THE CANADIAN CULINARY TOURISTS:
HOW WELL DO WE KNOW THEM?

by

Elena Ignatov

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
in fulfillment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Recreation and Leisure Studies

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2003

I hereby declare that I am the sole proprietor of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

ABSTRACT

Culinary tourism is emerging as an important component of the rapidly growing cultural tourism market. It introduces tourists to new flavours and different traditions associated with the preparation, serving, and consuming of foods and beverages. Although food has been strongly linked to tourism in some European and Asian destinations for years, culinary tourism is a relatively new phenomenon in North America.

Current research tends to focus on only one aspect of culinary tourism, wine, with most research done in Australia and New Zealand. Although growing, there is still little research in Canada, and it has also concentrated on the wine component of culinary tourism. However, those who engage in wine tourism may not necessarily be the same people who would engage in other culinary practices such as visiting farmer's fairs and markets, browsing food stores featuring local and gourmet ingredients, or who seek out authentic cuisine in restaurants. This study examines the characteristics and composition of the Canadian culinary tourism market and also explores the relationship between food and wine tourism.

The study is based on the Travel Activities and Motivations Survey (TAMS) dataset. The survey was carried out between September 1999 and April 2000 and involved a telephone interview followed by a mail questionnaire. The total number of completed mail questionnaires received was 5,740, generating a response rate of 23.2%.

The objectives of the study were to understand the similarities and differences between 1) Canadian culinary travellers and the rest of the Canadian traveling population; 2) culinary tourists engaging in food-related activities, those who participate in wine, and those who participate in both; and 3) to identify segments of culinary tourists with respect to cross-participation in each of the culinary related activities. The segments were compared in terms of demographics, psychographics, vacation and getaway trip characteristics, and media consumption habits. To accomplish the first two objectives, culinary-related activities were arranged in three groups:

Group One: farmer's fairs/markets; shop/browse gourmet foods in retail stores or farms; pick-your-own farms/harvesting;

Group Two: restaurant dining featuring regional or local cooking; restaurant dining at internationally acclaimed restaurants; staying at a cooking school; staying at a gourmet restaurant with accommodation on premises;

Group Three: touring a region's wineries where one stays one or more nights; going to wineries for day visits and tasting; staying at a wine tasting school.

"Culinary travellers" were conceptually defined as those who had taken trips in Canada in the past two years preceding the survey, and had participated in at least one activity from both group one <u>and</u> two <u>or</u> had participated in at least one activity from group three. "Food travellers" were defined as those who had traveled in Canada in the past two years preceding the survey and had participated in at least one activity from Group One <u>and</u> Two and had not engaged in any activities in Group Three; "wine travellers" were those who had participated in at least one activity in Group Three and did not qualify as "food travellers"; and "food and wine travellers" were those who met the criteria of both "food" and "wine" travellers.

A factor analysis was performed in order to establish which cuisine-related variables were closely related and what underlying dimensions might exist in culinary tourism activities. The next step was to perform a k-means cluster analysis of the factors in order to identify distinct groups of cuisine travellers. The resulting four clusters were labeled: “rural”, “sophisticated”, “indifferent”, and “true cuisine”.

The results show that the Canadian culinary tourism market represents nearly 45% of Canadian travellers and exhibits characteristics and behaviours that clearly distinguish them from other tourists. Canadian culinary tourists tend to be females in their mid-forties, highly educated with above average incomes; they are highly diverse in their travel motivations, interests, and activities pursuits (both at home and while traveling); travel mainly in the summer months but also take trips in the other seasons; they are accompanied by a spouse/partner (no children) while traveling and stay at hotels/resorts/country inns or at the homes of friends and relatives. They exhibit high readership preferences for newspapers (daily and weekend) and travel publications, and are more likely to use the Internet as an information source. In all instances, the culinary segment represented the large majority compared to the non-culinary travellers.

Two segments emerged as relatively consistent across the analyses involving the “food”, ”wine”, “food and wine”, and the “rural”, ”sophisticated”, “indifferent”, and “true cuisine” segments. These segments were the “food/rural” and the “food and wine/true cuisine” groups. The “food/rural” group are highly interested in the local, traditional country-style forms of cuisine associated with rural regions; they seem to enjoy being in rural areas and close to the sources of their daily food. They tend to be females, in their mid-forties, with secondary education and middle incomes; travel to strengthen family ties, and seek simpler holiday experiences associated with rural regions. In contrast, the “food and wine/true cuisine” group is very diverse in their travel motivations and activities pursuits; they are highly involved in all aspects of culinary tourism and exhibit high cultural orientation and exquisite tastes; these are females, in their mid-forties, university graduates with incomes well above average. Another interesting finding is that wine tourists appear mostly interested in the wine itself; they are not really as active and diverse in their activities and interests as the food and food and wine enthusiasts. This may indicate that food and not wine is what motivates culinary tourists; rather, wine is only a supplement. The findings of the study led to a consideration of possible marketing implications and areas for future research have been provided.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENETS

There are several individuals who helped me in my journey and in reaching this major milestone. My heartfelt appreciation is extended to Steve Smith who supported me unconditionally, believed in my ideas, and was a source of inspiration; whose effort went much beyond supervision and extended to providing guidance and an encouragement in both my personal and professional development. Even while on sabbatical, Steve would always rush from home when I shouted “help”! Thank you for your friendship, Steve.

A very warm thank-you to Marion Joppe for her advice and interest throughout my career at the University of Waterloo; for her willingness to be there and help whenever I needed her. Thanks, Marion.

A very special thank-you to Paul Eagles for his enthusiasm, insightful comments, and constructive criticism. I am really grateful, Paul.

I would also like to thank my friend and colleague, Anda Carabineanu, who was always there encouraging me during some of the more challenging times. A sincere thank-you to Anne Ross and Sandy De Visser who always understood and shared my disappointments and excitements.

My husband, Kamen, has also greatly contributed to the completion of this thesis. He always helped me clear my thoughts and put things into perspective. For that, he deserves an enormous thank you!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

"The discovery of a new dish does more for human happiness than the discovery of a star".

Jean Anthelme Brillat-Savarin (1755-1826)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A new form of cultural tourism is emerging in Canada, tourism involving the senses of smell and taste. This is culinary or cuisine tourism. From the Niagara Grape and Wine Festival to the Arctic Food Celebration, from Tastes of Niagara to the Okanagan Cultural Corridor, travellers are increasingly looking for unique experiences providing personal enrichment and learning opportunities associated with food and drink (Canadian Tourism Commission, 2002c; Richards, 2002).

Tourism allows people to discover their world. It provides opportunity for escape from the every day routine and environment and to immerse in the world of fantasy, freedom, and novelty. It is argued that tourism is the largest and fastest growing industry in the world (Burton & Volpe, 2000). According to the World Tourism Organization (WTO), tourist arrivals amounted to 693 million in 2001and are forecasted to increase to 1.6 billion in 2020 (WTO, 2002a). International tourism receipts were recorded at 463 billion USD in 2001and are expected to rise to 2 trillion USD by 2020.

Canada ranked 9th among destination nations in the world in 2001, sharing 2.8% of the international tourism market (WTO, 2002a). It also held 9th place as a tourism earner with international tourism receipts reaching 11.4 billion USD. Although the foreign tourism market is a significant contributor to Canada's economy, the domestic market remains much larger than the international. Domestic tourism involves the residents of a country travelling within the boundaries of that particular country. The Word Tourism Organization (2002b) defines domestic tourism as the activities of persons on a trip within their own country of residence, outside their usual environment for no more than 12 months and whose main purpose of travel is not related to an activity remunerated from within the place visited. In 2001, it is estimated that Canadians made 78.1 million domestic trips of which 15.9 million trips were inter-provincial. Domestic tourism expenditures reached $38.4 billion – 1.3% increase from 2001 (CTC, 2002a).

Tourism demand worldwide as well as in Canada has changed significantly over the last several years. More experienced travelers with large disposable incomes and more available time for travel have emerged (Thorne, 2001). Factors affecting their decision to travel and their choice of destination have also changed. An increasing number of tourists are looking for specific experiences – learning vacations, horticulture tours, and gastronomy, among others (CTC, 2002a). Therefore, to sustain presence and to compete successfully as a four-season destination in the international and domestic market, Canada needs to develop new innovative products and experiences highlighting its natural and cultural treasures and also catering to specific kinds of travelers (Canadian Tourism Commission, 2002b). The CTC (2002b) has identified several tourism products warranting special attention: outdoor tourism, winter tourism, and cultural tourism.

Cultural tourism has been recognized as an increasingly important sector of the global tourism demand (Richards, 2000; McKercher, Ho, du Cors & So-Ming, 2002). The World Tourism Organization estimated that cultural tourism accounts for 37% of all tourist trips and that the demand for this type of tourism will grow by 15% annually (Richards, 1996, cited in McKercher, 2002). Through cultural tourism, both hosts and tourists have the opportunity to learn about each other, to develop their emotions and tastes, and to improve their quality of life and enhance the tourism experience (Moulin, 1995). According to the CTC (1999), cultural and heritage tourism provides an opportunity to:

- Augment what there is for tourists to see and do in Canada
- Offer tourists experiences which cannot be found elsewhere
- Capitalize on market demand for quality cultural experiences and niche market segments such as learning travel
- Overcome the challenge of seasonality (CTC, 1999).

Cultural tourism is not limited to visiting museums, historic sites, or art galleries; it also includes cuisine, gastronomy, and culinary (cooking) practices. While cuisine is concerned with the ingredients used by different peoples and regions and with the way food is prepared and cooked, gastronomy is about the quality of eating and achieving a totally pleasurable meal experience. Despite the distinction between gastronomy, cuisine and culinary practices, the terms have been used interchangeably for describing tourism associated with the senses of smell and taste.

Culinary tourism is emerging as an important component of the rapidly growing cultural tourism market (CTC, 2002c). It is an important new niche that fosters economic and community development and new intercultural insights. Scarpato (2002) sees gastronomy as a “medium of cultural tourism” and as an important resource for destinations seeking to develop new quality tourism products and experiences. The concept of culinary tourism is not new. Thousands of years ago, merchants travelled abroad, looking for exotic and different foods and drinks to trade or to bring home. Spices, wine, fruits and other food products were often the currencies of the past (Wolf, 2002).

"An increasingly significant number of travelers are stating that food is a key aspect of the travel experience and that they believe that experiencing a country's food is essential to understanding its culture" (The Conde Nast Publications Inc and Plog Reesearch, 2001, cited in CTC, 2002c, p.5). According to Richards (2002), gastronomy plays a key role in cultural tourism because it "has become a significant source of identity formation in postmodern society" (p.3). Recognizing the growing interest and importance of culinary tourism to local communities, globally and in Canada, the Canadian Tourism Commission (2002c) has taken steps to develop cuisine as a tourism product showcasing Canada's diverse cultures and communities. In its related product development strategy, CTC states that culinary tourism in Canada has the potential to offer great variety, quality and value tourism experience. Furthermore, cuisine is identified as a four-season product extending the length of stay and spending of visitors.

This study will utilize the 1999 *Travel Activities and Motivations Survey (*TAMS) for the purpose of exploring the culinary tourism market in Canada. TAMS is a rich source for comprehensive assessment of travel behaviour and motivators. It represents an important database that can be used by tourism organizations to develop marketing strategies and travel products to attract visitors to Canada and Ontario. Statistics Canada, on behalf of the Canadian Tourism Commission and an association of four provincial and territorial tourism agencies conducted the survey in Canada and the United States. The study explores travel behaviours in the past two years and travel intentions in the next two years; it looks at a variety of travel experiences, preferences, activities, short trips and longer vacations, and the general impressions of Canada and Ontario as travel destinations.

Using TAMS, Lang Research (2001) prepared a report that focussed on examining interest in travel associated with wine (visiting wineries and wine regions) and cuisine (dining). While it provided insights into the characteristics of these travellers, the report only took into consideration wine activities and restaurant dining. As it will be illustrated in chapter 2, culinary tourism "goes well beyond the dining experience" (CTC, 2002c, p. 2). Thus, this limitation will be addressed in the current study.

1.1 PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This section will present the purpose and the specific research questions that will be addressed in the study.

Purpose

1. To understand the differences and similarities between Canadians participating in cuisine-related activities and the rest of the Canadian travellers.
2. To understand the differences and similarities between Canadians engaging in food-related activities and those who participate in wine- and both food and wine-related activities.
3. To identify categories of culinary tourists within this segment with respect to cross-participation in each of the culinary-related activities and to compare the resulting groups.

Research questions:

1. Are there significant differences between tourists engaging in cuisine-related activities and the rest of the Canadian travellers in terms of:
    - Demographics
    - Psychographics

- Media consumption
- Trip characteristics

2. Are there significant differences between travellers participating in food-, wine-, and both food and wine-related activities in terms of:
   - Demographics
   - Psychographics
   - Media consumption
   - Trip characteristics

3. What distinct categories within the culinary tourism segment can be identified in terms of cross-participation in each of the cuisine-related activities and what is the profile of each one of them in terms of:
   - Demographics
   - Psychographics
   - Media consumption
   - Trip characteristics

For the purpose of this report, culinary tourism will be operationally defined as a combination of the following activities:

- Visiting farmers' fairs or markets
- Pick-your-own farms/participating in harvesting
- Shopping or browsing – gourmet foods in retail stores or farms
- Dining in restaurants with regional or local cooking
- Dining in internationally acclaimed restaurants
- Touring a region's wineries where you stay one or more nights
- Going to wineries for day visits and tasting
- Staying at a cooking school
- Staying at a wine-tasting school
- Staying at a gourmet restaurant with accommodation on the premises

1.2 Significance of the Study

The current study is significant for several reasons. As already illustrated, Canadians represent the most important tourism market in Canada - 70% of tourism receipts and 80%

of tourist volume is generated by domestic travellers (CTC, 2002d). This study focuses on Canadians, thus contributing to the understanding of this market.

The culinary tourism industry in Canada consists mostly of small and medium-sized businesses – festivals, restaurants and wineries, local and regional associations, etc. (CTC, 2002c; Wolf, 2002) who usually have limited resources for conducting research (Smith & Taylor, 1994). Therefore, research specifically related to the demand for culinary tourism is needed. Indeed, in its product development strategy “Acquiring a taste for cuisine tourism” CTC (2002c) identifies demand-related market research as one of the main strategies for developing a competitive culinary tourism product in Canada. This study is significant because of its potential to contribute new insights into this tourism niche.

Although food has been strongly linked to tourism in some European and Asian destinations for years, culinary tourism is a relatively new phenomenon in North America and, thus research in this area is scarce. Traditionally, studies have mainly focused on one small aspect of the culinary tourism, wine tourism and most research has been done in Australia and New Zealand. Although growing, there is still little research in Canada, which has also concentrated only on the wine component of culinary tourism. However, as it will be shown in Chapter 2, culinary tourism involves other venues as well. Therefore, this study will provide a more complete picture of the Canadian culinary tourist.

Wine has generally been associated with food and dining, and as a result, it has been assumed that those who engage in wine-related activities also incorporate gastronomic experiences in their itineraries. However, while food is one of the ways to provide for the wine tourism experience and visitors may attend food and wine festivals, or visit wineries offering food services, there may be others who may visit farmer's fairs or markets and browse local food stores without necessarily engaging in activities involving wine. In this case, regional cuisine (cuisine based on foods produced locally) may be considered an attraction in its own right and visitors may be different from those visiting wineries. As McKercher, *et al.* (2002) assert, the cultural tourism market is not homogenous and different types of cultural tourists will be drawn to different types of attractions. Consequently, culinary tourists, as part of the broader cultural tourism market, may be drawn to different types of culinary products. Therefore, this study will explore the diversity of the culinary tourism market in Canada and the relationship of food and wine tourism.

2.0 Literature Review

This chapter provides a review of literature focusing on the culinary tourism phenomenon. It consists of three sections. The first part discusses the major factors that have contributed to the increased interest in culinary tourism. It also presents the concept of culinary tourism and its various definitions. The second section reviews market segmentation and the variety of segmentation approaches used in tourism. It also explores studies segmenting the wine tourism market. The last section gives an overview of the future of domestic travel in Canada and the road ahead for culinary tourism.

2.1 Major Drivers of Culinary Tourism

The increased interest in culinary tourism can be attributed to a number of factors. Firstly, today’s consumers have become environmentally and health conscious leading to demand for pure, fresh, and healthful ingredients derived through responsible agricultural practices (Getz, 2000; Wolf, 2002). According to Lee (2002), the market for organic foods (almost $10 billion US a year) is growing and is predicted to increase 20 percent annually because of the affluent aging population concerned about its health and desire to support more environmentally friendly agriculture. Furthermore, research now links moderate alcohol consumption with some major health benefits (Rimm, Klatsky, Grobbee, & Stampfer, 1996). In this regard, Getz (2000) states that wine drinking accompanied by meals has been accepted as “being an integral part of a healthy lifestyle” (p. 43).

Second, food is now seen not just as a source of nutrition, but also as a part of a slower-paced, quality lifestyle. Examples are the Italian-based Slow Food Movement and the Slow Cities Movement, which have formed as a resistance to the ever increasing pace of modern life. They are dedicated to slowing down different aspect of life and to promoting authentic, traditional local food, as well as to improving our overall quality of life (Slow Food, 2001).

Other factors fueling the culinary tourism phenomenon include growing interest in specialty food and beverages associated with multicultural societies like Canada and the U.S as well as culture-specific product sampling (Getz, 2000; Wolf, 2002). For instance, the mixing of different cultures has led to increased sophistication in tastes and expectations and has raised consumer curiosity about different cuisines and ingredients. According to Wolf (2002), “culinary tourists are born through product sampling” (p.8). For instance, some hotels or inns may offer their guests samples of local food and drink (e.g. a bottle of locally produced wine) thus helping the customers associate them with the particular culture or destination.

2.2 CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

Cultural tourism is on the rise as the baby boom generation is increasingly seeking unique travel experiences providing learning and enrichment. According to Richards (1996), learning is the main characteristic of cultural tourism. Cultural tourism is now viewed as a special interest tourism since traveler’s motivation and decision making are determined by an interest in a particular subject (Weiler & Hall, 1992, Richards, 1996). Read (1980, cited in Weiler & Hall, 1992) has suggested the notion of REAL travel: Rewarding, Enriching, Adventuresome, and Learning. Culinary tourism is emerging as a form of special interest tourism offering “real” travel. It introduces visitors to new and exiting smells, tastes and flavours, to new cultures, and it also provides learning opportunities. Au and Law (2002) state that food is a cultural process in that "it signifies cultural meaning to those who consume it" (p. 828). Cultural heritage includes not only the physical aspect (*e.g.* built heritage) but also elements of gastronomy (Reynolds, 1994; Bauer, 1996). Hall and Macionis (1998) discuss food and wine as being expressive of regional culture. Hegarty and O'Mahony (2001) further the cultural aspect of food by pointing out that there are observable cultural differences in the ingredients, in the way in which food is prepared, cooked, and preserved, and in the traditions of serving and eating food. Richards (2002) observes that the food we consume and the way we consume it forms and supports our identities, that meals and eating traditions are culturally bound. Scarpato (2002) calls the meal a "cultural artefact", because it permits a person to "partake each day of the national past as well as present" (Barthes, 1979, p.170, cited in Scarpato, 2002). Hjalager and Corigliano (2000) suggest that tourism is a "cultural act" and that "food is culture", thus by combining travel with local products (*i.e.* eating a particular dish and drinking a local wine) means sharing the local culture. Getz (2000) refers to the wine experience as "an exercise in individual cultural tourism" (p. 19) by exploring wine country and the atmosphere of wine villages.

To gain a better understanding of culinary tourism, the terms tourism, gastronomy, and cuisine need to be defined first. Tourism is usually defined in terms of activities engaged in or in terms of the tourists' behaviour and motivation. The WTO provides the following activities-based definition: *"The activities of a person traveling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure,* *business and other purposes not related to the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited"* (WTO, 2002b). Canada uses a distance criterion for describing the "home" or "usual" environment used in the above definition. Thus, tourism consists of the trips of Canadians travelling within Canada for a distance of 80 kilometres or more (one-way) away from their home.

