism (Clanfion, Bella, & Dugo, 2013; Kim & Ellis, 2015; Marcot, Melewar, & Dennis, 2016; Montanari, 2009; Staiff & Bushell, 2013).

In other, less prominent examples, authors such as Mak et al. (2012) discuss existing relationships between cuisine, identity and culture. For example, Mak et al. (2012, p. 177) identify food experiences as being fundamentally involved in “a symbolic form of consumption”, meaning that the act of food consumption is similarly the act of cultural consumption. Food is seen to tell the story of the culinary culture and heritage of the destination, be an experience of the cultural history of place, or be symbolic of a culture (Alonso & Northcote, 2010; Avieli, 2013; Bessiere, 2013; Hegarty & O'Mahony, 1999; Metro-Roland, 2013; Ron & Timothy, 2013).

While this approach represents the second largest approach in food tourism research, the relatively low frequency, compared with the management and marketing approach, suggests the preference for more business-oriented concepts by tourism researchers. The social and cultural studies approach is however valuable, and does potentially provide a platform for future exploration of food tourism. A strong relationship between tourism and business, as well as sociology and even anthropology are evident in existing food tourism research. The significance of this approach is evidenced by the cognitive mapping analysis and conceptualisation of food tourism in Section 5 and 6.

### 4.3. Geography approach

The inextricable relationship between tourism and geography is apparent in food to tourism research. This approach also partly covers cultural aspect of food at a local level, but, compared to the social and cultural approach, its association with tourism presents wider research areas from the meaning and transformation of food heritage and its role as tourism resources (Che, 2006; Jolliffe & Aslam, 2009; Kim & Ellis, 2015; Metro-Roland, 2013; Teixeira & Ribeiro, 2013) to spatial relationships of production and consumption of food (Bitsani & Kavoura, 2012) and to regional development (Baldacchino, 2015; Bessiere, 2013; Everett, 2012; Hall, 2006; Montanari, 2009; Nilsson, Svard, Widarsson, & Wirell, 2011; Schluter, 2011). The great majority of research in this approach investigated the use of food and food heritage for destination experiences or regional development, mainly rural development (Bertella, 2011; Gyimothy & Mykletun, 2009; Jolliffe & Aslam, 2009; Kim, 2015; Schluter, 2011; Sidali, Kastenbolzh, & Bianchi, 2015). Bertella (2011) acknowledges the substantial potential of food for regional development arguing a strong relationship between food as a keeper of cultural knowledge and expression and rural destinations as common locations of food production. Meanwhile, Sidali et al. (2015, p. 1180) point out “rural areas with their specific history, traditions and eco-gastronomic heritage seem suitable for the development of successful food niches”.

The geography approach has expanded the research on food and tourism from food tourism’s broad contribution to regional development to geographic transformation at a community level. Tourism sustains the food heritage by influencing the local community to maintain traditional heritage, skills, and a way of life (Everett & Aitchison, 2008; Kim & Iwashita, 2016), and food production places as tourism spaces received researchers’ attention. Everett (2012) discusses this transformative and ‘place-making’ impact of food tourism, whereby ‘production places’ can be altered and changed into ‘consumption spaces’, which is also supported by Kim and Ellis (2015) in the context of Japanese noodle tourism. The local food concept is often highlighted in this approach. Not only for the regional identity preserved and continued from the historical and social perspectives, is food heritage also discussed for its potential of enhancing the awareness of authentic experience of a destination (Kim, 2015). Locality is often linked to the sustainability of tourism, which emphasizes the regional identity and conservation as the competitive edge of today’s global standardization of food and the food production environment. In addition, locality raises the importance of food producers and suppliers in creating regional food tourism products and delivery of food experiences (Broadway, 2017;
It is witnessed that food tourism research from the geography approach explored a wide variety of themes, compared to the two other disciplinary approaches. This is evident in the interdisciplinary approach, for instance, the geography approach was married with other disciplinary scopes such as destination branding, food tourism marketing and promotion, and/or community development. This interdisciplinary research approach likely expands the area of food tourism research.

5. Conceptualizing food tourism

The next stage of critical literature review is structuring the concepts (i.e., themes), discussed in reference to food tourism or food and tourism in the literature. Then they are restructured in the process of conceptual mapping in order to conceptualise what food tourism means. From the analysis of the literature documented in this paper, five themes or viewpoints emerge from the central and domain analysis: motivation, culture, authenticity, management and marketing and destination orientation. Given the nature of cognitive maps and the issues of connectivity and causality, many of the concepts in each emerging theme overlap. Therefore, these themes collectively are represented in Fig. 6.

5.1. Motivation

In Fig. 7 the core links for motivations include culture, perspectives, activity based, health, secondary importance, experience, the tourist, satisfaction, management and marketing, consumer behaviour and authenticity thus demonstrating how motivation is a primary factor across a range of views in the cognitive maps. Whereas Fig. 8 explores the wider concepts of motivations in food tourism bringing in the concepts of authenticity, culture and identity.

What we see here is the complexity of the food tourism from a motivation perspective. Food tourism is more than just eating but drawing upon elements of the creative classes and the experience economy. Food tourism to tourists is about ‘cultural experience’ (authentic experience and cultural learning), ‘sensory appeal’ (sensory pleasure through taste, smell, touch, etc.), ‘interpersonal relations’ (social interaction through experience), ‘excitement’ (exciting and different experience, escapism), and ‘health concern’ (increasing wellbeing) (Kim & Eves, 2012). It is an enjoyable and memorable experience and provides meaning. It is a combination of need and an excuse to travel. It is an experience of sense, consumption and status. Intrinsic motivations include how we talk about it, whereas extrinsic motivations include where foodies travel to learn in order to develop skills and acquire knowledge. The motivations range from seeking authentic experiences to participating in food events. Thus, motivation is a key element of the design and creation of the food tourism, from physical to physiological, from security to cultural and social needs. A motivation of belonging and personal need, the need for prestige (gastronomy and luxury), status or self-actualization are also included. Thus, motivation represents a multiplicity of desires and wants.

5.2. Culture

In Fig. 9, culture is directly linked to motivations, physical, rural and regional development, heritage, identity and cultural tourism which then links into concepts such as authenticity and culinary tourism. Food is a ‘cultural reference point’, which, within it, contains entirely unique information about the production and culture and geography of the destination from which it originates (Montanari, 2009). Some appear to position food products, styles of cuisine, or certain dishes as representations of destination (Cianflone et al., 2013; Staiff & Bushell, 2013). For example, Staiff and Bushell (2013) discuss what they term ‘Lao French Fusion’ and how the history of colonisation and cultural development is understood thus represented through food. Food is intrinsically linked to the place in which it is produced and located, and can be considered an “expression of local ways of consumption and of local growing or manufacturing praxis linked to the territory and to its history” (Cianflone et al., 2013, p. 336). Alternatively, food can also enable learning in relation to specific types of food (Alonso & Northcote, 2010). As food tourism includes learning from different cultures, the food tourist seeks experiences on local identity and authenticity. Food tourism has a physical presence. From a cultural perspective it is the behaviour, knowledge and customs of location that combined and thus it creates a sense of place and identity. It is a culture that is physical, of taste, experience and purchase – all in all participatory. Food represents the language, origin and evolution of the place as food acts as the symbol of a place’s culture. The design of any food tourism offering will not be viable if it does not take into account the cultural characteristics of the territory. Gastronomy allows tourists to access the cultural and historical heritage of destinations through tasting, experiencing and purchasing.

5.3. Authenticity

Although we live in a fast society, mobile living, time constraints and convenience (Yeoman, 2012) thus tourism is an escape from the everyday. Authenticity is an important aspect of the food tourism experience. In Fig. 10, food is recognized as a concept of place and culture with links to identity, place making, destination orientation and iconic dishes. Icon dishes is an output from authenticity and a loop can be viewed with motivations, sustainable development, local communities and food tourism. Authenticity through other links connects to place making, geography, culture, and taste. Thus, authenticity and food tourism play an important part. There are clear linkages as tourists search for an alternative to the homogenization or McDonaldization of everyday life. Authenticity as a tourists’ quest for otherness (MacCannell, 1973) is a long belief in developing and justifying tourism experiences of a destination and food acts as an experience of otherness from the tourist perspective, but it is identity to the locals by positioning it against ‘the other’ (Nyman, 2003). Authenticity and food are bound by cultural, historical and place aspects. To the food tourist, this is the provenance and heritage, the details of where, how and whom of food creation. Food tourism and authenticity also links to the ‘social
and/or cultural) capital and accumulation of knowledge associated with food and holidays through skills, immersion or means of display. Such collectible experiences in turn become rich sources of social and cultural capital and an important means of differentiating ourselves.

5.4. Management and marketing

Fig. 11 highlights the management and marketing of food tourism with the concepts of destination orientation, image creation, disciplinary approaches, motivations, satisfaction, consumer behaviour, research themes and the tourist. These immediate links to management and marketing are dominant by the tourist-oriented research. Beside...
motivation, satisfaction, and consumer behaviour previously addressed, destination image based on food, and the involvement of the culinary culture to promote ‘the location’ are important research topics within this theme (Frochot, 2003; Huang, 2009; Lee & Arcodia, 2011; Okumus, Okumus, & McKercher, 2007).