The definitions of gastronomy and cuisine also deserve attention. Gastronomy has been defined as "the art, or science, of good eating" (Gillespie, 2001, p. 2). More generally, gastronomy is concerned with the appreciation and enjoyment of food and beverages. It is about the quality of wine and other beverages and how they complement the food; it is concerned with the total meal experience. Gastronomy provides a learning opportunity about other cultures. It has generally been associated with the well to do. However, Gillespie (2001) argues that "by truly recognizing and appreciating good food and beverage…individuals can also consider themselves as having a gastronomic approach to living" (p. 5). Cuisine is defined as a "manner of preparing food; style of cooking; or the food prepared" (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 1985). The word "culinary" relates to the kitchen or cookery. Thus, culinary, gastronomic, or cuisine tourism involves learning about food and beverage products and different styles of cooking. It is about the discovery and enjoyment of different tastes and flavours. It links visitors with foods and beverages produced locally (Smith, 2001).

In the literature, culinary tourism has been described in various ways. The Canadian Tourism Commission (2002c) defines culinary tourism in terms of myriad of food and beverage - related activities developed for visitors and involving cultural discovery of a region's dishes. According to Wolf (2002), culinary tourism exists within the context of agricultural tourism (which includes farm holidays, visiting farmers' markets and fruit orchards, among others) and focuses specifically on the search for, and enjoyment of, prepared food and drink. Culinary tourism is viewed as promoting unique gastronomic experiences. Smith (2001) adds a motivation factor related to culinary tourism: "culinary tourism occurs when the appreciation of regionally produced foods and beverages is a significant motivator or activity during the trip" (p. 3). The Economic Planning Group of Canada (2001) also emphasizes the motivation for travel stating that the opportunity for culinary experiences significantly impacts trip-related decisions either before or during the trip. Culinary-related experiences include but are not limited to:

- Traditional or high quality dining experiences
- Food and Wine festivals and events
- Culinary learning experiences – cooking schools, wine education
- Tasting/buying local products/farmer's markets
- Visitation to and/or tours of wineries and/or vineyards, wine tasting
- Observing chefs compete
- Eating/drinking at a hard-to-find "locals-only" restaurant or bar
- Fruit picking
- Food trails (e.g. apple routes; beer routes)
- Walking in food streets and precincts in cities (Getz, 2000; The Economic Planning Group of Canada, 2001; Canadian Tourism Commission, 2002c; Wolf, 2002).

The above definitions of culinary tourism are consumer-focused definitions. However, as Getz (2000) points out in his discussion on wine tourism, the perspective of producers and destination marketing organizations should also be considered. Thus, culinary tourism can be simultaneously:

- A form of consumer behaviour;
- A strategy by which destinations develop and market attractions and imagery associated with cuisine; and
- A marketing opportunity for local agricultural producers (including wineries) to sell their products directly to consumers and also to educate them.

This paper will focus on the first aspect of culinary tourism – consumer behaviour.

As previously mentioned, culinary tourism can be considered a subset of cultural tourism. Munsters (1996) offers a typology of cultural tourism resources, which include attractions and events. Applying Munsters' model, the culinary tourism resources can be described by the following examples:

Table 1: General Typology of Culinary Tourism Resources

Attractions	**Events**
a) Buildings • A cheese factory, a brewery or winery • Local cafes or restaurants; internationally acclaimed restaurants • Farms and farmer's markets b) Parks and gardens • Vineyards c) Museums • A food or beverage -related museum d) Routes • Wine or gourmet routes	• Food and Wine festivals • Consumer shows • Culinary exhibitions

Source: Adapted from Munsters (1996)

Munsters (1996) further integrates the cultural attractions and events into three basic forms of cultural tourism products. As applied to culinary tourism, they are:

- The infrastructure of cuisine-related facilities and events,
- Packages featuring culinary destinations,
- Tours within culinary regions.

According to Hjalager and Corigliano (2000), the availability of special kinds of food (*e.g.* selected wines, fruits, vegetables, fish, etc.) has given rise to festivals and other events, which appeal to tourists and local residents. Wolf (2002) cites Becky Marcury, author of “Food Festival USA”: “visiting local food festivals is the best way to get a sense of a community flavour” (p. 18). Getz (2000) further observes that “wine and food festivals and events have multiplied and are enormously popular, and wine tours to and within wine country are expanding in number and size” (p. 231). He further states that food and wine festivals present visitors with an authentic lifestyle experience in pleasant environment. They are considered products for attracting visitors as well as a means for gaining publicity and enhancing the destination image (Getz, 2000). Thus, food and wine are packaged and wine routes and events are created to achieve competitive advantage and to enhance a region’s image.

This section introduced the core concepts and definitions of culinary tourism and on which this study is based. The study will examine the similarities and differences between those who participate in food related activities and those engaging in activities associated with wine. It will also identify categories of culinary tourists. The next section outlines market segmentation and discusses studies on wine tourists and research done on dining experiences.

2.3 MARKET SEGMENTATION

Market segmentation is considered one of the tools for understanding a market efficiently (Kotler, 1999). The process of segmentation involves either the aggregation of individual travellers into groups or dividing the market into distinct segments (Middleton, 1994; Morrison, 1996). Segmentation helps define the size of groups who may wish to consume a specific product (McKercher, *et al.*, 2002). It allows organizations to better understand the needs and wants of each segment and consequently, to design products more effectively that cater to these needs and wants. Market segmentation also aids in optimizing marketing activities and in achieving profitability (Swenson, 1990). Marketing segmentation is beneficial because it contributes to recognizing differences between groups, identification of future markets, and because of its customer-oriented philosophy (Michman, 1991).

Segmentation is useful only if it assists an organization to better match its products with its target markets (McKercher *et al.*, 2002). Therefore, to serve some strategic purpose, each segment must meet a certain criteria as follows:

- Members of a particular segment must be similar to other members in that segment and different from consumers in other segments;
- Segments should be sufficiently large to provide return on investment to the organization;
- Each segment must be easy to reach through promotional media and other marketing activities; and
- Segments must be relatively stable – have to remain relevant over a long period of time (Morrison, 1996; Moscardo, Pearce & Morrison, 2001).

Organizations must consider the type of product and the information about a particular segment before deciding on the kind of segmentation approach. There have been debates over which segmentation bases are appropriate to use for segmenting the tourism market. Tourism organizations will find value in different segmentation bases depending on the situation and needs of the particular organization (Moscardo *et al*, 2001*;* McKercher *et al.*, 2002). The following table summarizes the segmentation categories typically identified in the literature:

Table 2: Categories of Segmentation Bases

Category	**Types of Variable**
Sociodemographics	Age, gender, education, income, marital status, occupation and employment status, religion, race, nationality
Geographic	Location of residence
Psychographics	Benefits sought, attitudes, values, personality characteristics, opinions, motivations, lifestyles
Behavioural	Activities, user status, frequency of use, types of information sources and distribution channels used

Source: Middleton, 1994; Morrison, Hsieh and O'Leary, 1994; Wilkie, 1994; Morrison, 1996.

The first two categories (demographics and geographic) are considered to be the most commonly used forms of market segmentation and are usually chosen before the data is analyzed. Their popularity has been explained with their simplicity in terms of statistical analysis and application. Such variables are easy to present to and use by practitioners (Wilkie, 1994; Morrison, 1996). Geographic segmentation is claimed to be popular because of its usefulness in the development of media promotional campaigns (Middleton, 1994;

Dodd & Bigotte, 1997). Research has shown that the demographic segmentation approach is a good indicator of people's propensity to travel and a help in predicting visitor behaviour (Hsieh, *et al.*, 1994; Middleton, 1994). For example, in the wine industry, the visitor's income level has been considered to be one of the best predictors of wine consumption (Dodd & Bigotte, 1997). Some studies have also found that certain sociodemographic variables (gender, age, marital status, and income) determine dining out expenditure and frequency (Au & Law, 2002). A study by O'Connor (1993) found that some races spent less on food than others and that education was positively related to expenditure amounts while dining. On the other hand, psychological and behavioural variables have been considered more useful in segmenting the tourism market since they explain consumption behaviour and satisfaction with products and services (Wilkie, 1994; Morrison, 1996).

Every segmentation approach has its limitations. For instance, geographic and demographic segmentation does not provide any insights into the reason why people travel or the specific products and vacation styles they choose (Morrison, 1996). Psychographics alone, on the other hand, does not provide information on access to tourists. Therefore, researchers have advocated the staged segmentation whereby psychological or behavioural segmentation is conducted first in order to identify the major markets and then it is followed by examining the geographic distribution and demographic characteristics of these markets (Hsieh, *et al.*, 1994; Middleton, 1994; Morrison, 1996; Moscardo, *et al.,* 2001).

As previously mentioned, research in the area of culinary tourism has focused on wine tourism, only a small component of the broader culinary tourism phenomenon. The following sections relate to the comprehensive bases for segmenting the wine tourism market, namely geographic, sociodemographics, psychographics, and trip characteristics. The information has been derived from research done mainly in Australia and New Zealand, with some research originating in Europe, the United States, and Canada.

2.3.1 Geographic Segmentation

Geographic segmentation groups visitors according to their location of residence (Middleton, 1994; Morrison, 1996; Getz, 2000).

2.3.1.1 Origins of Winery Visitors

Generally, it has been assumed that the majority of winery visitors will be local or regional in origin (Getz, 2000). Dodd (1995), in a study of visitors to wineries in Texas, found that 85% were from within Texas and 15% were out of state. Beverland, James, Porter, and Stace (1998), found that 80% of the surveyed winery patrons in Auckland were from within this wine region. The Australia Wineries Tourism Council in Victoria surveyed winery visitors to the state and found that 65% were from this region (cited in Getz, 2000). Similar findings were reported by Telfer and Hashimoto (2001), who found that 65% of wine tourists in the Niagara region were from the Province of Ontario.

There are destinations attracting visitors from outside the wine region. A study examining the influence of gender and region on winery visits in New Zealand (Mitchell & Hall, 2001), found that the usual place of residence of the majority of respondents (81.6%) was outside the wine region. Dodd and Bigotte (1995), also determined that most visitors travelled some distance to visit a winery (56.6% travelled more than 48 km and 14.4% were visitors from other states).

There is also an international component of wine tourism. For instance, in Australia, international visitor surveys revealed that approximately 10% of international visitors to the country included winery visits in their itineraries. The countries which generated the most winery visitors were Canada (24%), the United Kingdom (25%), and Germany (18%) (Robins, 1999). Research in South Australia concluded that 40% of international visitors to the state visited a winery (Getz, 2000). In Canada, a study of non-resident wine tourists to British Columbia determined that 9.7% of non-resident visitors surveyed had visited a farm or winery during their trip (Williams & Dossa, 2001). The study, however, does not indicate the visitors' origins (i.e. which provinces or nations).

Drawing on the discussion of geographic origins of winery visitors, it can be concluded that some international tourists favour winery visits but most demand will come mainly from local and regional markets.

2.3.2 Sociodemographic Variables

2.3.2.1 Age

The South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) (1997) found that the majority of domestic tourists visiting wineries were aged 40 to 60. Mitchell and Hall (2001), in a study of the influence of gender and region on New Zealand wine tourists found that almost half of respondents (49.6%) in New Zealand's wine regions were middle-aged (aged between 30 and 49). This is also consistent with findings of Carmichael (2001) who reported that 33% of winery visitors in the Niagara region were between the ages 41to 50.

In contrast, Morris and King (1997) reported that the most likely visitors to wineries were those who fell within the 25-54 range. These findings are consistent with a study in the state of Victoria (cited in Getz, 2000), which determined that there was almost an equal split between the age groups 25 and 54 years: 28% were in the 25 to 34 age category, 26% were aged 35 to 44, and 22% were 45 to 54 years of age. Telfer and Hashimoto (2001) also found a relatively even split between the ages of 26 and 55 years.

2.3.2.2 Gender

Telfer and Hashimoto (2001) reported a fairly equal split of females and males (45.9% and 53.8%, respectively) in their sample of wine tourists to the Niagara wine region. Williams and Dossa (2001) found that men were more represented than women (54.1%). Mitchell and Hall (2001) found that males and females were relatively equally represented with slightly more females (54.3%) than males (45.7%). Almost identical results were reported by Dodd (1995) where females were more represented (54%) than males (46%). The study in Victoria also found that the sample included more women (52%) than men (48%).

2.3.2.3 Education

Dodd and Bigotte (1995) reported that the majority of winery visitors (66%) were well-educated having some type of university degree (undergraduate or graduate). The findings are congruent with those of Mitchell and Hall (2001) who found a relatively high proportion of university qualifications (49.4%) attained by respondents. Morris and King (1997) and Telfer and Hashimoto (2001) also reported that more than 50% of winery visitors held university qualifications. The large majority (80%) of winery visitors in the Niagara region had a college diploma or university degree. The SATC (1997) and Williams and Dossa

(2001) also concluded that the most likely tourists to visit wineries were those with higher education.

2.3.2.4 Occupation

Mitchell and Hall (2001) reported that a large proportion of the wine tourists surveyed (60.6%) were represented by those falling into a professional/managerial category. Carmichael (2001) reported that 72% of the wine tourist sample were represented by professional/skilled workers. These findings are consistent with other studies (Maddern & Golledge, 1996; Morris & King 1997; SATC, 1997).

2.3.2.5 Income

Dodd and Bigotte (1995, 1997) found that income was one of the best predictors of spending among wine tourists in Texas. Dodd (1995), reported that 70% of visitors to wineries in Texas had a household income of over $39,999 US, more than the median income level of $31,553 in the state. Almost half (48.6%) of wine tourists in New Zealand reported, annual earnings of between $30,000 and $59,999 and another 17% reported annual income of over $80,000 (Mitchell and Hall, 2001). In Canada, Carmichael (2001) found that 44% of respondents had annual household incomes of over $90,000. Telfer and Hashimoto (2001) determined that the highest annual income response category was $60,000 to $89,000 (21.5% of respondents).

2.3.3 Psychographics

Although demographics can provide the basis for simple segmentation, psychographic segmentation (such as motives, lifestyles, opinions, benefits sought, attitudes and values) add “vitality to consumer profiles that cannot be easily captured by demographics” (Schiffman and Kanuk, 1987, p. 141, cited in Hall & McIntosh, 2000, p. 123). Current research on wine tourism is beginning to include more psychographic data. The following section examines motivations, lifestyles, and trip characteristics of wine tourists.

2.3.3.1 Motivation

Iso-Ahola (1980) describes motives as internal dispositions that trigger, direct, and integrate a person’s behaviour. Motives, together with biological needs and situational factors are determinants of a person’s motivation. According to Dann (1977) and Crompton (1979), travel motivations involve push and pull factors. Push motives are needs which cause a person to feel an imbalance that can be overcome through a tourism experience. It is these demand-side factors that help to understand tourists’ decision-making process. The intrinsic motives, which make one want to travel, often include escape from the daily routine, relaxation, exploration, and social interaction/bonding (Crompton, 1979; Moulin, 1985). Some individuals travel for social prestige/recognition, self-esteem, learning/discovery, and novelty/thrill (Crompton & Kim, 1999, cited in Kim & Lee, 2002).

Pull motives (external in nature), on the other hand, are generally considered from a supply-side standpoint. They affect where one wants to travel; that is, pull factors are demand generators. Resources generally considered pull factors include cultural and natural attractions, special events or festivals, and other entertainment opportunities (Kim & Lee, 2001). There is limited research on the pull and push motives of culinary tourists with existing studies focusing on wine tourism only.

According to Smith (2001) “the quest for experiential authenticity, on-site preparation and consumption motivates many travellers to incorporate culinary experiences into their travel plans (p. 8). There is little research on the motivations of culinary tourists (Wolf, 2002). Current studies have examined the motivations of wine tourists. For most visitors, tasting and buying wine appear to be major motivators for visiting wine regions. In Western Australia, Morris and King (1997) found that wine tasting and purchasing were the main reasons for visiting wineries. A study by Macionis (1996) and Maddern and Golledge (1996) also revealed that tasting and buying wine were considered important motivations for winery visits. Wine purchase was also reported by 70.6% of wine tourists in the Niagara region (Telfer & Hashimoto, 2001). However, as Hall and McIntosh (2000) suggest “there is more to…wine tourism than the simple consumption of a beverage or that this experience is limited to the senses and emotions associated with the wine alone” (p. 130). Therefore, the wine-related experience should be considered within a broader context when discussing motivations for visiting wineries. For instance, wine experiences rely on the setting, on socializing with the winemaker, and on other elements such as food, accommodation and other visitors. Indeed, Macionis (1996) and Maddern and Golledge (1996) reported other motives (in addition to buying and tasting wine) such as enjoying the rural setting; socializing; relaxation; learning about wine; meeting the wine maker; and entertaining. In Canada, Telfer and Hashimoto (2001) found that the rural setting influenced almost 60% of wine tourists to visit a winery. Learning was also a significant motivator, reported by 69% of wine tourists.

Food can also be considered a travel motivator attracting people to a region. For some tourists, dining experiences are the sole purpose for visiting a particular place (Au & Law, 2002). For instance, Getz and Frisby (1988) discovered that a food festival was one of the most attractive events and reasons for a visit. Research in France (Choisy, 1996, cited in Getz, 2000) found that food and wine motivated 45% of visitors to the wine region of Burgundy. Food and wine were also among the top five factors motivating international tourists to visit Australia (Australian Tourist Commission, 2000). Another study in France (Daniel, 1994, cited in Frochot, 2000) determined that gastronomy was the main focus of 60% of tourists (both domestic and foreign). Ritchie and Zins (1978) examined the cultural factors influencing the attractiveness of a tourism region. Gastronomy was one of the socio-cultural elements associated with a region's attractiveness. In a study of non-resident wine visitors to British Columbia, Williams and Dossa (2001) found that visiting places with unique and interesting restaurants was rated as important in choosing a destination.

2.3.3.2 Lifestyles

According to Michman (1991) segmenting the tourism market according to lifestyles is often the main focus of the psychographic segmentation process. The lifestyle approach is typically based on activities, interests, and opinions. It groups people based on points of commonality such as shared values and opinions, club membership, ethnic and religious connections, preferred recreational activities, or geographical loyalty (Michman, 1991).

The following section examines the day-to-day lifestyles related to wine tourists, with some research on food as part of lifestyle.

2.3.3.2.1 Culinary Tourism as a Day-to-Day Lifestyle

Culinary tourism is considered a lifestyle by many (Smith, 2001). Wine, for instance, is an important part of lifestyle, "it is more than just a beverage, it has become a lifestyle product with a high degree of complementarity with food, hospitality, the arts and tourism" (Winemakers' Federation of Australia, 1996, cited in Hall & McIntosh, 2000, p. 197). Getz (2000) also discusses wine tourism and food as a lifestyle product "in which food and wine are two of the most tangible and marketable products" (p. 44).

Studies focusing on wine tourism have linked it to day-to-day wine consumption and knowledge about wines. They have revealed that wine visitors are "regular consumers of wine, have an intermediate to advanced knowledge of wine and visit wineries or wine regions several times a year" (Johnson, 1998, cited in Hall & McIntosh, 2000, p. 123). For example, Dodd and Bigotte (1995) found that winery visitors in Texas purchased between three and eight bottles per month and 25% of them had visited a winery at least once before. In New Zealand, Longo (1999, cited in Hall, *et al.,* 2000) determined that wine visitors purchased approximately two bottles per week and visited wineries between three and four times a year. In Canada, Telfer and Hashimoto (2001) found that 75% of respondents had visited a winery before and their average monthly purchases of wine were between $11 and $30.

With respect to knowledge of wines, Maddern and Golledge (1996) reported that 55% of winery visitors in Victoria had an intermediate knowledge and 40% a basic knowledge. In a study in Western Australia, King and Morris (1997) reported that 52% of respondents considered themselves to be knowledgeable/highly knowledgeable about wines. In contrast, Charters and Ali-Knight (2002) found that 49.6% of wine tourists in Western Australia had limited knowledge of wine and 37% classified themselves as knowledgeable. However, 83.6% were interested/highly interested in wines. Telfer and Hashimoto (2001) reported an almost even split between those who had a basic knowledge of wines and those with an intermediate knowledge (48.3% and 42.4%, respectively).

Food is also a part of lifestyle. For instance, a study commissioned by the San Francisco Convention and Tourist Board (1999), revealed that 38.2% of the adult population in the US described themselves as "foodies". These were people showing high interest in food, enjoying fine dining and spending more in restaurants during an average week. "Foodies" were found to have higher household incomes and to take more leisure and business trips than others. They were also less conscious about price in restaurants and agreed that cities with good restaurants were the most attractive destinations to visit.