In the wider cognitive map linking through to food, place and culture, place marketing, tourism development, thus food herein broadly links the community and region to tourism, and thus, intrinsic value of the place (including people) rather the location itself is a focus of food tourism management and marketing. The marketing of food tourism creates an image and sense of place for a community. Food tourism is what binds communities and stakeholders together, thus creating a sense of place, a purpose and vision from farm to tourist. As food tourism is a catalyst for community engagement it thus has political capital driving rural and regional development. Certain dishes have icon appeal, because of heritage and association with place thus food has destination position and marketing appeal. The cognitive mapping discovers the depth of meaning of food tourism in marketing and management, which was not visible in the review of a series of single articles that concentrated and discussed on consumer behaviour and managerial implications.

5.5. Destination orientation

From Fig. 12 we can see that destination orientation has direct links with forms of tourism, place marketing, resources, products and

Fig. 9. Culture.

Fig. 10. Authenticity.
management and marketing. In the wider context, destination orientation overlaps with experiences, motivations and food, place and culture. Thus, what the heritage and culture of destination is equals what food tourism is, whether it is Scotland and haggis or Italy and pasta. The dish not only as a ‘cultural artifact’, carrying with its cultural knowledge and movement of peoples, but also as a national icon replicated throughout the world. Food is undeniably positioned as a relic of culture, containing information of cultural heritage of destination (Metro-Roland, 2013). This heritage plays an important part in the destination image and orientation as image links to reputation, positioning and brand (Getz et al., 2014). The destination is the focus in which tourism revolves, combining product and experience. With tourism, a local cuisine is also a continuously evolving form of culture that results from consistent negotiation between the tourists and locals (Avieli, 2013). Orientation is the destinations history and culture, thus food creates image and position.
6. Conclusion: what is food tourism?

It is apparent that culture is the central concept shared in all five emerging themes. Combined authenticity, culture and motivations represent origin, history, place and language of a place. Thus, it could be argued that food tourism is about cultural anthropology through understanding the interactions of tourists with place through the medium of food. If food tourism is predominately about cultural anthropology, those in policy and business are managers of cultural resources from users, an image, sustainability, development and profit perspective. Fig. 13 conceptualises the movement of the literature in recent years (see, for example, Bessiere, 2013; Cohen & Avieli, 2004; Daugstad & Kirchengast, 2013; Everett & Aitchison, 2008; Gyimothy & Mykletun, 2009; Hillel et al., 2013; Horng & Tsai, 2012; Kim & Ellis, 2015; Kim & Iwashita, 2016; Staille & Bushell, 2013) from a management to a cultural anthropological perspective. With this in mind, food functions as a metaphor for the construction and expression of ethnicity and cultural identity, and we human beings connect food and eating to rituals, symbols and belief systems from the perspective of the cultural anthropology or anthropological food studies (Avieli, 2012; Brown, 1995; Feeley-Harnik, 1994).

As such, food is a cultural experience and thus the importance of authenticity is paramount. This authenticity cannot be separated from the destination orientation i.e., heritage. Food defines the cuisine of a place and food is used in many forms and interactions from a tourism perspective in a place. As food represents traditions, stories and symbols – it is the tourist who interacts and creates an experience through performance, enquiry and engagement. Thus, food tourism is a presentation of history and place, that is, haggis and Scotland, Bakewell tarts, Stilton cheeses or Kimchi and Korea. The desire for new experiences, which are something living and interactive is a representation of new tourist motivations, whether it is cooking classes, food, craft beer and/or wine trails, farm tours and food tasting, and simply performing a ritual of the must-eat food of the destination. Food is genuinely grounded on the experience economy, and co-creation of value is inherent based on how place and associated food are selected and consumed. Therefore, we propose that food tourism is a cultural anthropology concept.

As many destinations now emphasise food tourism as a core product of the destination, for example, Melbourne Food and Wine Festival⁴ or a tasting guided tour of the backstreet restaurants of Lisbon⁵ a greater emphasis on culture and thus the management of food tourists as users of the cultural resource needs to pay more attention to the interactive aspect of food tourism, hence as emphasized in Fig. 13 the management of food tourism takes a holistic rather than an isolated perspective.

Why? Sustainable development and management of food tourism is about sustainable management of food cultural resources. Food is intangible heritage but produced and consumed within a geographic boundary. Multi-stakeholder's involvement is essential, and the scale also matters. Food is often used for rural development, and thus, food tourism business intuitively sounds a small-scale business. However, an influx of tourists to a destination likely requires an excessive volume of food consumption which impacts on local food supply systems. Or the impact could be easily anticipated on the other way around. In order to avoid the negative impacts of food tourism, local resource management in terms of commercialization of food heritage, food supply and production and related human resources should be planned and established with wider stakeholders and the local government involvement. Not only production, but the way of consuming the cultural resources through food tourism is also part of sustainable food tourism management which is part of experiencing ‘otherness’ of tourism.
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