2.3.3.3 Trip Characteristics, Activities, and Travel Philosophy of Wine Tourists

Most research on wine tourists has focused on the winery itself - purchasing behaviour at the cellar door, tasting, perceptions of and satisfaction with the winery attributes (*i.e.* Dodd, 1995; Dood & Bigotte, 1995; Maddern & Golledge, 1996; Dodd & Bigotte, 1997; Mitchell & Hall, 2001; Telfer & Hashimoto, 2001; Charters & Ali-Knight, 2002). However, only two studies have gone further, examining the travel characteristics, philosophy, and activities (other than ones associated with the winery) of wine tourists (Carmichael, 2001; Williams & Dossa, 2001). These are discussed next.

Travel Characteristics

Williams and Dossa (2001) reported that non-resident wine tourists in B.C took more than six leisure trips in the past three years preceding the survey. They also travelled in larger groups, stayed longer in the destination visited, and spent more while travelling.

Activities

While on a trip, the large majority of them (95%) participated in sightseeing, 93% went shopping, 90% dined out, 89% took casual walks, and 84% visited natural displays and gardens. They were also more active than other travellers in terms of participation in water-based and sporting activities (Williams & Dossa, 2001). Wine tourists in the Niagara region visited a natural attraction (Niagara Falls – 34%), a festival (The Shaw festival - 11.5%), casino (8.5%), and the small town of Niagara-on-the-Lake (14.8%) (Carmichael, 2001).

Travel Philosophy

Wine tourists in British Columbia (Williams & Dossa, 2001) were supportive of using money for travel purposes within value conscious and planned parameters. They were less impulsive and adventurous in their travel habits, selecting familiar destinations and planning their trips in advance, taking part in guided tours and travelling on package deals. They preferred less expensive and shorter trips.

2.3.3.4 Clusters of Wine and Food Tourists

In Italy, the Movimento del Turismo del Vino (cited in Hall & McIntosh, 2000), using a lifestyle approach to wine tourism consumers, has identified four types of wine tourists based on their knowledge and interest in wine, their travel characteristics and behaviour. These are: *the professional, the impassioned neophyte, the hanger-on, and the drinker.*

The professional was someone 30 to 45 years of age who was knowledgeable about wines and could discuss and judge the fine aspects of the wines with the wine maker. In addition, this type was always interested in discovering new things.

The impassioned neophyte was someone younger (25 to 30 years old) and affluent who enjoyed wines but saw them as a means for socializing, enjoying food, and exploring the countryside. These types of tourists were more likely to be accompanied by friends on their trip, were interested in learning about wines, but were not as serious as the professionals.

The hanger-on segment was older, aged 40 to 50 years and wealthy. He/she had only a basic knowledge in wines and was attracted to wines only as a means of acquiring social distinction. These tourists were drawn by brand names and were more likely to be impressed by appearances; they also looked for discounts.

The last segment, *the drinker*, was characterized by 50 to 60 years old individuals visiting wineries as part of a weekend group. They did not show interest in wines and only used the visit as an alternative to a bar, drinking and asking for more. They also tended to purchase wine in bulk.

Another study identified two distinct wine tourism market niches based on their motivations: g*eneralists and immersionists* (Williams & Dossa, 2001). The *generalists* represented 60% of the non-resident wine tourism market. They were motivated to travel by opportunities to interact with friendly and hospitable people and to visit environmentally clean and scenic places. Compared to the *immersionists*, the generalists were inclined to take more frequent but shorter trips and to have their holidays prearranged in advance. They also travelled in larger groups and spent less than the *immersionists*. The *immersionists* were significantly more active than generalists with respect to incidence of participation in activities during their trip.

Finkelstein (1989), in a study linking dining out behaviour to modern sociality, observed three categories of dining behaviour: *experiential, experimental, and existential.* In the experiential dining experience, the person will usually try new and unknown foods and will not consume them again. In the experimental mode, the diner experiments with new foods on a trial-and-error basis and chooses the ones that complement his/her taste. In the last, existential experience, the person is devoted to tasting different foods and restaurants, and trying new “dining fashions”. It is the last two categories of diners, the experimentalist and the existentialist, that can be considered culinary tourists.

This section of the literature review examined market segmentation approaches utilized by tourism marketers. It also discussed existing studies on wine tourists and research associated with dining experiences. It looked at the geographic, sociodemographics, and psychographics of wine tourists. The current study will also employ geographic, demographics, and psychographics segmentation techniques to compare the food and wine sub segments of the culinary tourism market as well as existing clusters within the culinary tourism market.

2.4 LOOKING AHEAD

2.4.1 Domestic Travel in Canada

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 had an impact on tourism in Canada and worldwide. An Ipsos-Reid October survey commissioned by the CTC immediately after September 11 revealed that 14% of Canadian travellers cancelled or postponed their trips. Of those, nearly 50% had intended to travel to the U.S. and 23% within Canada (CTC, 2001a). However, as fear of air travel increased, Canadians became more inclined to vacation in their home land (CTC, 2002b). According to the 2001 Canadian Winter Travel Intentions Survey, 38% of Canadians were still planning on taking a winter vacation trip. Of those planning to travel in the winter months (November 2001 through April 2002), 51% selected Canada as their winter vacation destination. Only 4.7% of domestic winter trips were expected to be cancelled (CTC, 2001b).

A recent survey of seven major English-Canadian markets (Halifax, Ottawa, Toronto, Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver), revealed that 51% of those living in these markets planned to travel within Canada over the next two years. Nearly eight in ten (78%) indicated that they were planning/seriously considering Canada as their destination choice (Ipsos-Reid, 2002). These results are consistent with an earlier national study, which examined Canadian vacation travel habits and the impact of the lower Canadian dollar (The Roper Reports Canada, 2000). The results revealed that 50% of Canadians were planning a domestic vacation trip in the next 12 months.

Domestic travellers will continue to be Canada's most important market as it is expected that Canadians will reduce their international travel in favour of taking trips at home. It is forecasted that in 2003 almost half of the Canadian travel market will continue to consider travelling within Canada as opposed to visiting the U.S. or overseas destinations (CTC, 2002a). Consequently, domestic travel is being heavily promoted. The Canadian Tourism Commission's domestic marketing program aims to encourage domestic travel by affluent Canadians between the ages of 25-54 and to convert outbound travel in provinces with the most substantial outbound flows (CTC, 2002b). New and more competitive product offerings are being considered in order to sustain Canada's image as a desired destination for its domestic market.

2.4.2 The Future of Culinary Tourism

Cuisine is a significant part of the overall tourism experience and has a great potential to enhance a destination's tourism appeal (CTC, 2002c). As the demand for special interest tourism grows, culinary tourism, with its links to cultural tourism, will become a major niche market globally and in Canada. Consequently, an increasing number of professionals, both private- and public-sector, will understand its important role in their destinations and will seek opportunities for more partnerships and strategic alliances (Wolf, 2002).

Although Canada lacks the reputation of an international cuisine destination, the country is well positioned to attract culinary enthusiasts (CTC, 2002c). Canada has renowned chefs exploring their regional roots and creating impressive new dishes using premium fresh, local, and seasonal ingredients. The country also has excellent restaurants and farmers' markets, quality wines and distinguished regional cuisine, as well as unique places to visit (Ferguson, 1995; CTC 2002c). According to Ferguson (1995), Canadian cuisine is represented by distinct regions with their unique culinary character, which reflects the climatic conditions and local ingredients as well as the diversity of backgrounds of the settlers. “Canada has always been a land of immigrants, and each wave has added new flavours to the old, as people first figured out how to cook what they found locally, then gradually adapted their traditional dishes, creating brand-new ones” (Ferguson, 1995, p.3). Caira (1995) further asserts the regional aspect of Canadian gastronomy stating that it is “the totality of regional cuisine” that defines Canadian cuisine. Recognizing the uniqueness of Canada’s culinary traditions, Cuisine Canada, an alliance of Canadian culinary professionals, is devoted to promoting an understanding and knowledge of Canada’s food history and diversity (Cuisine Canada, 2002). Working closely with the CTC, it is actively involved in the development of Canadian cuisine as a tourism product.

In response to the growing interest in culinary tourism products, various sectors of tourism and agriculture are coming together to build closer co-operation amongst each other. For instance, “Tastes of Niagara” is a strategic quality food alliance, linking area wines with local food products and focusing on the development and promotion of a unique Niagara-based regional cuisine. It organizes food and wine tasting as well as special events and festivals (Telfer, 2000). “Taste of Nova Scotia” brings together quality restaurants showcasing Nova Scotia’s culinary history and traditions (Taste of Nova Scotia Society, 2002). The Okanagan Valley Cultural Corridor, in British Columbia, offers another example of how agriculture and tourism join forces to promote local food and wine along with other cultural attractions such as heritage and the arts. In Quebec, “La Route des Saveurs” celebrates cuisine in Quebec's Charlevoix region, linking agriculture, dining, and hospitality and offering unforgettable experiences (CTC, 2001b).

These are but a few examples of the variety and uniqueness of the Canadian cuisine tourism product. And as the culinary tourism market matures, the number of such initiatives will grow and there will be more itineraries offering Canadian culinary experiences in unique and exciting ways.

3.0 METHODS

This study has used data derived from the Travel Activities and Motivations Survey for the purpose of 1) determining differences and similarities between Canadian travellers participating in culinary tourism and the rest of the Canadian travelling population; 2) determining differences and similarities between Canadian travellers participating in food-, wine-, and in both, food and wine-related activities and 3) developing categories of culinary tourists with respect to cross-participation in each of the culinary-related activities.

The TAMS database was used because of its quality, including a large sample size, in-depth information on the culinary tourism market, and because of its level of reliability and validity. It contains extensive information on the motivations of travellers as well as their activities and media consumption habits, which is unavailable from other national surveys such as Canadian Travel Survey.

The study was carried out in order to collect information on Canadian's travel activities and motivation travel. More specific objectives included:

- To collect information on overnight trips taken in the past 2 years in Canada, the U.S. and other countries;
- To gather information on the reasons for overnight trips taken in Canada, the U.S. and other countries;
- To collect data on activities participated in while travelling and on motivation to take future trips.

The first section of this chapter discusses the data source. More specifically, it describes: 1) concepts and definitions, 2) population coverage,

3) sample design and sample size, 4) data collection, capture, edit and processing, 5) survey errors and 6) response rate. The second section discusses validity and reliability. The last section identifies the dependent and independent variables used in the current study and describes the manipulations that were performed to adjust the data from the original survey. It also discusses the statistical procedures used to answer each research question.

3.1 DATA SOURCE

Statistics Canada, on behalf of the Canadian Tourism Commission and an association of four provincial and territorial tourism agencies conducted the survey in Canada and the United States. The survey was conducted between September 1999 and April 2000. The first stage involved telephone surveys with people over the age of 18 and lasting approximately 20 minutes. The second stage involved a mail survey used as a complement to and following the telephone interviews. Addresses were obtained during the first stage (TAMS User Guide, 2000).

3.1.1 Concepts and Definitions

The survey's Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) application consisted of a control and a questionnaire part. The control part was used to maintain a record of each call in the sample, to list household members and their age and gender, and to select a respondent to complete the telephone interview.

The questionnaire component included two sections: one for the telephone interview and one for the mail survey, if the respondent indicated during the telephone survey that he/she had travelled in the past two years or is expected to do so in the next two years.

Table 3 provides definitions included in the control and questionnaire components and pertaining to this study.

Table 3: Concepts and Definitions	
Household	Any person/group of people living in a dwelling (*e.g.* one person living alone; a group of people who are not related but who share the same dwelling)
Respondent	The household member 18 years of age or older, randomly chosen to provide the information for the questionnaire
Overnight Trip	Any trip of one or more nights regardless of distance from home. “Trip” is left to the interpretation and perception of the respondent (*e.g.* sleeping at a next-door friend’s house; going to the cottage for the weekend). The following do not constitute a trip: • Taking an ambulance to a hospital or a clinic; • Travelling as an employed operator or vehicle crew member (*e.g.* truck driver; flight attendant); • Commuting to school or a usual place of work; • Actually moving from one residence to another (looking for a home prior to moving is considered a trip); • Trips that began when a respondent was not a Canadian resident (trips must have originated in Canada); • Trips longer than a year of 365 days.
Main Reason for the Trip	This question determines why a respondent travelled. If another person went on the trip with the respondent, only the main reason of the respondent is recorded.
Pleasure Trip	Trips taken for shopping, sightseeing, accompanying someone on a business trip or attending a sporting event, a concert, a movie, or music festival. Included are trips where the main reason was to shop around or to make purchases unavailable closer to home (in some areas of Canada, respondents may take short overnight trips to the U.S. to shop) Subsequently, all of these trips are reported under “Pleasure”.
Visiting Friends or Relatives	The main motivation for the trip was to visit friends or relatives even though the respondent may have participated in other activities while on the trip.
Business	The main purpose of travel is to carry out the duties of employment. Business trips include meetings, conferences, and seminars, training, inspecting, consulting, or attending a convention.
Other Personal Reasons	The main motivation for the trip is to keep an appointment with a physician, a lawyer, a dentist; to go to a funeral or a job interview. Included a trips caused by emergency evacuation. A trip associated with a church function will be reported according to the type of event attended. Respondents should be probed to determine if the purpose was for pleasure (*e.g.* social event organized by the church).

Income	Income from all sources is included. Examples are: • Wages and salaries or self-employment including tips, commissions, and gratuities • Government sources such as employment insurance, Canada or Quebec pension plan, old age security • Interest, dividends, investments or private pensions • Other sources such as alimony, scholarships
Level of Education	Refers to the type of high school education certificates, diplomas, degrees or other types of post-secondary education.
Elementary/Secondary Education	Its province and territory has developed its own system for education, and the structure can differ from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.
Trade/Vocational Certificate or Diploma	Used to classify skill courses preparing trainees for occupations not at the professional or semi-professional levels. A trade-vocational school is public educational institution offering courses to prepare people for employment in a specific occupation such as heavy equipment operator, automotive mechanic and upholstering. Many community colleges/technical institutes offer certificates or diplomas at the trade level.
Community/Technical College or CEGEP Certificates or Diplomas	Usually offered after one to two years of study. Note: Ryerson University and many B.C. colleges award both university and college-level diplomas and certificates. The following are equivalences in the former education systems: Bible colleges/seminary = baccalaureat (Priesthood) theology; Nursing = community college diploma.
Other Education	Includes a) diplomas, certificates or licenses obtained through professional associations such as in accounting, banking or insurance; b) non-professional health certificates (i.e. CPR, First Aid, Red Cross); and c) continuing education, personal interest courses.

Source: Statistics Canada, TAMS User Guide, 2000

3.1.2 Population Coverage

The target population for the telephone survey included all persons 18 years and older in each of the ten Canadian provinces, excluding full time residents of institutions and households without telephones. The latter group represented less than 2% of the target population; therefore, survey estimates have been adjusted through weighting to account for them. The mail survey population was the same, only excluding non-travellers. Travellers were defined as persons who had taken a trip in the past two years or were very likely/fairly likely to do so in the next two years.

3.1.3 Sample Design, Sample Size and Response Rate

A stratified simple random sampling of telephone numbers was employed in the first stage of the study. The Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) of the province and the non-CMA areas represented the strata. Stratifying by sub-provincial areas was done in order to break down final estimates by stratum. The mail surveys were distributed to those who were identified as travellers during the telephone interviews.

Since the target population was defined as adults but the sampling unit was telephone numbers, weighting was applied to calculate the initial probability of selection of the people in the sample. This probability was based on the initial telephone probability of selection, the hit rate (the percentage of randomly generated numbers that were residential lines), the number of telephones in a household and the number of adults in the household.

The sample was represented by 60,000 telephone numbers nationally. After contacting a household, a list of household members and their age and sex was compiled. From this list, a person 18 years of age or older was randomly selected and a telephone interview was conducted. Of the total 29,123 people eligible, 18,385 completed the telephone survey yielding 63.1% response rate.

Travellers who completed the telephone survey were asked to complete the mail-back questionnaire. The mail response rate was based on the estimated number of travellers with residential telephones. Consequently, the mail survey response rate was affected by the non-response from the telephone interview. A total of 5,740 completed mail questionnaires were received generating a response rate of 23.2%.

3.1.4 Data Collection, Capture, Edit and Processing

The telephone survey took place between October and December, 1999 and was administered through the Statistics Canada Regional Offices of Montreal, Sturgeon Falls, Winnipeg and Vancouver. As interviews were completed data files were electronically transmitted to Ottawa where a raw-data file was created to be used in post-collection survey processing (TAMS User Guide, 2000).

The data was collected by interviewers who were trained on the purpose and concepts of TAMS. Respondents were approached in the principal official language of their choice and bilingual interviewers were available when requested. If the respondent was temporarily away or a language or other difficulty prevented the interview, interviewers were instructed to call back another time.

Collecting the mail-back surveys lasted nearly five months, from November 1999 to March 2000. A follow-up was conducted in January and February, 2000. Post-collection editing of the data was performed to ensure clarity of responses. This was done to aid the users of the final micro-data file in distinguishing between valid response items, non-response, and valid skip in the question. If a question did not apply to a respondent, a “valid skip” code was assigned. If there was an uncertainty whether or not a question applied to a respondent, a “not stated” code was used. Multiple choice questions were reformatted to yes/no questions and answers from open-ended questions were recoded.

There were several errors that needed correction. The first error involved questions, which were not applicable to the respondent but contained an answer. A “valid skip” code was thus assigned. The second error involved questions, which should have been answered but were left blank instead. In this case, a “not stated” code was used.

The telephone and mail surveys had different target populations and response rates. Therefore, separate weights were applied to each in order to derive estimates representative of the survey population.

3.1.5 Survey Errors

Errors not related to sampling were reduced through: focus group testing of the questionnaire; testing of processes through a pilot survey; use of and training of highly skilled interviewers of the survey procedures and questionnaire; and coding and edit checks to verify the processing logic (TAMS User Guide, 2000).

Total non-response occurred because the interviewer was either unable to get in touch with the respondent, no member of the household could provide the information, or the respondent refused to participate in the survey. This type of error was overcome by adjusting the weights of the households who responded to the survey to compensate for those who did not participate. The survey was also subjected to partial non-response when the respondent did not understand or misinterpreted a question, refused to answer a question, or was unable to remember certain information.

3.2 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

To ensure internal validity of the survey, the questionnaire was subjected to focus group testing. However, there are certain circumstances that may affect the internal validity of the study. For instance, there are question asking respondents to state whether they do something on a regular basis (*e.g.* reading on a regular basis, using the Internet on a regular basis, etc.). This may be confusing since it is not clear what constitutes a “regular basis” and the term may be interpreted in a number of different ways.

Using weights allowing the generation of estimates representative of the entire Canadian population ensured external validity of the survey. However, caution should be taken when drawing sub-samples from a sample due to the possibility of generating small numbers.

The TAMS User Guide (2000) provides the minimum size estimates for release of the results based on un-weighted data and coefficient of variation. For instance, estimates with a sample size of 30 or more and a low coefficient of variation (0.0%-16.5%) are at an acceptable level. Where the coefficient of variation is high (16.6%-33.3%), given the same sample size, estimates are considered to be at a marginal level. Consequently, it should be noted that such estimates must be considered with caution due to the high levels of errors. Finally, where the sample size is less than 30 and the coefficient of variation is over 33.3%, estimates are considered unacceptable and should not be released.

3.3 DATA TREATMENT

The following sections outline the process of creating the dependent variables and also describe the recoding of several independent variables. These sets of segments are defined as: a) 'cuisine' and 'non-cuisine'; b) food', 'wine', and 'food + wine'; and c) 'rural', 'sophisticated', 'indifferent', and 'true cuisine'. The following section describes how these segments were operationally defined.

3.3.1 Dependent Variables

The first research objective was to understand the differences and similarities between the cuisine and non-cuisine travellers in terms of demographics, psychographics, trip characteristics (both vacation and getaway), and media consumption habits. To accomplish this, a new variable (which segregates cuisine from non-cuisine travellers) was created, using cuisine-related activities arranged in the three groups:

Group One: farmer's fairs/markets; shop/browse gourmet foods in retail stores or farms; pick-your-own farms/harvesting;
Group Two: restaurant dining – regional or local cooking; restaurant dining – internationally acclaimed restaurants; staying at a cooking school; staying at a gourmet restaurant with accommodation on premises;
Group Three: touring a region's wineries where you stay one or more nights; going to wineries for day visits and tasting; staying at a wine tasting school.

Cuisine travellers were conceptually defined as those who had taken trip(s) in Canada in the past two years preceding the survey, and had participated in at least one activity from both group one and two or had participated in at least one activity from group three. Non-cuisine travellers were defined as those who had not met the above criteria.

The second research objective was to compare the ‘food’, ‘wine’, and both ‘food and wine’ tourists in terms of demographics, psychographics, trip characteristics (both vacation and getaway), and media consumption habits. A new variable was created grouping the ‘food’, ‘wine’, and ‘food and wine’ enthusiasts. ‘Food’ travellers were defined as those who had traveled in Canada in the past two years preceding the survey and had participated in at least one activity from group one and two and had not engaged in any activities in group three. ‘Wine’ travellers were those who had participated in at least one activity in group three and did not qualify as ‘food’ travellers. ‘Food and Wine’ travellers were those who met the criteria of both ‘food’ and ‘wine’ travellers.

The last research objective was to identify distinct categories of culinary tourists in terms of cross-participation in the cuisine activities identified above. To accomplish this, the ‘valid skip’ and ‘not stated’ answers were eliminated from the respective variables and converted into ‘system missing’. Each activity was subsequently recoded where 1=yes and 0=no. Next, a factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed in order to establish which cuisine-related variables were closely related and what underlying dimensions might exist in culinary tourism activities. Certain variables were excluded from the analysis due to low response rates (less than 10%), which caused skewing of the results. These were: staying at a cooking school; staying at a gourmet restaurant with accommodation on premises; touring a region’s wineries where you stay one or more nights; and staying at a wine tasting school. Two factors emerged from this analysis. The following table presents the results of the factor analysis.

Table 4 Rotated Component Matrix		
	Component	
	Factor 1 Sophistication	Factor 2 Rurality
Dining (internationally acclaimed rest)	.754	-.122
Shop/browse (gourmet foods in retail stores/farms)	.629	.332
Wineries - day visits and tasting	.548	2.302E-02
Dining (regional/local cooking)	.504	.250
Farmers' fairs/markets	7.131E-02	.755
Pick-your-own/harvest participation	7.755E-02	.733

The shaded areas represent the groups of variables with high factor loadings which define the underlying dimensions – 'sophistication' and 'rurality'. The next step was to perform a k-means cluster analysis of the factors in order to identify distinct groups of cuisine travellers. Table 5 identifies the four resulting clusters. The clusters were labelled as follows: cluster 1 - 'rural' since it showed higher score for the 'rurality' factor; cluster 2 – 'sophisticated' since it had a higher score on the 'sophistication' factor; cluster 3 – 'indifferent' since it had negative scores on both factors; and cluster 4 – 'true cuisine' since it showed high scores on both factors.

Table 5 Final Cluster Centers					
		Cluster			
		1 Rural	2 Sophisticated	3 Indifferent	4 True Cuisine
REGR factor score 1	1 for analysis	-0.40974	1.243175	-0.55834	1.844002
REGR factor score 1	2 for analysis	1.185324	-0.69739	-0.63294	1.134282

3.3.2 Independent Variables

Originally, TAMS contained a variable identifying the actual age of the respondents (18 to 92 years). A new variable was created whereby the ages were grouped in the following seven categories: 18-25; 26-35; 36-45; 46-55; 56-65; 66-75; and over 75. There were 18 education level categories in the original dataset. They were subsequently reduced to six groups and the 'don't know' and 'refused' answers converted into 'system missing'. With respect to household income, the original variable organized the income level of the respondents into eight categories. The information was recoded into six new income brackets: less than \$20,000; \$20,000-\$39,999; \$40,000-\$59,999; \$60,000-\$79,999; over \$80,000; and don't know/refused.

In terms of engaging in non-trip activities, the original variables measured degrees of participation at the interval level: frequently; occasionally; rarely; not at all; not available where I live; and don't know/refused. These variables were recoded since measuring participation intensity was not the purpose of this report. Thus, frequently and occasionally were combined as 'yes'; rarely and not at all as 'no'; and don't know and refused were transformed into 'system missing'.

To address the research questions, cross-tabulation and chi-square tests were used. Table 6 presents the independent variables and the survey questions pertaining to each of them.

Table 6 TAMS Questions for the Independent Variables

Independent Variables		**TAMS Questions**
Demographics	Age	In the control component of the telephone survey
	Gender	In the control component of the telephone survey
	Income	T37. What is your total household income from wages and other sources before taxes, in
	Education	T24. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
	Occupation	T25. Do you work at a job or business?
		T26. Are you an employee or are you self-employed?
		T32. Are you… 1. A homemaker? 2. A student? 3. Retired? 4. Unemployed, looking for a job?
Psychographics	Trip Purpose	T4. Were any of the trips of one or more nights that you took in Canada: 1) mainly for pleasure including pleasure trips in which you visited friends and relatives, 2) mainly for business, 3)mainly for other personal reasons, 4)for any other reason (specify)
		1A. Looking at the types of experiences listed below, indicate in column A if you have taken a trip of one or more nights in the past 2 years seeking any of them.
	Trip Activities	2A. What activities have you participated in over the past 2 years while on trips of one or more nights for any purpose? – Culture and Entertainment
	Home Activities	T18. Now, I would like to get an idea of the kinds of things you personally do for day-to-day recreation and entertainment when you are not travelling. In the past year or so, how frequently have you participated in each of the following?
Province of Destination		T5. You indicated that you took at least one pleasure trip in Canada in the past two years. In which of the following provinces or territories did you stay (either passing through or as your destination) for one or more nights on these pleasure trips?
Trip Characteristics	Getaway Characteristics	3. Did you take any getaway trips (1-3 nights) in the past two years?
		4. With whom did you travel on the getaway trip that you took in the past 2 years?
		6. What types of accommodation did you use on your getaway trips in the past 2 years?

		7. What information sources did you use to plan your getaway trips in the past 2 years?
	Vacations characteristics	8. Did you take any vacations (4 nights or more) in the past two years?
		9. With whom did you travel on the vacation trip that you took in the past 2 years?
		11. What types of accommodation did you use on your vacation trips in the past 2 years?
		12. What information sources did you use to plan your vacation trips in the past 2 years?
Media Consumption Habits	Publication Readership	T19. Which of the following types of publications do you read or look through on a regular basis?
		T19A. Do you read the travel section of a daily newspaper on a regular basis?
		T19B. Do you read or look through the travel section of a weekend edition of a newspaper on a regular basis?
	Internet Use	T21A. Have you personally booked a trip over the Internet in the past 2 years?
		T21B. Do you regularly use the Internet as a source of information?
	Television Viewing	T20. Which of the following types of TV shows do you watch on a regular basis?
Filters		T1. Have you taken any trips of one or more nights away from home, for any purpose in the past two years (September 1997 to the present)?
		T2. Of those trips of one or more nights away from home, tell me whether you stayed in the following locations: Canada/United States/Other Countries?
		1A. Looking at the types of experiences listed, indicate in column A if you have taken a trip of one or more nights in the past 2 years seeking any of them.

4.0 RESULTS

As already mentioned in Chapter 3, the final dataset consisted of 5,740 cases. The cases were weighted to extrapolate to the general population and to correct for sampling bias, using weights provided by Statistics Canada. The results in this section are thus based on weighted data. Table 7 presents the number of respondents, both un-weighted and weighted, for each of the segments identified in Chapter 3.

Table 7 Un-weighted and Weighted Responses

	Un-weighted	Weighted
Total survey responses	5,740	19,618,857
Question 1		
Cuisine	2,244	6,843,593
Non-Cuisine	2,337	8,455,712
Question 2		
Food	1,553	4,787,083
Wine	245	755,133
Food + Wine	446	1,301,377
Question 3		
Rural	1,374	4,234,570
Sophisticated	854	2,838,816
Indifferent	1,850	6,687,438
True Cuisine	361	1,051,950

Because the process of weighting inflates the sample to represent the population of Canada, virtually all results appear statistically significant. Consequently, little emphasis should be placed on these tests because they do not indicate whether the results are meaningful for marketing purposes.

The results are organized according to the research questions presented in Chapter 1.

4.1 QUESTION 1

- **Are there significant differences between tourists engaging in cuisine-related activities and the rest of the Canadian travellers in terms of: a) Demographics; b) Psychographics; c) Trip characteristics; and e) Media consumption?**

4.1.1 Demographics

Table 8 provides the results of the data analysis performed to determine and compare the demographic characteristics of cuisine and non-cuisine travellers. The demographics analyses are segregated in five sections: gender, age, education level, income level, and occupation.

More females (55.7%) than males (44.3%) participated in cuisine travel. The non-cuisine segment has a near mirror distribution between males (53.8%) and females (46.2%).

With respect to age, 66.1% of cuisine travellers were between the ages 26 and 55. Slightly less non-cuisine travellers fell within the same age groups, at 61.1%. There were fewer travellers (10.4%) between the ages 18 and 25 in the cuisine segment, than among the non-cuisine (16.8%). The average age of the cuisine segment was 44.1 years and the non-cuisine travellers were slightly younger – 42.7 years.

There are two education levels that dominated the cuisine and the non-cuisine segments – elementary/secondary and university – accounting for 77% and 75.5% for cuisine and non-cuisine travellers, respectively. Cuisine travellers were more likely to have a university education (38.8%) than non-cuisine travellers (33.1%). Non-cuisine travellers, on the other hand, were more likely to have elementary/secondary education (42.4%) than the cuisine segment (38.2%).

The majority of cuisine travellers (56.7%) tend to have average or above average incomes ($40,000 or more). The analysis also revealed that cuisine travellers tend to earn more as a group than the non-cuisine travellers. More cuisine travellers (20.5%) earn $80,000 or more compared to the non-cuisine segment (15.2%). About seven out of ten members of each of the two segments were employed or self-employed: 70.6% of cuisine and 70.4% of non-cuisine. There were more self-employed among cuisine travellers (14.2%) than among the non-cuisine (11.4%). However, there were fewer employees among cuisine travellers (56.4%) than in the non-cuisine segment (59.0%). Slightly more non-cuisine travellers were retired (15.9%) than cuisine (14.7%).

Table 8 Demographics				
Categories	Cuisine N=6843593 (44.7%)	Non-Cuisine N=8455712 (55.3%)	χ^2	P
Gender				
Females	55.7	46.2		
Males	44.3	53.8	138051.3	<0.001
Age				
18-25	10.4	16.8		
26-35	20.7	20.5		
36-45	**26.6**	**24.5**	188377.3	<0.001
46-55	**18.9**	16.1		
56-65	14.2	10.8		
66-75	6.9	8.8		
75+	2.4	2.5		
Education Level				
Elementary/Secondary	38.2	42.4		
Trade/Vocational	5.7	6.9		
College/CEGEP	17.2	17.4	67300.8	<0.001
University	38.8	33.1		
Other	0.1	0.2		
Income Levels ($)				
Less than 20,000	10.6	12.5		
20,000 - 39,999	20.7	25.0		
40,000 - 59,999	21.6	21.0	111709.2	<0.001
60,000 - 79,999	14.6	13.4		
80,000+	20.5	15.2		
Occupation				
Employee	56.4	59.0		
Self-employed	14.2	11.4	36810.7	<0.001
Working with family - without pay	0.1	0.3		
Not Working				
Homemaker	7.8	6.7		
Student	4.0	4.0	17306.3	<0.001
Retired	14.7	15.9		
Unemployed	1.5	1.9		

4.1.2 Psychographics – Trip Purpose

TAMS identifies five trip purposes: pleasure, business, personal, educational, and moving (Table 9). Both segments were most likely to travel for pleasure, including visiting friends and relatives, in the past two years preceding the survey. Cuisine travellers were slightly more likely to take pleasure trips (92.6%) than non-cuisine travellers (90.9%). The cuisine segment was also slightly more likely to travel for business (25.9%) than the non-cuisine (23.5%). Non-cuisine travellers took trips for personal reasons at about the same rate (12.6%) as cuisine travellers (12.0%).

Table 9 Past Trip Purpose

	Cuisine N=6843593 (44.7%)	Non-Cuisine N=8455712 (55.3%)	χ^2	P
Pleasure (incl.VFR)	92.6	90.9	14104.2	<0.001
Business	25.9	23.5	12057.1	<0.001
Personal	12.0	12.6	1165.4	<0.001
Education	0.5	0.1	19083.9	<0.001
To move	0.1	0.1	4.514	0.034

Table 10 provides the motivations for taking pleasure trips.

Table 10 Past *Pleasure* Trip Purpose

	Cuisine N=6843593 (44.7%)	Non-Cuisine N=8455712 (55.3%)	χ^2	P
To rest, relax, recuperate	82.5	69.2	429895.2	<0.001
VFR	78.5	65.8	384159.8	<0.001
To spend time with family away from home	71.2	58.7	361637.3	<0.001
To spend time with good friends	58.5	45.0	397882.9	<0.001
To see natural wonders/natural sites	57.9	36.2	809648.7	<0.001
To visit historic sites	50.7	30.5	753864.4	<0.001
To experience unspoiled nature	48.4	29.8	667617.7	<0.001
For intimacy + romance	45.3	30.8	471703.6	<0.001
To participate in a hobby or sport	43.4	34.4	283559.7	<0.001
To experience adventure and excitement	41.7	26.7	513830.6	<0.001
To experience city life	41.2	26.5	498362.8	<0.001
To be someplace that feels familiar/safe	39.7	24.5	538792.7	<0.001
To experience different cultures/ways of life	37.7	19.2	769582.4	<0.001
To experience the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, being pampered	36.5	19.0	711780.6	<0.001
To escape winter weather	28.9	19.3	351881.5	<0.001
To visit a popular/trendy place	23.0	16.7	267275.3	<0.001
To visit casinos and gamble	19.5	14.4	247983.5	<0.001
To participate in a hands-on learning experiences	8.9	4.3	311376.7	<0.001
For spiritual/religious experiences	7.9	5.5	222318.1	<0.001

The cuisine segment uniformly had much higher responses for all past pleasure trips than non-cuisine travellers. The three main trip purposes for cuisine travellers were resting/relaxing/recuperating (82.5%), visiting friends and relatives (78.5%), and spending time with family away from home (71.2%). Cuisine travellers were also many more likely to have taken trips for the purpose of spending time with good friends (58.5%) than non-cuisine travellers (45.0%). There are notable differences with respect to pleasure trip purposes associated with seeing natural wonders/natural sites and visiting historic sites. A significantly more cuisine enthusiasts (57.9%) than non-cuisine travellers (36.2%) went on a trip for the purpose of seeing natural wonders/natural sites. There were also more travellers from the cuisine segment (50.7%) compared to non-cuisine (30.5%) who took a trip for the purpose of visiting historical sites.

4.1.3 Psychographics – Home Activities

Table 11 provides the results of the analysis for activities engaged in while not travelling. Again, the cuisine segment almost uniformly reported higher participation for all home activities. As expected, more cuisine (89.5%) than non-cuisine (81.8%) travellers dined at a non-fast food restaurants while at home. The majority (69.0%) of cuisine travellers exercised at home/fitness club compared to the non-cuisine segment (61.1%). Many more cuisine (67.0%) than non-cuisine (54.0%) travellers went on a picnic/day-outing while at home. The cuisine segment was also more active than the non-cuisine with respect to swimming in pools/natural bodies of water while at home (66.8% versus 58.9%). Cuisine enthusiasts were also much more likely to engage in a variety of other activities while not travelling than the non-cuisine segment: gardening activities (60.5% vs. 49.9%), camping/hiking/backpacking

(60.0% vs. 52.7%), attending to music concerts (57.0% vs. 45.2%), going to live theatre (53.1% vs. 40.7%), biking (52.4% vs. 45.8%), visiting zoo/botanical gardens (50.3% vs. 39.4%), and so on. The non-cuisine sample reported slightly higher participation in the following home activities: team sports (23.8%), snowmobiling (12.5%), and hunting (4.8%).

Table 11 Home Activities

	Cuisine N=6843593 (44.7%)	Non-Cuisine N=8455712 (55.3%)	χ^2	P
Restaurants (no fast food)	89.5	81.8	178686.4	<0.001
Exercise - home/fitness club	69.0	61.1	101706.1	<0.001
Picnic/day-outing	67.0	54.0	265095.8	<0.001
Swimming in pools/natural bodies of water	66.8	58.9	99171.9	<0.001
Gardening	60.5	49.9	170459.4	<0.001
Camping/hiking/backpacking	60.0	52.7	81643.9	<0.001
Music concerts	57.0	45.2	211047.8	<0.001
Live theatre	53.1	40.7	234831.0	<0.001
Biking	52.4	45.8	65557.6	<0.001
Museum	50.3	39.4	182095.1	<0.001
Zoo/botanical garden	47.4	34.5	264536.7	<0.001
Dancing	46.6	37.1	141796.6	<0.001
Art gallery/art show	43.3	29.1	336289.7	<0.001
Ice-skating	39.3	37.3	6447.9	<0.001
Professional sports events	38.2	33.3	43742.4	<0.001
Amusement/ theme parks	37.7	34.5	30847.7	<0.001
Golf	35.5	30.7	40144.7	<0.001
Fishing	30.1	27.9	9523.0	<0.001
Sailing/other boating	28.2	23.6	40959.8	<0.001
Canoeing/kayaking	26.8	17.0	218242.2	<0.001
Downhill skiing/snowboarding	24.3	21.3	19362.4	<0.001
Team sports	23.3	23.8	421.1	<0.001
Cross-country skiing	21.0	15.5	77674.5	<0.001
Racquet sports	19.0	17.8	3391.0	<0.001
Gambling at casinos	15.1	13.3	9977.3	<0.001
Ballet	12.3	6.4	158225.2	<0.001
Opera	11.8	6.9	110444.5	<0.001
Snowmobiling	11.7	12.5	2377.0	<0.001
B&B in own city/town	10.2	8.0	22544.5	<0.001
Hunting	3.2	4.8	12389.4	<0.001

4.1.4 Psychographics – Trip Activities

Table 12 provides information on the activities that each group participated in the past while travelling. The activities were classified in three groups: outdoor, cultural, and touring.

Outdoor:

In general, cuisine travellers tended to engage significantly more in outdoor activities while traveling than travellers from the non-cuisine sample. Significantly more cuisine travellers (62.3%) than non-cuisine (37.4%) engaged in picnics in park settings while traveling. They were also much more active in terms of swimming in lakes (57.0%) and sunbathing/sitting on a beach (54.2%) while traveling than the non-cuisine travellers.

Table 12 Trip Activities

	Cuisine N=6843593 (44.7%)	Non-Cuisine N=8455712 (55.3%)	χ^2	P
Outdoor				
Picnics in park settings	62.3	37.4	1169394.0	<0.001
Swimming in lakes	57.0	37.8	830778.6	<0.001
Sunbathing/sitting on a beach	54.2	32.5	993438.1	<0.001
Cultural				
Restaurant dining (regional/local)	94.8	55.9	2939495.0	<0.001
Shop/browse (clothing, shoes, jewellery)	75.6	48.9	1298421.0	<0.001
Read for relaxation/personal interest	74.6	46.0	1438106.0	<0.001
Shop/browse (book/music stores)	73.4	38.8	1971793.0	<0.001
Shop/browse (local arts & crafts)	65.4	26.0	2536504.0	<0.001
Movies	62.1	34.3	1381399.0	<0.001
Farmers' fairs/markets	60.8	6.3	5421556.0	<0.001
Local outdoor cafes	53.2	24.4	1567780.0	<0.001
Shop/browse (antiques)	50.1	16.7	2178283.0	<0.001
Touring				
Day - coastal/lakeshore scenic drives	53.8	30.3	870373.7	<0.001
Wandering around small towns/villages 1+ nights	57.8	31.9	1267034.0	<0.001

Cultural:

Not surprisingly, cuisine travellers were most likely to dine in restaurants with regional/local cooking and to visit farmers' fairs/markets (94.8% and 60.8%) than the non-cuisine segment (55.9% and 6.3%). The cuisine enthusiasts reported much higher participation in a variety of shopping activities: shopping/browsing for clothing, shoes, and jewellery (75.6%), book/music stores (73.4%), local arts and crafts (65.4%), and antiques (50.1%). They were also much more likely to read for relaxation/personal interest than the non-cuisine travellers (74.6% vs. 46.0%). The cuisine segment was much more likely to see movies and to visit local outdoor cafes (62.1% and 53.2%) than the non-cuisine (34.3% and 24.4%).

Touring:

A significantly higher percentage of cuisine tourists took coastal/lakeshore scenic drives and wandered around small towns/villages for one or more nights (53.8% and 57.8%) than the non-cuisine travellers (30.3% and 31.9%).

4.1.5 Vacation Trip Characteristics

Vacations were defined as trips of minimum four nights away from home, taken primarily for pleasure (including visiting friends and relatives trips). The characteristics where classified in four groups: travel season, party composition, accommodation, and sources of information. Table 13 provides the results of the analysis.

The most popular season for both segments was the summer and the least popular was the spring. There was some variation in the propensity to travel in the summer among the two groups. Slightly more cuisine (77.7%) than non-cuisine (73.5%) travellers took trips in the summer. However, the cuisine segment was much more likely to travel in the winter (47.8%), in the fall (39.2%), and in the spring months (36.1%) than non-cuisine travellers (39.5%, 29.1%, and 26.9%, respectively).

More often than not, both segments travelled with their spouses/partners as a couple. Cuisine travellers were more likely (54.9%) to travel with their spouses/partners than non-cuisine (43.9%). The large majority of cuisine travellers (41.0%) preferred to take trips with their immediate family (including children) than the non-cuisine (36.0%).

The respondents used a variety of accommodations but more often than not, both segments stayed at hotels/resorts/country inns, or with friends or relatives. Cuisine enthusiasts were significantly more likely, at 60.3% than non-cuisine travellers, at 48.1% to stay at hotels/resorts/country inns. They were also more likely to use the homes of friends or relatives (60.1%) than the non-cuisine travellers (54.6%).

Generally, both cuisine and non-cuisine travellers relied on past experience and the advice of friends/relatives when planning their vacation trips. Cuisine travellers were much more likely, at 53.7%, to obtain information from friends/relatives compared to non-cuisine travellers (43.6%). Past experience was the second most relied on source of information for cuisine enthusiasts (53.4%) than for the non-cuisine segment (45.8%). Cuisine travellers were also more likely (40.7%) to use the services of a travel agent when planning their trip than the non-cuisine sample (32.2%).

Table 13 Vacation Trip Characteristics				
	Cuisine N=6843593 (44.7)	Non-Cuisine N=8455712 (55.3%)	χ^2	P
Travel season				
Summer	77.0	73.5	32468.5	<0.001
Winter	47.8	39.5	94603.6	<0.001
Fall	39.2	29.1	148045.6	<0.001
Spring	36.1	26.9	129902.9	<0.001
Party Composition				
Spouse/partner (no children)	54.9	43.9	153292.4	<0.001
Immediate family (incl. children)	41.0	36.0	43952.6	<0.001
Immediate family, friends, relatives	28.2	20.9	98392.2	<0.001
Friends/business associate	20.4	18.9	19223.7	<0.001
Alone	18.3	17.2	17830.6	<0.001
Other	3.8	3.5	16653.6	<0.001
Accommodation				
Hotels/resorts/country inns	60.3	48.1	183175.1	<0.001
Homes of friends & relatives	60.1	54.6	42718.1	<0.001
Motels	38.0	29.4	105716.3	<0.001
Fully serviced campgrounds/RV parks	22.9	17.3	65173.2	<0.001
Unserviced campgrounds/backcountry	19.1	15.3	37275.4	<0.001
Rented cottage	15.8	13.1	26045.6	<0.001
B & B	15.6	8.1	169799.3	<0.001
Campgrounds/RV parks (Elec. only)	14.1	8.6	97941.3	<0.001
Other	14.1	12.5	14142.8	<0.001
Own cottage	11.4	8.7	32044.0	<0.001
Fishing/hunting lodges	4.1	3.2	14948.3	<0.001
Sources of Information				
Advice of friends/relatives	53.7	43.6	155571.3	<0.001
Past experience	53.4	45.8	107386.0	<0.001
A travel agent	40.7	32.2	134565.6	<0.001
Internet	30.4	20.6	193150.0	<0.001
Auto Club (CAA)	28.1	18.8	186195.1	<0.001
Travel information offices	28.0	17.8	216118.5	<0.001
Articles in newspapers/magazines	26.0	14.4	288231.7	<0.001
Advertisements in newspapers/magazines	22.9	9.8	416754.3	<0.001
Airline reservation system	18.1	12.3	127779.7	<0.001
Travel guide books	16.8	8.9	214526.4	<0.001
Travel information received in the mail	14.6	7.6	198746.0	<0.001
Other	10.0	8.1	68257.8	<0.001
TV programs	9.9	3.3	257993.0	<0.001
TV advertisements	7.4	4.0	119468.3	<0.001
Trade/travel/sportsmen's shows	4.9	2.4	111190.9	<0.001

4.1.6 Getaway Trip Characteristics

Getaway trips have been defined as trips of up to three nights away from home taken for pleasure (including visiting friends and relatives). Table 14 provides the results of the analysis. The getaway characteristics where divided in four groups: travel season, party composition, accommodation, and sources of information.

Again, the most popular season for both segments was the summer and the least popular was the spring. There was some variation in the propensity to travel in the summer among the two groups. Cuisine travellers were more likely (85.4%) to take trips in the summer months than non-cuisine (80.9%). The same general pattern also holds true in the fall: 66.0% of the cuisine sample travelled in the fall versus 50.5% of the non-cuisine segment. The winter and spring seasons were also more popular for the cuisine enthusiasts (62.4% and 58.4%) than for the non-cuisine travellers (52.7% and 45.7%).

More often than not, both segments travelled with their spouses/partners as a couple. Here, too, there were inter-segment differences. Cuisine travellers were more likely (64.3%) to travel with their spouses/partners than non-cuisine (52.3%). The majority of cuisine travellers (47.0%) preferred to take trips with their immediate family (including children) than the non-cuisine (40.5%). A significantly more cuisine enthusiasts traveled with immediate family, friends, and/or relatives (39.2%) than non-cuisine (29.2%).

The respondents used a variety of accommodations but more often than not, both segments stayed with friends or relatives, or at hotels/resorts/country inns. The majority (68.5%) of cuisine travellers stayed with family or friends compared to non-cuisine (60.1%). The cuisine segment was more likely (67.4%) to use hotels/resorts/country inns. than the non-cuisine sample (54.9%). Cuisine travellers were also much more likely (47.3%) than non-cuisine (37.3%) to stay at motels.

Table 14 Getaway Trip Characteristics				
	Cuisine N=6843593 (44.7%)	Non-Cuisine N=8455712 (55.3%)	χ^2	P
Travel season				
Summer	85.4	80.9	72053.7	<0.001
Fall	66.0	50.5	331324.7	<0.001
Winter	62.4	52.7	150569.9	<0.001
Spring	58.4	45.7	230853.7	<0.001
Party Composition				
Spouse/partner (no children)	64.3	52.3	190440.6	<0.001
Immediate family (incl. children)	47.0	40.5	63901.8	<0.001
Immediate family, friends, relatives	39.2	29.2	149974.9	<0.001
With friends/business associates (no family)	31.5	29.0	22089.5	<0.001
Alone	23.6	21.0	25081.6	<0.001
Other	5.9	5.9	14513.5	<0.001
Accommodation				
Homes of friends & relatives	68.5	60.1	99432.5	<0.001
Hotels/resorts/country inns	67.4	54.9	211525.6	<0.001
Motels	47.3	37.3	134865.5	<0.001
Fully serviced campgrounds/RV parks	29.7	22.4	93285.0	<0.001
Unserviced campgrounds/backcountry	27.0	22.7	37308.8	<0.001
B & B	24.1	10.7	406326.1	<0.001
Rented cottage	20.6	15.3	64578.1	<0.001
Campgrounds/RV parks (Elec. only)	18.7	12.0	116618.2	<0.001
Other	15.7	14.4	10326.0	<0.001
Own cottage	13.9	10.9	33635.7	<0.001
Fishing/hunting lodges	7.5	5.2	34765.8	<0.001
Sources of Information				
Past experience	65.4	56.4	146146.9	<0.001
Advice of friends/relatives	64.2	52.6	208343.6	<0.001
Articles in newspapers/magazines	36.2	17.7	592376.9	<0.001
A travel agent	34.7	24.1	220265.9	<0.001
Internet	34.3	24.5	196437.7	<0.001
Travel information offices	32.9	21.0	273051.8	<0.001
Advertisements in newspapers/magazines	30.5	17.3	350605.6	<0.001
Auto Club (CAA)	28.4	18.4	228022.4	<0.001
Airline reservation system	17.4	10.0	201223.9	<0.001
Travel guide books	16.5	8.9	219278.0	<0.001
Travel information received in the mail	16.0	10.8	131991.3	<0.001
TV program	13.9	4.5	395874.5	<0.001
Other	10.0	11.6	77912.1	<0.001
TV advertisements	8.7	4.8	136660.4	<0.001
Trade/travel/sportsmen's shows	8.3	3.7	177834.0	<0.001

More often than not, cuisine and non-cuisine travellers obtained information about their destinations from past experience and the advice from friends/relatives. However, cuisine travellers were much more likely (65.4%) to rely on their past experience than the non-cuisine segment (56.4%). They also tended to obtain information from their friends or relatives more (64.2%) than non-cuisine tourists (52.6%). Articles in newspapers/magazines were much more used by cuisine travellers (36.2%) than non-cuisine (17.7%).

4.1.7 Media Consumption Habits

The following section discusses print media and internet consumption habits of the cuisine and non-cuisine segments. Table 15 provides the results of the analysis.

Table 15 Media Consumption Habits - Print Media

	Cuisine N=6843593 (44.7%)	Non-Cuisine N=8455712 (55.3%)	χ^2	P
Daily newspaper	79.3	74.6	47010.1	<0.001
Weekend edition of newspaper	78.1	73.6	41468.6	<0.001
Community newspaper	71.8	66.6	46902.7	<0.001
Travel section of a weekend newspaper	56.2	44.8	199802.1	<0.001
Travel section of weekend edition of newspaper	56.1	44.8	214402.2	<0.001
Travel section of daily newspaper	49.8	39.5	167923.0	<0.001
News magazines	48.9	41.5	84030.4	<0.001
Other magazines	47.6	45.0	10667.1	<0.001
Hobby magazines	45.1	32.2	269708.4	<0.001
Fashion/homemaking magazines	42.4	32.5	160451.6	<0.001
Travel magazines	37.1	24.9	267283.0	<0.001
Canadian or National Geographic	36.2	25.9	187099.1	<0.001
Other newspapers	34.8	29.2	59813.5	<0.001
Sports magazines	22.5	23.7	3059.2	<0.001
General interest magazines	22.3	17.8	46817.3	<0.001

The three most popular print media sources were daily newspaper, weekend edition of a newspaper, and community newspaper. Slightly more cuisine travellers (79.3%) tend to read daily newspapers than non-cuisine (74.6%). Cuisine enthusiasts were also more likely (78.1%) than non-cuisine (73.6%) to read the weekend edition of a newspaper. The large majority of cuisine travellers (71.8%) read a community newspaper compared to non-cuisine (66.6%). The cuisine segment reported much higher readership with respect to the travel sections of newspapers: 56.2% read the travel section of a weekend newspaper; 56.1% look through the travel section of a weekend edition of a newspaper; and 49.8% read the travel section of a daily newspaper. Non-cuisine travellers reported slightly higher readership (23.7% vs. 22.5%) for sports magazines.

With respect to Internet use, the majority of both cuisine and non-cuisine travellers use the Internet as an information source (Table 16). Cuisine enthusiasts are more likely to browse the Internet for information, at 55.8%, compared to 51.0% of the non-cuisine segment. However, both segments are not likely to use the Internet to book trips. Only 7.8% of cuisine tourists and 5.5% of non-cuisine travellers used the Internet to personally book a trip.

Table 16 Media Consumption Habits - Internet Use

	Cuisine N=6843593 (44.7%)	Non-Cuisine N=8455712 (55.3%)	χ^2	P
Internet as an information source	55.8	51.0	33331.2	<0.001
Personally booked a trip on the Internet	7.8	5.5	48272.6	<0.001

4.2 QUESTION 2

- **Are there significant differences between travellers participating in food-, wine-, and both food and wine-related activities in terms of: a) Demographics; b) Psychographics; c) Trip characteristics; and d) Media consumption?**

4.2.1 Demographics

Table 17 provides the results of the data analysis performed to determine and compare the demographic characteristics of ‘food’, ‘wine’, and both ‘food + wine’ travellers. The demographics analyses are segregated in five sections: gender, age, education level, income level, and occupation.

Females were more likely than males to be involved in ‘food’ or ‘wine’ activities. Specifically, 57.3% of females participated in food-related activities compared to only 42.7% of males; the figures were 54.8% (female) versus 45.2% (male) for wine activities. However, there was a nearly equal distribution among travellers engaging in ‘food + wine’ activities with respect to gender (50.5% females and 49.5% males).

The majority of ‘food’ and ‘wine’ travellers (66.6% and 66.8%, respectively) were between the ages of 26 and 55. Slightly fewer ‘food + wine’ travellers (63.4%) were represented in these categories, although travellers still had a majority of their members in this cohort (Table 17). The ‘food’ and ‘wine’ segments had an average age of 43.6 and 43.8, respectively. The ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts were older, with an average age of 46.2 years.

There were significant differences among the groups with respect to education attainments. ‘Wine’ travellers were more likely to have a university education (44.8%) than food travellers (34.9%) Travellers engaging in both food and wine were the most likely group to have a university education (49.6%). ‘Food’ enthusiasts were more likely to have elementary/secondary education (42.3%) compared to the other two segments.

All three segments tended to have average or above average incomes, although ‘food’ travellers tended to be lower. The majority of the ‘food + wine’ segment (63.8%) had an income level of $40,000 or more, followed by the ‘wine’ segment (59.7%), and the ‘food’ segment (54.4%). The analysis also revealed that more travellers in the ‘food + wine’ segment (28.6%) earned $80,000+ compared to the ‘wine’ segment (24.3%) and the ‘food’ segment (17.7%).

Table 17 Demographics

	Total % of responses	Food N=4787083 (69.9%)	Wine N=755133 (11.0%)	Food and Wine N=1301377 (19.0%)	χ^2	P
Gender						
Females	55.7	57.3	54.8	50.5		
Males	44.3	42.7	45.2	49.5	19743.8	<0.001
Age						
18-25	10.4	11.7	9.9	5.7		
26-35	20.7	20.1	22.1	22.2		
36-45	26.6	27.7	27.1	22.1	115309.2	<0.001
46-55	18.9	18.8	19.4	19.1		
56-65	14.2	13.1	10.4	20.6		
66-75	6.9	6.3	7.5	8.5		
75+	2.4	2.3	3.6	1.9		
Education Level						
University	38.8	34.9	44.8	49.6		
Elementary/Secondary	38.2	42.3	29.9	27.9		
College/CEGEP	17.2	17.1	19.9	16.2	155985.5	<0.001
Trade/Vocational	5.7	5.8	5.2	5.9		
Other	0.1		0.2	0.4		
Income Levels ($)						
Less than 20,000	10.6	11.3	9.0	9.0		
20,000 - 39,999	20.7	21.6	21.1	17.2		
40,000 - 59,999	21.6	22.1	19.6	20.9	94809.0	<0.001
60,000 - 79,999	14.6	14.6	15.8	14.3		
80,000+	20.5	17.7	24.3	28.6		
Don’t know/Refused	11.9	12.8	10.1	10.0		
Occupation						
Employee	56.4	57.0	56.2	54.2		
Self-employed	14.2	13.5	16.4	15.8	11017.4	<0.001
Working for family (no $)	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2		

Not Working						
Homemaker	7.8	8.1	6.0	7.7		
Student	4.0	4.4	4.5	2.3	60630.8	<0.001
Retired	14.7	13.7	15.6	17.9		
Unemployed	1.5	2.0	0.3	0.3		

With respect to occupation status, the results indicate that about seven out of ten members of each of the three segments were employed or self-employed: 72.6% of 'wine', 70.5% of 'food', and 70.0% of 'food + wine'. 'Wine' travellers were more likely to be self-employed than the other segments (16.4%) compared to 15.8% for 'food + wine' and 13.5% for 'food' segments. The 'food + wine' segment was more represented by retired people (17.9%) than the 'wine' (15.6%) and 'food' (13.7%) segments.

4.2.2 Psychographics – Trip Purpose

Table 18 presents the results of the trip purpose analysis.

Table 18 Past Trip Purpose

	Total % of responses	Food N=4787083 (69.9%)	Wine N=755133 (11.0%)	Food and Wine N=1301377 (19.0%)	χ^2	P
Pleasure (incl.VFR)	92.6	92.8	89.3	93.5	13443.436	<0.001
Business	25.9	23.9	32.0	29.7	33662.495	<0.001
Personal	12.0	12.4	10.7	11.3	2662.823	<0.001
Education	0.5	0.7	0.0	0.0	14438.387	<0.001
To move	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	2266.574	<0.001

All three segments were more likely to travel for pleasure, including visiting friends and relatives, in the past two years preceding the survey. More 'food' and 'food + wine' enthusiasts (92.8% and 93.5%) travelled for pleasure compared to the 'wine' segment (89.3%). 'Wine' travellers were more likely to take business trips (32.0%) than the 'food' and ‘food + wine’ segments (23.9% and 29.75). The majority (12.4%) of ‘food’ travellers took trips for personal reasons.

Table 19 presents the motivation factors for trips taken for pleasure. The ‘food + wine’ segment almost uniformly reported higher responses for all past pleasure trip purposes. Specifically, slightly more ‘food + wine’ (85.0%) than ‘wine’ (83.4%) and ‘food’ (81.7%) travellers took a trip for the purpose of resting/relaxing/ recuperating. Marginally more ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts (81.5%) travelled for the purpose of visiting friends and relatives. The majority (72.2%) of the ‘food’ segment travelled for the purpose of spending time with family.

Table 19 Past *Pleasure* Trip Purpose						
	Total % of responses	Food N=4787083 (69.9%)	Wine N=755133 (11.0%)	Food and Wine N=1301377 (19.0%)	χ^2	P
To rest, relax, recuperate	82.5	81.7	83.4	85.0	27282.9	<0.001
VFR	78.5	78.4	73.8	81.5	32310.2	<0.001
To spend time with family	71.2	72.2	63.1	72.1	38133.3	<0.001
To spend time with good friends	58.5	57.5	52.7	65.5	55331.9	<0.001
To see natural wonders/natural sites	57.9	56.6	53.2	65.7	60098.3	<0.001
To visit historic sites	50.7	47.5	49.6	63.5	126868.3	<0.001
To experience unspoiled nature	48.4	48.1	40.4	54.2	51571.6	<0.001
For intimacy + romance	45.3	43.2	42.8	54.5	73299.6	<0.001
To participate in a hobby or sport	43.4	42.9	38.0	48.4	37458.5	<0.001
To experience adventure and excitement	41.7	39.4	44.2	48.3	53044.4	<0.001
To experience city life	41.2	40.2	32.8	49.7	79223.0	<0.001
To be someplace that feels familiar/safe	39.7	40.8	35.1	38.3	21848.4	<0.001
To experience different cultures/ways of life	37.7	33.0	40.8	53.1	201538.8	<0.001
To experience the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, being pampered	36.5	31.8	37.2	53.2	225807.7	<0.001
To escape winter weather	28.9	25.8	26.8	41.7	146633.3	<0.001
To visit a popular/trendy place	23.0	20.9	24.9	29.3	58535.2	<0.001
To visit casinos and gamble	19.5	19.0	14.7	24.2	44667.2	<0.001
To participate in a hands-on learning	8.9	9.2	4.2	10.4	38153.9	<0.001
For spiritual/religious experiences	7.9	8.2	4.0	9.0	31693.6	<0.001

The ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts were significantly more likely to travel for the purpose of spending time with good friends (65.5%), to see natural wonders/natural sites (65.7%), to visit historic sites (63.5%), to experience unspoiled nature (54.2%), and for intimacy and romance (54.5%) compared to those in the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ segments. There are notable differences with respect to pleasure trip purposes associated with experiencing different cultures and ways of life and experiencing the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, being pampered. The ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts reported much higher responses (53.1% and 53.2%) for these trip purposes than the ‘wine’ and ‘food’ segments. Being someplace that feels familiar/safe was an important reason for trips taken by the ‘food’ travellers (40.8%) compared to the ‘wine’ (35.1%) and ‘food + wine’ (38.3%) tourists.

4.2.3 Psychographics – Home Activities

Table 20 provides the results of the analysis for activities engaged in while not travelling.

Table 20 Home Activities						
	Total % of responses	Food N=4787083 (69.9%)	Wine N=755133 (11.0%)	Food and Wine N=1301377 (19.0%)	χ^2	P
Restaurants (no fast food)	89.5	88.2	92.0	93.0	31253.0	<0.001
Home/fitness club	69.0	68.5	66.1	72.5	11039.5	<0.001
Picnic/day-outing	67.0	67.3	58.6	70.4	30809.3	<0.001
Swimming in pools/natural bodies of water	66.8	67.0	57.5	71.3	41754.8	<0.001
Gardening	60.5	60.0	53.8	66.1	31860.3	<0.001
Camping/hiking/backpacking	60.0	59.7	58.7	62.0	2909.1	<0.001
Music concerts	57.0	53.6	53.2	71.9	145767.1	<0.001
Live theatre	53.1	49.2	52.4	67.8	144553.0	<0.001
Biking	52.4	52.3	45.2	56.9	26325.1	<0.001
Museum	50.3	48.2	43.9	62.0	92619.2	<0.001
Zoo/botanical garden	47.4	46.3	43.3	53.7	47220.6	<0.001
Dancing	46.6	46.8	40.5	49.3	15374.7	<0.001
Art gallery/art show	43.3	39.5	36.4	61.6	221856.6	<0.001
Ice-skating	39.3	39.3	38.7	40.0	357.3	<0.001
Professional sports events	38.2	36.6	38.4	44.1	25269.0	<0.001
Amusement/ theme parks	37.7	37.4	32.9	41.7	26109.9	<0.001
Golf	35.5	32.1	39.2	46.1	93326.8	<0.001
Fishing	30.1	30.8	25.3	30.4	9625.2	<0.001
Sailing/other boating	28.2	27.3	26.9	32.3	13430.3	<0.001
Canoeing/kayaking	26.8	25.7	26.2	31.3	16805.7	<0.001
Downhill skiing/snowboarding	24.3	21.6	29.0	31.5	64493.7	<0.001
Team sports	23.3	22.6	29.9	22.4	20252.2	<0.001
Cross-country skiing	21.0	19.2	26.2	24.7	32548.9	<0.001
Racquet sports	19.0	16.9	24.9	23.1	44647.2	<0.001
Gambling at casinos	15.1	13.7	17.9	18.7	25749.3	<0.001
Ballet	12.3	11.4	11.2	15.9	33196.3	<0.001
Opera	11.8	10.0	10.3	19.5	107424.2	<0.001
Snowmobiling	11.7	11.8	15.2	9.2	16714.3	<0.001

B&B in own city/town	10.2	10.4	7.0	11.2	10056.8	<0.001
Hunting	7.1	8.1	3.9	5.1	25860.8	<0.001

Again, the ‘food + wine’ segment almost uniformly reported higher responses for all home activities. Slightly more ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts (93.0%) than ‘wine’ and ‘food’ travellers dined in a non-fast food restaurants while at home. The majority (72.5%) of the ‘food + wine’ segment exercised at home/fitness club compared to the ‘food’ (68.5%) and ‘wine’ (66.1%) segments. More travellers in the ‘food + wine’ segment (70.4%) than the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ travellers (67.3% and 58.6%, respectively) went on a picnic/day-outing. The large majority (71.3%) of ‘food + wine’ travellers also engaged in swimming in pools/natural bodies of water while at home, compared to ‘food’ (67.0%) and ‘wine’ (57.5%) travellers. Also, more ‘food + wine’ travellers (66.1%) engaged in gardening while at home compared to the ‘food’ (60.0%) and ‘wine’ (53.8%) segments. The majority (62.0%) of ‘food + wine’ travellers reported higher participation in camping/hiking/backpacking activities than the ‘food’ (59.7%) and ‘wine’ (58.7%) segments, while at home. Many more ‘food + wine’ travellers attended music concerts, a live theatre, a museum, a zoo/botanical garden, and an art gallery/art show while at home (71.9%, 67.8%, 62.0%, 53.7%, 61.6%) compared to ‘food’ and ‘wine’ travellers. ‘Food + wine’ travellers were also slightly higher (56.9%) on activities associated with biking than ‘food’ (52.3%) and ‘wine’ (45.2%) travellers.

The ‘wine’ enthusiasts were more likely to participate in sports while at home. Specifically, they engaged in team sports (29.9%), cross-country skiing (26.2%), racquet sports (24.9%), and snowmobiling (15.2%). The ‘food’ travellers reported higher participation rates in hunting (8.1%) while at home compared to the other two segments.

4.2.4 Psychographics – Trip Activities

Table 22 provides the results of the trip activity analysis. Trip activities were classified in three groups: outdoor, cultural, and touring activities.

Table 21 Trip Activities

	Total % of weighted responses	Food N=4787083 (69.9%)	Wine N=755133 (11.0%)	Food and Wine N=1301377 (19.0%)	χ^2	P
Outdoor						
Picnics in park settings	62.3	62.2	47.4	71.5	117819.5	<0.001
Swimming in lakes	57.0	56.9	49.2	62.1	32286.8	<0.001
Sunbathing/sitting on a beach	54.2	54.0	45.0	60.4	45947.0	<0.001
Swimming in oceans	38.6	35.0	36.9	53.1	142687.7	<0.001
Cultural						
Restaurant dining (regional/local)	94.8	98.0	68.8	98.2	1160516.8	<0.001
Shop/browse (clothing, shoes, jewellery)	75.6	76.8	60.7	79.9	107525.6	<0.001
Read for relaxation/personal interest	74.6	75.1	62.3	79.6	77763.5	<0.001
Shop/browse (book/music stores)	73.4	75.7	49.4	78.9	255621.6	<0.001
Shop/browse (local arts & crafts)	65.4	65.6	44.2	76.6	222136.1	<0.001
Movies	62.1	63.2	40.3	70.3	191907.1	<0.001
Farmers' fairs/markets	60.8	68.6	7.0	63.3	1043129.1	<0.001
Local outdoor cafes	53.2	51.2	35.6	70.5	258260.6	<0.001
Shop/browse (antiques)	50.1	50.9	24.8	61.9	266626.3	<0.001
General history/heritage museums	44.7	44.1	30.8	55.1	116285.2	<0.001
Shop/browse (gourmet foods)	43.6	44.8	3.2	62.7	697171.0	<0.001
Natural wonders	41.3	37.0	38.8	58.5	196610.7	<0.001
Theatre	38.2	35.8	26.3	54.1	196839.1	<0.001
Art galleries	35.6	33.4	23.9	50.7	185891.1	<0.001
Touring						
Day - coastal/lakeshore scenic drives	59.7	57.1	51.9	73.7	139294.8	<0.001
Wandering around small towns/villages 1+ nights	57.8	55.2	54.4	69.1	84355.8	<0.001
Wineries for day visits and tasting	24.8		79.2	84.2	5248025.0	<0.001
Touring region's wineries with stay 1+ nights	16.4		51.6	56.5	3144824.0	<0.001

Outdoor:

In general, ‘food + wine’ travellers tended to engage more in outdoor activities than the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ segments. More ‘food + wine’ travellers (71.5%) than ‘food’ and ‘wine’ travellers (62.2% and 47.4%, respectively) engaged in picnics in park settings while on their trips. The ‘food + wine’ segment reported also higher participation in swimming in lakes, sunbathing/sitting on a beach, and swimming in oceans (62.1%, 60.4%, and 53.1%, respectively), compared to the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ travellers.

Cultural:

Not surprisingly, virtually all ‘food + wine’ (98.2%) and ‘food’ (98.0%) travellers dined in restaurants offering regional/local cooking. While a majority of ‘wine’ travellers also engaged in this activity, the percentage was substantially lower (68.8%).

Members of the ‘food + wine’ segment reported higher participation (79.9%) in shopping/browsing for clothing, shoes, and jewellery than the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ travellers (76.8% and 60.7%, respectively). The ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts also rated higher on reading for relaxation/personal interest, (79.6%), and shopping/browsing for books/music (78.9%) than ‘food’ ‘wine’ travellers. Significantly more ‘food + wine’ travellers shopped/browsed for local arts and crafts, antiques, and gourmet foods on their trip(s) (76.6%, 61.9%, and 62.7%, respectively) than the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ tourists. The ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts were also much more likely to go to the movies (70.3%), to visit local outdoor cafes (70.5%), to visit general history/heritage museums (55.1%), natural wonders (58.5%), a theatre (54.1%), and art galleries (50.7%) on their trips compared to the ‘food’ and ‘wine tourists. Not surprisingly, more ‘food’ enthusiasts (68.6%) than ‘food + wine’ (63.3%) and ‘wine’ (7.0%) travellers visited farmers’ fairs/markets on their trips.

Touring:

A very high percentage (73.7%) of ‘food + wine’ travellers took day-coastal/lakeshore scenic drives compared to ‘food’ (57.1%) and ‘wine’ (51.9%) travellers. ‘Food + wine’ travellers were also much more likely (69.1%) to wander around small towns/villages for 1 night or more while traveling than the ‘food’ (55.2%) and ‘wine’ (54.4%) enthusiasts. The ‘food + wine’ segment reported higher participation (84.2%) than the ‘wine’ segment (79.2%) with respect to going to wineries for day visits and tasting. They were also slightly higher (65.5%) than ‘wine’ travellers (51.6%) in terms of touring a region’s wineries with one or more nights stay.

4.2.5 Vacation Trip Characteristics

TAMS provides data on four trip characteristics: travel season, party composition, accommodation, and sources of information. Table 22 summarizes the results of the analysis.

The most popular season for all three segments was the summer and the least popular was the spring. The propensity of all three to travel in the summer was approximately equal: ‘food + wine’ - 79.5%, ‘food’ - 76.9%, and ‘wine’ - 72.4%. The majority (53.6%) of the ‘food + wine’ segment travelled in the winter compared to the ‘food’ (46.1%) and ‘wine’ (47.1%) travellers, respectively. They also reported higher rates for travel in the fall and spring months (46.6%, 46.5%) than the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ segments.

More often than not, all segments travelled with there spouses/ partners as a couple. Here, too, there were inter-segment differences. The majority (68.4%) of the ‘food + wine’ segment preferred to travel with their spouses/partners, compared to the ‘food’ (50.8%) and ‘wine’ (55.4%) travellers. The ‘food’ enthusiasts were more likely (42.4%) than ‘food +

wine' (38.4%) and 'wine' (36.5%) travellers to take trips with their immediate family (including children). A significantly higher percentage (34.5%) of 'food + wine' enthusiasts travelled with immediate family, friends, and/or other relatives than the 'food' (27.0%) and 'wine' (24.5%) travellers, respectively.

The respondents used a variety of accommodations but all three segments were most likely to stay at hotels/resorts/country inns or with friends/relatives. The large majority of 'food + wine' travellers (71.4%) stayed at hotel/resorts/country inns compared to the 'food' (56.8%) and 'wine' (61.8%) segments. 'Food' and 'wine' enthusiasts were almost equally likely to stay with family or friends (60.8% and 59.7%); 'food + wine' travellers were only slightly less likely, at 58.0%. More 'food + wine' enthusiasts (44.1%) stayed at motels compared to the 'food' (36.4%) and 'wine' (36.2%) travellers.

Table 22 Vacation Trip Characteristics						
	Total % of weighted responses	Food N=4787083 (69.9%)	Wine N=755133 (11.0%)	Food and Wine N=1301377 (19.0%)	χ^2	P
Travel season						
Summer	77.0	76.9	72.4	79.5	20505.6	<0.001
Winter	47.8	46.1	47.1	53.6	30251.1	<0.001
Fall	39.2	37.2	37.7	46.6	44499.6	<0.001
Spring	36.1	33.3	33.9	46.5	80259.0	<0.001
Party Composition						
Spouse/partner (no children)	54.9	50.8	55.4	68.4	123281.3	<0.001
Immediate family (incl. children)	41.0	42.4	36.5	38.4	25836.9	<0.001
Immediate family, friends, relatives	28.2	27.0	24.5	34.5	41324.7	<0.001
With friends/business associates	20.4	18.7	22.4	24.9	34680.9	<0.001
Alone	18.3	18.8	16.3	17.7	15247.2	<0.001
Other	3.8	3.6	5.6	3.8	18135.7	<0.001
Accommodation						
Hotels/resorts/country inns	60.3	56.8	61.8	71.4	88418.1	<0.001
Homes of friends & relatives	60.1	60.8	59.7	58.0	9945.7	<0.001
Motels	38.0	36.4	36.2	44.1	29709.9	<0.001
Fully serviced campgrounds/RV parks	22.9	23.4	14.4	26.1	41138.2	<0.001
Unserviced campgrounds/backcountry	19.1	19.5	13.7	20.5	20994.4	<0.001
Rented cottage	15.8	15.1	15.2	18.6	14940.1	<0.001
B & B	15.6	11.9	19.1	25.8	148300.4	<0.001
Campgrounds/RV parks (Elec. only)	14.1	14.6	9.7	14.6	18262.6	<0.001
Other	14.1	13.9	14.6	14.6	6663.7	<0.001
Own cottage	11.4	9.2	14.1	17.3	70891.3	<0.001
Fishing/hunting lodges	4.1	4.1	3.0	4.5	9006.5	<0.001
Sources of Information						
Advice of friends/relatives	53.7	52.8	51.8	57.5	15463.0	<0.001
Past experience	53.4	54.3	46.6	54.0	23279.1	
A travel agent	40.7	35.7	48.2	53.2	137888.3	<0.001
Internet	30.4	25.7	43.0	39.6	142164.2	<0.001
Auto Club (CAA)	28.1	25.4	27.4	37.4	71327.5	<0.001
Travel information offices	28.0	26.0	19.0	39.4	118367.1	<0.001
Articles in newspapers/magazines	26.0	22.9	15.9	41.8	217430.1	<0.001
Advertisements in newspapers/magazines	22.9	20.7	18.0	33.2	98656.5	<0.001
Airline reservation system	18.1	17.2	16.5	22.0	21915.6	<0.001
Travel guide books	16.8	12.5	17.5	30.6	224345.7	<0.001
Travel information received in the mail	14.6	13.4	7.0	22.6	103580.2	<0.001
Other	10.0	10.5	11.0	7.5	18020.0	<0.001
TV program	9.9	9.1	8.0	13.7	31642.8	<0.001
TV advertisements	7.4	7.3	6.6	8.2	9072.2	<0.001
Trade/travel/sportsmen's shows	4.9	4.0	2.3	9.5	77820.8	<0.001

The most frequently used information sources for all three segments were the advice of friends/relatives or past experience. The majority (57.5%) of ‘food + wine’ travellers used the advice of their friends/relatives to plan their vacation trips compared to the ‘food’ (52.8%) and ‘wine’ (51.8%) segments. More ‘food’ travellers (54.3%) than ‘food + wine’ (54.0%) and ‘wine’ (46.6%) enthusiasts relied on their past experience. The ‘food + wine’ travellers were much more likely (53.2%) to use a travel agent as a source of information compared to those in the ‘food’ (35.7%) and ‘wine’ (48.2%).

4.2.6 Getaway Trip Characteristics

Table 23 provides the results for the “getaway trip characteristics” analysis. The most popular season for all three segments was the summer and the least popular was the spring. There was a slight variation in the propensity to travel in the summer among the three groups. ‘Food + wine’ were more likely (89.0%) to take trips in the summer months, followed by ‘food’ (85.5%) and ‘wine’ (77.9%). The same general pattern also holds true in the fall: 75.2% of the ‘food + wine’ segment travelled in the fall versus 64.2% of the ‘food’ and 61.6% of the ‘wine’. The winter and spring seasons were also more popular for the ‘food + wine’ travellers than for the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ segments.

More often than not, all three segments travelled with their spouses/partners as a couple. Here, too, there were inter-segment differences. The majority (77.0%) of the ‘food + wine’ segment preferred to travel with their spouses/partners, compared to the ‘food’ (60.4%) and ‘wine’ (66.3%) travellers. The ‘food’ enthusiasts were more likely (48.4%) than ‘food + wine’ (43.0%) and ‘wine’ (45.3%) travellers to take trips with their immediate family (including children). A significantly higher percentage (45.2%) of ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts travelled with immediate family, friends, and/or other relatives than the ‘food’ (38.3%) and ‘wine’ (33.9%) travellers, respectively.

Table 23 Getaway Trip Characteristics						
	Total % of weighted responses	Food N=4787083 (69.9%)	Wine N=755133 (11.0%)	Food and Wine N=1301377 (19.0%)	χ^2	P
Travel season						
Summer	85.4	85.5	77.9	89.0	57640.3	<0.001
Fall	66.0	64.2	61.6	75.2	65174.2	<0.001
Winter	62.4	60.9	61.4	68.5	32847.8	<0.001
Spring	58.4	56.7	52.3	68.0	69575.5	<0.001
Party Composition						
Spouse/partner (no children)	64.3	60.4	66.3	77.0	120818.7	<0.001
Immediate family (incl children)	47.0	48.4	45.3	43.0	31744.3	<0.001
Immediate family, friends, relatives	39.2	38.3	33.9	45.2	42811.5	<0.001
Alone	23.6	23.4	23.5	24.3	17546.2	<0.001
Other	5.9	5.8	5.9	6.1	17429.2	<0.001
Accommodation						
Homes of friends & relatives	68.5	69.6	60.2	69.0	28047.1	<0.001
Hotels/resorts/country inns	67.4	64.2	73.9	75.1	65911.7	<0.001
Motels	47.3	46.6	43.9	51.7	17080.6	<0.001
Fully serviced campgrounds/RV parks	29.7	30.4	20.1	32.6	38862.1	<0.001
Unserviced campgrounds/backcountry	27.0	27.4	20.4	29.4	22160.5	<0.001
B & B	24.1	18.4	29.3	41.5	281416.5	<0.001
Rented cottage	20.6	20.2	18.1	23.3	12168.4	<0.001
Campgrounds/RV parks (Elec. only)	18.7	19.1	18.0	17.7	5487.8	<0.001
Other	15.7	15.6	14.8	16.5	5013.9	<0.001
Own cottage	13.9	12.2	17.3	18.1	37291.8	<0.001
Fishing/hunting lodges	7.5	7.5	5.8	8.5	8252.7	<0.001
Sources of Information						
Past experience	65.4	64.8	55.4	72.8	62761.0	<0.001
Advice of friends/relatives	64.2	63.9	61.1	67.2	12003.3	<0.001
Articles in newspapers/magazines	36.2	32.4	34.6	50.6	133733.3	<0.001
A travel agent	34.7	30.8	40.9	45.3	99351.3	<0.001
Internet	34.3	29.3	46.6	45.6	157566.7	<0.001
Travel information offices	32.9	29.5	29.4	46.8	131335.8	<0.001
Advertisements in newspapers/magazines	30.5	28.1	26.7	41.0	79308.3	<0.001
Auto Club (CAA)	28.4	26.7	26.6	35.6	40825.3	<0.001
Airline reservation system	17.4	14.8	18.0	26.1	85226.8	<0.001
Travel guide books	16.5	12.4	18.4	29.8	205690.8	<0.001
Travel information received in the mail	16.0	14.4	8.2	25.6	122192.1	<0.001
TV program	13.9	13.1	11.3	18.3	29358.3	<0.001
Other	10.0	9.9	11.4	9.2	7029.1	<0.001
TV advertisements	8.7	9.0	6.3	9.2	10214.9	<0.001
Trade/travel/sportsmen's shows	8.3	7.4	6.8	12.2	34654.8	<0.001

The respondents used a variety of accommodations but more often than not, all three segments stayed with friends or relatives, or at hotels/resorts/country inns. ‘Food’ travellers and ‘food + wine’ travellers were equally likely to stay with family or friends (69.6% and 69.0%); ‘wine’ travellers were only slightly less likely, at 60.2%. More ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts (75.1%) stayed at hotels/resorts/country inns compared to the ‘food’ (64.3%) and ‘wine’ (73.9%) travellers. Also more ‘food + wine’ (51.7%) than ‘food’ (46.6%) and ‘wine’ (43.9%) travellers stayed at motels.

With respect to sources of information used, past experience and the advice of friends/relatives were the most frequently used sources for the three segments. However, there were substantial differences among the three segments. The majority (72.8%) of ‘food + wine’ travellers relied on past experience to plan their getaway trips compared to the ‘food’ (64.8%) and ‘wine’ (55.4%) segments. They also tended to obtain information from friends/relatives more (67.2%) than the ‘food’ (63.9%) and ‘wine’ (61.1%) travellers, respectively. The majority (50.6%) of ‘food + wine’ travellers were much more likely to use articles in newspapers/magazines than those in the ‘food’ (32.4%) and ‘wine’ (34.6%) segments, respectively.

4.2.7 Media Consumption Habits

Table 24 provides the results of the print media analysis. The three most popular media sources were daily newspaper, weekend edition of a newspaper, and community newspaper. About four out of five of the members of each segment tended to read daily newspapers. Specifically, 81.9% of the ‘food + wine’ travellers, 78.5% of ‘food’ travellers, and 80.1% of ‘wine’ travellers. ‘Food + wine’ and ‘wine’ tourists were equally more likely (82.4% and

82.1%) than ‘food’ travellers (76.3%), to read the weekend edition of a newspaper. The majority (73.1%) of the ‘food’ segment travellers read the community newspaper compared to the ‘food + wine’ (71.9%) and ‘wine’ (62.8%) travellers respectively. The ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts reported much higher readership with respect to the travel sections of newspapers. Specifically, more travellers (67.4%) of the ‘food + wine’ segment read the travel section of a weekend newspaper compared to those from the ‘food’ (53.4%) and ‘wine’ (54.2%) segments respectively. They are also much more likely (67.4%) to read the travel section of a weekend edition of a newspaper than the ‘food’ (53.3%) and ‘wine’ (54.2%) enthusiasts. More ‘food + wine’ travellers (58.6%) than ‘food’ (47.4%) and ‘wine’ (50.1%) travellers read the travel section of a daily newspaper. The ‘food + wine’ travellers reported higher readership (55.0%) than the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ travellers with respect to reading a news magazine. More ‘wine’ travellers (50.7%) than ‘food’ (47.0%) and ‘food + wine’ (47.9%) travellers reported reading other magazines.

Table 24 Media Consumption Habits - Print Media						
Publication Readership	Total % of responses	Food N=4787083 (69.9%)	Wine N=755133 (11.0%)	Food and Wine N=1301377 (19.0%)	χ^2	P
Daily newspaper	79.3	78.5	80.1	81.9	7529.2	<0.001
Weekend edition of newspaper	78.1	76.3	82.1	82.4	30740.7	<0.001
Community newspaper	71.8	73.1	62.8	71.9	34467.1	<0.001
Travel section of a weekend newspaper	56.2	53.4	54.2	67.4	103366.2	<0.001
Travel section of weekend edition of newspaper	56.1	53.3	54.2	67.4	108600.5	<0.001
Travel section of daily newspaper	49.8	47.4	50.1	58.6	52469.0	<0.001
News magazines	48.9	46.5	53.4	55.0	35951.4	<0.001
Other magazines	47.6	47.0	50.7	47.9	3587.8	<0.001
Hobby magazines	45.1	46.3	40.6	43.6	9904.0	<0.001
Fashion/homemaking magazines	42.4	42.8	43.2	40.6	2234.3	<0.001
Travel magazines	37.1	36.0	30.6	44.9	50149.5	<0.001
Canadian or National Geographic	36.2	35.2	35.0	40.3	12005.0	<0.001
Other newspapers	34.8	35.1	28.2	37.6	18907.9	<0.001
Sports magazines	22.5	22.9	22.1	21.3	1490.5	<0.001
General interest magazines	22.3	20.4	20.7	30.2	57580.5	<0.001

Table 25 Internet Use						
	Total % of responses	Food N=4787083 (69.9%)	Wine N=755133 (11%)	Food and Wine N=1301377 (19.0%)	χ^2	P
Internet as an information source	55.8	53.4	66.8	58.1	48440.2	<0.001
Personally booked a trip on the Internet	7.8	6.7	8.7	11.3	35995.3	<0.001

With respect to Internet use, the majority of all three segments use the Internet as an information source (Table 25). “Wine’ travellers were most likely, at 66.8%, compared to 53.4% of the ‘food’ segment and 58.1% of the ‘food + wine’ travellers. However, all three segments were not likely to use the Internet to book trips. Only 11.3% of ‘food + wine’ travellers, 6.7% of ‘food’, and 8.7% of ‘wine’ (8.7%) travellers used the Internet to personally book a trip.

4.3 QUESTION 3

- **What distinct categories within the culinary tourism segment can be identified in terms of cross-participation in each of the cuisine-related activities and what is the profile of each one of them is in terms of: a) Demographics; b) Psychographics; c) Trip characteristics; and d) Media consumption?**

4.3.1 Demographics

Table 26 provides the results of the data analysis performed to determine and compare the demographic characteristics of the four clusters of culinary tourists (rural; sophisticated; indifferent; and true cuisine). The demographics analysis has been divided in five sections: gender, age, education level, income level, and occupation.

With respect to gender, females dominated the ‘rural’ and ‘true cuisine’ segments (57.4% and 55.7%). However, there was a nearly equal distribution among the ‘sophisticated’ travellers with respect to gender (50.8% females and 49.2% males). More males (54.8%) represented the ‘indifferent’ segment than females (45.2%).

Table 26 Demographics							
	Total % of responses	Rural N=4234569 (28.6%)	Sophisticated N=2838816 (19.2%)	Indifferent N=6687438 (45.1%)	True Cuisine N=6687438 (7.1%)	χ^2	P
Gender							
Females	50.5	57.4	50.8	45.2	55.7	166405.5	<0.001
Males	49.5	42.6	49.2	54.8	44.3		
Age							
18-25	14.1	8.4	14.7	17.4	13.9		
26-35	20.9	17.9	**23.3**	21.5	22.5		
36-45	25.5	29.2	**23.2**	24.5	22.8	317081.6	<0.001
46-55	17.3	18.3	19.6	15.3	19.9		
56-65	12.2	14.0	10.7	11.4	14.8		
66-75	7.7	9.4	6.0	7.7	5.1		
75+	2.3	2.8	2.3	2.2	1.1		
Education Level							
Elementary/Secondary	40.2	44.1	32.5	42.6	29.6		
Trade/Vocational	6.4	5.3	7.5	6.7	5.9		
College/CEGEP	17.3	17.6	15.7	17.8	17.1	250464.6	<0.001
University	36.0	33.1	44.1	32.7	46.9		
Other	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.5		
Income Level ($)							
Less than 20,000	12.4	12.0	9.5	12.4	5.6		
20,000 - 39,999	24.5	22.3	22.5	24.5	18.0		
40,000 - 59,999	21.7	22.2	19.0	21.7	20.3	311903.9	<0.001
60,000 - 79,999	14.0	14.6	13.8	14.0	15.4		
80,000+	14.3	16.0	24.0	14.3	31.1		

Occupation							
Employee	58.2	56.4	57.2	59.5	59.2		
Self-employed	12.9	12.2	17.1	11.0	15.7	114123.2	<0.001
Working for family (no $)	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.0		
Not Working							
Homemaker	7.1	8.2	6.5	7.0	5.6		
Student	4.1	2.8	6.1	3.8	5.0		
Retired	14.9	17.6	11.4	15.1	12.2	139818.3	<0.001
Unemployed	1.7	1.7	0.9	2.1	1.1		
Other	1.0	1.0	0.7	1.1	1.1		

The majority of ‘rural’, ‘sophisticated’, and ‘true cuisine’ travellers (65.4%, 66.1%, and 65.2%) were between the ages of 26 and 55. Slightly less ‘indifferent’ travellers (61.3%) were represented in these categories. The ‘rural’ segment was slightly older, having an average age of 45.7, whereas the ‘sophisticated’, the ‘indifferent’, and the ‘true cuisine’ travellers were younger – 42.04, 42.07, and 42.3, respectively.

In terms of education, all four groups generally had elementary/secondary educational attainment, although there are significant differences among them. The rural and indifferent segments were more likely to have an elementary/secondary education (44.1% and 42.6%) than the sophisticated and true cuisine travellers (32.5% and 29.6%). The sophisticated and true cuisine travellers were the most likely to have a university education (44.1% and 46.9%).

With respect to annual household incomes, the majority of the ‘rural’ and the ‘indifferent’ segments (44.5% and 46.2%) had an income levels between $20,000 and $59,999. The ‘sophisticated’ and the ‘true cuisine’ travellers had lower representation in these categories (41.5% and 38.3%). However, the latter two segments represented a large majority earning $80,000 and over (24.0% ‘sophisticated’ and 31.1% ‘true cuisine’).

About seven out of ten members of each of the four segments were employed or self-employed: 68.6% of the rural, 74.3% of the sophisticated, 70.5% of the indifferent, and 74.9% of the true cuisine travellers. The sophisticated travellers were more likely (17.1%) to be self-employed than the other segments: 12.2% for the rural, 11.0% for the indifferent and 15.7% for the true cuisine segments. The rural segment was more represented by retired people (17.6%) than the other three segments.

4.3.2 Psychographics – Trip Purpose

All four segments were more likely to travel for pleasure, including visiting friends and relatives, in the past two years preceding the survey (Table 27). Slightly more true cuisine travellers (94.2%) took trips for pleasure compared to the rural (92.1%), the sophisticated (92.5%), and the indifferent (90.8%) segments.

Table 27 Past Trip Purpose

	Total % of responses	Rural N=4234569 (28.6%)	Sophisticated N=2838816 (19.2%)	Indifferent N=6687438 (45.1%)	True Cuisine N=6687438 (7.1%)	χ^2	P
Pleasure incl.VFR	91.7	92.1	92.5	90.8	94.2	19700.489	<0.001
Business	24.9	22.2	28.5	23.7	33.1	79425.255	<0.001
Personal	12.3	11.7	10.3	12.9	16.1	28471.769	<0.001
Education	0.3	0.7	0.0	0.2	0.0	41153.675	<0.001
To move	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	8622.078	<0.001

Table 28 shows the motivating factors behind trips taken for pleasure.

Table 28 Past *Pleasure* Trip Purpose

	Total % of responses	Rural N=4234569 (28.6%)	Sophisticated N=2838816 (19.2%)	Indifferent N=6687438 (45.1%)	True Cuisine N=6687438 (7.1%)	χ^2	P
To rest, relax, recuperate	77.2	79.8	83.1	71.3	87.5	275434.0	<0.001
VFR	72.6	78.4	74.6	66.4	83.0	272039.0	<0.001
To spend time with family	65.6	72.2	67.5	59.0	76.0	276032.5	<0.001
To spend time with good friends	52.4	54.2	59.2	45.2	72.4	384284.0	<0.001
To see natural wonders/natural sites	47.3	55.0	53.8	36.6	67.3	636156.6	<0.001
To visit historic sites	40.6	45.0	51.4	30.1	61.0	672263.0	<0.001
To participate in a hobby or sport	39.7	42.7	41.9	35.4	48.4	130815.9	<0.001
To experience unspoiled nature	39.3	48.4	42.5	29.6	55.3	547568.5	<0.001
For intimacy + romance	38.4	38.0	49.5	30.9	57.3	490294.2	<0.001
To experience adventure and excitement	34.4	33.9	45.0	27.3	53.5	483724.5	<0.001
To experience city life	33.9	34.1	43.6	25.9	58.0	602868.4	<0.001
To be someplace that feels familiar/safe	32.2	39.2	35.9	24.5	43.1	369426.8	<0.001
To experience different cultures/ways of life	28.3	28.6	42.7	18.3	51.4	916459.8	<0.001
To experience the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, being pampered	27.6	22.5	47.6	18.0	55.3	1356963.1	<0.001
To escape winter weather	24.4	24.3	34.2	18.4	36.0	382929.3	<0.001
To visit a popular/trendy place	20.0	18.0	26.9	16.7	30.9	248146.0	<0.001
To visit casinos and gamble	17.1	18.3	19.4	14.2	24.3	120695.8	<0.001
For spiritual/religious experiences	6.7	8.6	6.7	4.5	13.1	172358.5	<0.001
To participate in a hands-on learning	6.6	9.3	7.9	3.5	11.7	234202.4	<0.001

The true cuisine segment uniformly reported higher responses for all past pleasure trip purposes. Resting/relaxing/recuperating were more important reasons for the sophisticated and the true cuisine travellers (83.1% and 87.5%) than for the rural (79.8%) and the indifferent (71.3%). More true cuisine tourists (83.0%) have travelled to visit friends and/or relatives than the rural (78.4%), the sophisticated (74.6%), and the indifferent (66.4%). Spending time with family away from home was a trip motivator for the majority of the rural (72.2%) and the true cuisine (76.0%) segments. The true cuisine enthusiasts were significantly more likely to travel for the purpose of spending time with good friends (72.4%), seeing natural wonders/natural sites (67.3%), visiting historic sites (61.0%), experiencing unspoiled nature (55.3%), and for intimacy and romance (57.3%) compared to those in the remaining three segments. There are notable differences with respect to pleasure trip purposes associated with experiencing city life, different cultures and ways of life, and experiencing the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, being pampered. The true cuisine enthusiasts reported much higher responses (58.0%, 51.4%, and 55.3%) for these trip purposes than the rural, the sophisticated, and the indifferent.

4.3.3 Psychographics – Home Activities

Again, the true cuisine segment almost uniformly reported higher responses for all home activities (Table 29). Not surprisingly, more true cuisine (93.9%) and sophisticated (92.7%) enthusiasts dined in non-fast food restaurants while at home than the rural (83.5%) and the indifferent (82.2%). The majority of the true cuisine segment was more active with respect to exercising (78.2%), swimming (74.1%), picnicking/day-outing (74.6%), and camping/hiking, or backpacking (71.6%) than the rural, the sophisticated, and indifferent travellers. The rural and the true cuisine travellers were equally more likely (64.3% and 64.4%) than the sophisticated (49.6%) and the indifferent (49.1%) to engage in gardening activities while at home. A significantly larger number of true cuisine enthusiasts attended music concerts (72.0%), a live theatre (66.0%), and a museum (59.9%) than the rural, the sophisticated, and the indifferent segments. They were also much more active with respect to biking (61.8%) compared to the other three groups.

Table 29 Home Activities							
	Total % of responses	Rural N=4234569 (28.6%)	Sophisticated N=2838816 (19.2%)	Indifferent N=6687438 (45.1%)	True Cuisine N=6687438 (7.1%)	χ^2	P
Restaurants (no fast food)	85.4	83.5	92.7	82.2	93.9	250986.1	<0.001
Exercise - home/fitness club	64.6	65.9	70.0	59.4	78.2	202834.0	<0.001
Swimming in pools/natural bodies of water	63.1	65.4	63.6	59.7	74.1	97692.6	<0.001
Picnic/day-outing	60.4	66.0	62.8	53.6	74.6	279772.8	<0.001
Camping/hiking/backpacking	56.6	57.8	57.4	53.2	71.6	130471.8	<0.001
Gardening	54.6	64.3	49.6	49.1	64.4	311761.1	<0.001
Music concerts	50.9	51.2	58.1	44.3	72.0	363732.1	<0.001
Biking	49.3	49.5	50.6	46.6	61.8	86264.3	<0.001
Live theatre	46.6	47.0	55.6	39.5	66.0	395378.4	<0.001
Museum	44.6	48.1	47.5	38.8	59.9	221022.2	<0.001
Dancing	41.8	43.0	44.7	37.4	57.0	166757.1	<0.001
Zoo/botanical garden	40.4	46.5	42.2	33.8	53.1	274204.6	<0.001
Ice-skating	38.6	39.3	38.4	37.8	41.8	7306.0	<0.001
Amusement/ theme parks	36.2	37.4	39.4	33.4	40.2	65218.7	<0.001
Professional sports events	35.9	34.7	40.4	33.3	44.7	109147.7	<0.001
Art gallery/art show	35.7	37.1	45.2	27.6	56.6	505450.8	<0.001
Golf	33.2	29.6	40.9	30.9	41.7	150598.8	<0.001
Fishing	29.2	30.6	28.3	27.8	34.5	26434.3	<0.001
Sailing/other boating	26.0	25.7	27.6	24.0	34.6	57698.5	<0.001
Team sports	23.9	21.5	25.4	24.8	24.2	20108.7	<0.001
Downhill skiing/snowboarding	23.0	18.6	30.9	20.7	33.5	231441.0	<0.001
Canoeing/kayaking	21.6	24.3	24.1	16.9	34.3	215158.3	<0.001
Racquet sports	18.6	13.9	25.0	17.1	28.8	220750.0	<0.001

Cross-country skiing	18.3	18.5	21.6	15.6	25.1	85548.2	<0.001
Gambling at casinos	14.2	14.0	16.4	13.4	13.8	15377.7	<0.001
Snowmobiling	12.3	12.3	13.5	12.1	9.4	11987.8	<0.001
B&B in own city/town	9.2	8.6	10.7	7.8	16.3	88836.7	<0.001
Ballet	9.1	8.2	13.2	6.3	19.4	280797.6	<0.001
Opera	9.1	7.9	12.3	6.6	21.2	291993.3	<0.001
Hunting	8.0	8.5	7.5	8.3	5.2	14727.8	<0.001

The sophisticated segment was more likely to participate in team sports (25.4%), to gamble at casinos (16.4%), and to go snowmobiling (13.5%) while at home than the other groups. The rural and the indifferent reported equally higher participation rates in hunting (8.5% and 8.3%) compared to the other two segments.

4.3.4 Psychographics – Trip Activities

The results of the trip activities analysis are presented in Table 30.

Outdoor

True cuisine travellers engaged far more in outdoor activities than the rural, the sophisticated, and the indifferent segments. They were the most likely group to engage in picnics (76.8%), in swimming activities (lakes - 64.3% and oceans - 55.1%), to sunbathe/sit on the beach (66.3%), and to engage in wildlife viewing (53.0%) during their trips away from home.

Cultural:

Not surprisingly, virtually all true cuisine (98.6%) and sophisticated (97.7%) travellers dined in restaurants offering regional/local cooking. While a majority of rural travellers also engaged in this activity, the percentage was lower (81.7%). Dining at internationally acclaimed restaurants was significantly more popular activity among the true cuisine segment (82.1%) than among the rural (2.6%) and the indifferent travellers (3.0%). The sophisticated cuisine enthusiasts were also more likely to dine at internationally acclaimed restaurants (68.1%) although less likely than the true cuisine segment.

Members of the true cuisine segment reported significantly higher participation in shopping activities: clothing, shoes, and jewellery (88.6%), books and music (89.8%), local arts and crafts (82.8%), antiques (65.3%), and gourmet foods (92.9%). They were also much more likely than the other three segments to read for relaxation/personal interest (85.3%), go to the movies (77.6%), and to visit local outdoor cafes (77.2%). Not surprisingly, the rural segment was more likely (82.5%) to visit farmers' fairs and markets than the other three groups.

Table 30 Trip Activities

	Total % of responses	Rural N=4234569 (28.6%)	Sophisticated N=2838816 (19.2%)	Indifferent N=6687438 (45.1%)	True Cuisine N=6687438 (7.1%)	χ^2	P
Outdoor							
Picnics in park settings	50.1	62.9	49.6	38.0	76.8	971007.0	<0.001
Swimming in lakes	47.9	57.0	50.5	38.5	64.3	498851.8	<0.001
Sunbathing/sitting on a beach	43.6	50.6	50.7	32.6	66.3	691758.6	<0.001
Other wildlife viewing	34.9	45.1	33.4	26.3	53.0	568332.5	<0.001
Swimming in oceans	30.4	29.9	41.1	22.4	55.1	660080.7	<0.001
Cultural							
Restaurant dining (regional/local)	75.7	81.7	97.7	58.9	98.6	2150797.0	<0.001
Shop/browse (clothing, shoes, jewelry)	62.9	67.5	78.5	49.2	88.6	1163920.0	<0.001
Read for relaxation/personal interest	60.7	68.0	74.5	46.3	85.3	1170492.0	<0.001
Shop/browse (book/music stores)	56.1	65.0	69.3	39.4	89.8	1575278.0	<0.001
Movies	48.3	56.6	57.7	34.3	77.6	1104947.0	<0.001
Shop/browse (local arts & crafts)	45.1	57.6	54.3	27.3	82.8	1830568.0	<0.001
Local outdoor cafes	38.5	40.7	58.5	22.5	77.2	1871959.0	<0.001
Shop/browse (antiques)	32.7	43.6	42.2	16.5	65.3	1646993.0	<0.001
General history/heritage museums	32.4	41.4	36.1	20.9	59.8	935290.5	<0.001
Farmers' fairs/markets	31.7	82.5	13.3	0.7	73.8	9328388.0	<0.001
Natural wonders	30.1	35.9	37.5	19.7	52.3	730240.0	<0.001
Local festival fairs (fall fairs)	27.1	47.8	24.5	10.6	56.6	2311787.0	<0.001
Theatre	26.7	33.2	32.2	15.4	57.0	1068020.0	<0.001
Art galleries	24.5	28.4	34.2	13.1	55.0	1179859.0	<0.001
Restaurant dining (internationally acclaimed restaurants)	21.0	2.6	68.1	3.0	82.1	8336105.0	<0.001
Shop/browse (gourmet foods)	20.9	21.3	40.4	1.1	92.9	5538407.0	<0.001

Touring							
Day - coastal/lakeshore scenic drives	46.7	54.6	53.6	34.7	72.8	836466.9	<0.001
Wandering around small towns/villages (1+ nights)	44.9	51.3	53.7	33.2	69.1	775055.5	<0.001

Touring:

The true cuisine enthusiasts again reported significantly higher participation in touring activities: 72.8% took coastal/lakeshore scenic drives and 69.1% wandered around small towns/villages where they stayed one or more nights.

4.3.5 Vacation Trip Characteristics

Table 31 provides data on four trip characteristics: travel season, party composition, accommodation, and sources of information. The most popular season for all segments was the summer and the least popular was the spring. The propensity of the first three groups to travel in the summer was approximately equal: rural – 76.5%, sophisticated – 74.8%, and indifferent - 74.2%. However, the true cuisine segment was, again, more likely to take trips in the summer (81.2%). The winter, fall, and spring were much more popular travel seasons among the true cuisine enthusiasts than among the other travel groups.

In terms of travelling party composition, more often than not, all three segments travelled with their spouses/ partners as a couple. However, the true cuisine travellers dominated again. Specifically, more true cuisine enthusiasts (64.4%) preferred to travel with their spouses/partners, than the other groups. The rural segment was more likely (44.8%) to take trips with immediate family members (including children).

The respondents used a variety of accommodations but all four segments were more likely to stay with friends/relatives or at hotels/resorts/country inns. The rural and true cuisine groups were almost equally more likely to stay with family or friends (60.6% and 61.9%) than the sophisticated and the indifferent (56.0% and 53.9%). The large majority of true cuisine and sophisticated travellers (72.1% and 66.2%) stayed at hotel/resorts/country inns compared to the rural (51.9%) and the indifferent (47.1%) segments. The rural and the true cuisine travellers were equally more likely to stay at motels (37.4% and 38.0%) than the sophisticated and the indifferent.

Table 31 Vacation Trip Characteristics							
	Total % of responses	Rural N=4234569 (28.6%)	Sophisticated N=2838816 (19.2%)	Indifferent N=6687438 (45.1%)	True Cuisine N=6687438 (7.1%)	χ^2	P
Travel season							
Summer	75.6	76.5	74.8	74.2	81.2	36893.6	<0.001
Winter	43.7	44.2	49.8	38.1	53.9	154430.7	<0.001
Fall	34.2	36.5	36.8	28.7	46.5	157093.0	<0.001
Spring	31.5	31.1	37.6	26.0	45.0	208101.6	<0.001
Party Composition							
Spouse/partner (no children)	49.5	48.5	54.8	44.5	64.4	178269.6	<0.001
Immediate family (incl children)	38.4	44.8	37.0	34.5	39.9	105252.0	<0.001
Immediate family, friends, relatives	24.5	26.5	26.9	20.2	33.4	120253.4	<0.001
With friends/business associates (no family)	19.8	16.1	23.8	18.8	28.1	116010.1	<0.001
Alone	17.6	18.5	16.2	17.0	22.0	35359.2	<0.001
Other	3.7	3.3	5.0	3.2	3.9	33451.4	<0.001
Accommodation							
Homes of friends & relatives	57.2	61.9	56.0	53.9	60.6	66371.3	<0.001
Hotels/resorts/country inns	54.6	51.9	66.2	47.1	72.1	379458.4	<0.001
Motels	33.8	37.4	35.8	29.4	38.0	80360.5	<0.001
Fully serviced campgrounds/RV parks	20.4	24.3	19.7	16.7	27.0	108939.4	<0.001
Unserviced campgrounds/backcountry	17.4	19.9	16.2	15.4	22.3	55549.0	<0.001
Rented cottage	14.5	15.9	14.7	12.4	20.0	53684.9	<0.001
Other	13.2	12.5	13.8	13.3	13.6	10304.5	<0.001
B & B	11.9	10.7	16.7	8.0	22.6	240834.1	<0.001
Campgrounds/RV parks (Elec. only)	11.4	16.6	9.1	8.2	15.3	178457.5	<0.001
Own cottage	10.2	10.2	8.8	9.5	17.0	63735.9	<0.001

Fishing/hunting lodges	3.7	4.5	3.4	2.8	5.5	33975.7	<0.001
Sources of Information							
Past experience	50.1	55.8	45.6	46.7	59.1	134348.5	<0.001
Advice of friends/relatives	48.6	51.3	52.7	42.5	59.6	154260.9	<0.001
A travel agent	36.5	32.4	48.2	30.6	50.6	342796.0	<0.001
Internet	25.8	23.6	34.1	20.4	38.9	272952.8	<0.001
Auto Club (CAA)	23.3	26.4	24.5	19.2	30.9	112295.4	<0.001
Travel information offices	23.1	25.8	24.2	17.9	37.6	214367.3	<0.001
Articles in newspapers/magazines	20.3	22.5	22.3	13.5	41.6	432757.7	<0.001
Advertisements in newspapers/magazines	16.4	20.0	17.6	9.8	34.4	425066.2	<0.001
Airline reservation system	15.2	14.3	18.7	12.1	25.6	159966.3	<0.001
Travel guide books	12.9	11.2	18.8	8.4	26.8	356003.3	<0.001
Travel information received in the mail	11.2	14.3	10.9	7.2	20.7	214967.3	<0.001
Other	9.1	9.8	9.7	8.4	8.2	30201.6	<0.001
TV program	6.6	8.0	6.7	3.6	17.6	284216.5	<0.001
TV advertisements	5.7	6.3	5.6	3.8	13.6	166352.7	<0.001
Trade/travel/sportsmen's shows	3.7	4.0	4.0	2.4	8.0	94520.2	<0.001

The most frequently used information sources for the four groups were past experience and the advice of friends/relatives. The true cuisine and rural segments were more likely to rely on past experience to plan their getaway trips (59.1% and 55.8%) than the other two groups who were almost equally less likely (45.6% and 46.7%). The true cuisine travellers were more likely to seek the advice of friends and relatives and a travel agent (59.6% and 50.6%).

4.3.6 Getaway Trip Characteristics

Table 32 presents information on getaway trip characteristics. Again, the most popular season for all segments was the summer and the least popular was the spring. There was a slight variation in the propensity to travel in the summer among the four groups. The true cuisine travellers were more likely (91.1%) to take trips in the summer months, followed by sophisticated (85.1%) and rural (84.6%). The indifferent group also tended to travel in the summer but was less likely to do so (80.3%). The same general pattern also holds true in the fall: 76.6% of the true cuisine segment travelled in the fall versus 62.7% and 62.8% for the rural and sophisticated, respectively. The indifferent segment was far less likely (49.4%) to take trips in the fall. The winter and spring seasons were also more popular for the true cuisine travellers than for the other groups.

With respect to travelling party, more often than not, all three segments travelled with their spouses/partners as a couple. Here, too, there were inter-segment differences. The majority (72.7%) of the true cuisine segment preferred to travel with their spouses/partners, followed by the sophisticated (65.3%). The rural and indifferent group were less likely to travel as a couple (59.3% and 51.5%). The true cuisine enthusiasts were also more likely

(52.4%) to take trips with their immediate family (including children), followed closely by the rural segment (48.4%). A significantly higher percentage (45.4%) of true cuisine enthusiasts travelled with immediate family, friends, and/or other relatives than the other groups.

Table 32 Getaway Trip Characteristics

	Total % of responses	Rural N=4234569 (28.6%)	Sophisticated N=2838816 (19.2%)	Indifferent N=6687438 (45.1%)	True Cuisine N=6687438 (7.1%)	χ^2	P
Travel season							
Summer	83.4	84.6	85.1	80.3	91.1	105998.7	<0.001
Fall	58.1	62.7	62.8	49.4	76.6	377786.2	<0.001
Winter	57.6	54.4	67.2	52.0	74.4	307404.0	<0.001
Spring	52.0	53.5	57.0	45.6	68.6	245594.0	<0.001
Party Composition							
Spouse/partner (no children)	58.3	59.3	65.3	51.5	72.7	240950.1	<0.001
Immediate family (incl children)	43.6	48.4	41.7	39.8	52.4	106755.8	<0.001
Immediate family, friends, relatives	34.3	37.1	36.1	29.4	45.4	132027.2	<0.001
With friends/business associates (no family)	30.6	26.0	35.4	29.2	42.0	132332.0	<0.001
Alone	22.2	20.0	23.6	21.2	31.5	71346.9	<0.001
Other	5.9	5.0	7.9	5.1	8.5	49914.8	<0.001
Accommodation							
Homes of friends & relatives	63.9	69.0	64.0	58.9	72.7	138502.1	<0.001
Hotels/resorts/country inns	61.3	60.8	70.1	54.4	76.9	297240.8	<0.001
Motels	42.2	46.9	45.1	35.8	52.1	177634.9	<0.001
Fully serviced campgrounds/RV parks	26.2	29.0	24.5	23.5	35.4	89652.9	<0.001
Unserviced campgrounds/backcountry	25.1	26.7	24.7	22.9	32.5	55007.2	<0.001
Rented cottage	18.0	18.9	18.1	15.1	30.6	145029.6	<0.001
B & B	17.3	16.5	25.9	10.6	35.0	524306.7	<0.001
Campgrounds/RV parks	15.4	19.6	14.8	12.3	18.8	104755.2	<0.001

Other	14.9	15.5	14.3	14.4	17.5	14880.8	<0.001
Own cottage	12.5	11.6	12.8	11.8	19.3	53729.7	<0.001
Fishing/hunting lodges	6.4	6.9	6.8	5.2	10.4	49073.8	<0.001
Sources of Information							
Past experience	61.0	65.6	62.2	55.2	72.4	207725.7	<0.001
Advice of friends/relatives	58.4	60.0	65.7	51.5	71.3	277657.3	<0.001
Articles in newspapers/magazines	26.9	30.7	32.9	17.7	48.0	577711.4	<0.001
A travel agent	29.4	27.2	39.3	22.9	47.6	457117.8	<0.001
Internet	29.6	27.4	38.1	24.1	45.6	357658.7	<0.001
Travel information offices	27.1	30.4	30.4	20.1	44.6	373542.9	<0.001
Advertisements in newspapers/magazines	23.9	28.0	25.5	17.2	41.7	396557.7	<0.001
Auto Club (CAA)	23.3	26.4	26.3	18.3	30.9	202701.4	<0.001
Airline reservation system	13.6	12.4	17.2	9.8	28.9	13.6	<0.001
Travel guide books	12.6	11.8	17.0	7.6	31.5	555155.3	<0.001
Travel information received in the mail	11.3	14.1	11.3	7.6	24.2	534322.6	<0.001
TV program	9.1	11.1	11.9	4.2	20.8	427395.7	<0.001
Other	10.9	11.5	10.4	10.6	11.0	82101.3	<0.001
TV advertisements	6.7	7.5	7.1	4.4	15.1	232823.2	<0.001
Trade/travel/sportsmen's shows	6.0	6.7	6.3	4.0	13.1	204331.0	<0.001

The respondents used a variety of accommodations but more often than not, all four segments stayed at the homes of friends or relatives, or at hotels/resorts/country inns. True cuisine travellers were more likely to stay with family or friends (72.7%) followed by the rural segment (69.0%). The majority of true cuisine enthusiasts (76.9%) and the sophisticated (70.1%) stayed at hotels/resorts/country inns. Motels were also used more by the true cuisine segment (52.1%) than by the other three groups.

The most frequently used information sources for all four segments were past experience and the advice of friends/relatives. The true cuisine and rural segments were more likely to rely on past experience to plan their getaway trips (72.4% and 65.6%) than the other two groups. The advice of friends and relatives was used more by the true cuisine and the sophisticated travellers (71.3% and 65.7%).

4.3.7 Media Consumption Habits

Table 33 provides the results of the print media analysis. The three most popular media sources were daily newspaper, weekend edition of a newspaper, and community newspaper. About four out of five of the members of the rural, the sophisticated, and the true cuisine segments tend to read daily newspapers. Specifically, 82.3% of the true cuisine travellers, 78.3% of rural travellers, 77.0% of sophisticated enthusiasts.

Table 33 Media Consumption Habits - Print Media

	Total % of responses	Rural N=4234569 (28.6%)	Sophisticated N=2838816 (19.2%)	Indifferent N=6687438 (45.1%)	True Cuisine N=6687438 (7.1%)	χ^2	P
Daily newspaper	76.8	78.3	77.0	74.8	82.3	38258.3	<0.001
Weekend edition of newspaper	75.5	76.8	76.8	73.0	82.7	57849.5	<0.001
Community newspaper	69.0	74.3	63.5	67.7	71.1	104823.9	<0.001
Travel section of weekend edition of newspaper	50.2	55.4	55.1	42.9	62.2	293308.1	<0.001
Other magazines	46.3	45.3	46.0	45.8	55.0	34813.4	<0.001
News magazines	44.8	43.0	52.5	40.6	57.5	191389.6	<0.001
Travel section of daily newspaper	44.5	48.0	49.7	38.5	54.1	205060.8	<0.001
Hobby magazines	38.1	43.7	39.9	31.4	53.1	288929.5	<0.001
Fashion/homemaking magazines	37.1	40.7	41.1	31.9	44.6	145649.0	<0.001
Other newspapers	32.0	33.1	36.0	28.1	41.8	122719.9	<0.001
Canadian or National Geographic	30.7	33.6	31.6	26.3	44.4	172044.5	<0.001
Travel magazines	30.5	33.1	32.5	24.9	50.3	311228.3	<0.001
Sports magazines	23.3	21.2	25.4	23.4	25.0	19658.6	<0.001
General interest magazines	19.9	17.5	23.6	17.5	34.8	211466.0	<0.001

The indifferent were less likely, at 74.8%. The rural and the sophisticated groups were equally likely (76.8%) to read the weekend edition of a newspaper and the true cuisine segment was most likely (82.3%). The rural segment reported higher readership (74.3%) with respect to the community newspaper than the other groups. The sophisticated group was the least likely to read this type of paper (63.5%). The true cuisine segment reported higher readership with respect to the travel sections of newspapers or travel magazines. Specifically, more travellers (62.2%) of the true cuisine group read the travel section of a weekend edition of a newspaper than the rural and the sophisticated who were equally less likely (55.4% and 55.1%), and the indifferent who were the least likely (42.9%). The true cuisines also read the travel section of a daily newspaper more (54.1%) more than the remaining three segments. A significantly higher percentage (50.3%) of true cuisine travellers read travel magazines than the rural (33.1%), the sophisticated (32.5%), and the indifferent (24.9%) groups.

With respect to Internet use, the majority of all segments use the Internet as an information source (Table 34). The true cuisine and sophisticated travellers are equally most likely, at 55.1% and 54.5%, compared to 42.3% of the rural and 44.0% of the indifferent segments. However, all four segments are not likely to use the Internet to book trips.

Table 34 Media Consumption Habits - Internet Use

	Total % of responses	Rural N=4234569 (28.6%)	Sophisticated N=2838816 (19.2%)	Indifferent N=6687438 (45.1%)	True Cuisine N=6687438 (7.1%)	χ^2	P
Internet as an information source	46.3	42.3	54.5	44.0	55.1	208591.7	<0.001
Personally booked a trip on the Internet	6.6	5.1	9.0	5.3	14.5	196511.4	<0.001

5.0 DISCUSSION

This section summarizes the findings in Chapter 4. The discussion is organized around the three research questions.

5.1 Question 1

The first research objective was to compare the Canadian culinary tourists to the rest of the Canadian travelling population. It was found that cuisine travellers are represented by middle-age females, who hold university education and are employed. Compared to the non-cuisine travellers, they also tend to have higher incomes. These findings are consistent with studies on wine tourists (Dodd, 1995; Morris & King, 1997; Mitchell & Hall, 2001; Telfer & Hashimoto, 2001; Williams & Dossa, 2001).

While not travelling, the cuisine enthusiasts engage in a variety of activities at their places of residence. As could be expected, compared to non-culinary tourists, this travel segment is more interested in dining in non-fast food restaurants. Also, cuisine travellers appear to be fitness-oriented; they are more physically active in terms of exercising at home or a fitness club, swimming, biking, and hiking compared to the rest of Canadian travellers. They also like to go out for picnics and to engage in gardening. As a group, the culinary enthusiasts participate in a range of cultural activities while at home: attending music concerts and a live theatre, as well as visiting museums and art galleries.

Overall, Canadians travel mostly for pleasure. The most important travel motivators for the large majority of cuisine travellers are resting, relaxing, and recuperating as well as visiting friends and/or relatives and spending time with family away from home. The culinary enthusiasts also identified spending time with good friends and visiting natural and historic sites as important reasons for taking trips. It is surprising that experiencing the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, and being pampered was not high on the list of trip motivators for the cuisine enthusiasts given that fine cuisine and wine are components of culinary tourism. Perhaps the addition of “experiencing the good life” and “being pampered” took the focus away from the culinary-related components of fine cuisine and wine and gave a connotation of “being spoiled”.

The cuisine segment appears much more active and diverse than the non-cuisine travellers with respect to participation in trip activities. The culinary tourists engage in a variety of outdoor, cultural/entertainment, and touring activities. Similar to what they do on a regular basis, the cuisine enthusiasts go on picnics and stay active by swimming in lakes while travelling. They also indulge in sunbathing or sitting on the beach. However, activities in the cultural/entertainment category are most dominant among the cuisine lovers. Not surprisingly, culinary enthusiasts are most interested in exploring local cuisines by dining in restaurants offering regional/local cooking, unlike the non-cuisine travellers who do not appear particularly interested. Also, as might be expected, they visit farmers’ fairs and markets and local outdoor cafés. Shopping is a significant trip activity for the cuisine travellers. Although shopping for clothing, shoes, and jewellery is more popular, the culinary enthusiasts also purchase books and music and are interested in browsing or buying local arts and crafts, and antique items.

Although not as active as in the outdoor and cultural/entertainment activities, the culinary travellers engage in some touring on their trips in Canada. Specifically, they show appreciation for scenic drives along coastlines or lakeshores. In addition, the cuisine segment demonstrates desire for exploration by wandering around small towns/villages for one or more nights, perhaps to discover local cultures and tastes.

With respect to vacations and getaways, over half of the culinary tourists travel in the summer accompanied by a spouse/partner. During their trips, they stay at the homes of friends/relatives or at hotels/resorts/country inns. Typically, the cuisine enthusiasts rely on past experience and the advice of friends and relatives when planning their vacation or getaway trips. Interesting is the fact that the Internet was not among the popular sources of information as far as trip planning is concerned even though more than half of cuisine travellers reported using the Internet as an information source on a regular basis. Perhaps, there is a perception that this media source does not provide enough information pertaining to culinary tourism.

The culinary tourists show high readership preferences for the daily and weekend editions of newspapers as well as for the community newspaper. In addition, they are interested in looking through the travel sections of newspapers (daily and weekend).

5.2 Question 2

The second research objective was to compare Canadian travellers engaging in food, wine, and both food and wine activities on certain variables pertaining to demographics, psychographics, trip characteristics, and media consumption habits.

All three groups of culinary tourists tend to be represented by a female majority with the ‘food’ lovers having the highest proportion. The ‘food + wine’ tourists are almost equally represented by females and males.

With respect to age, all three segments fall within 26 and 55 years of age. More ‘food’ and ‘wine’ enthusiasts are between 36 and 45 years, or have an average age of 44 years. A large proportion of ‘food + wine’ travellers are older - between 56 and 65, or 46 years on average.

In terms of education and income, the “food + wine’ enthusiasts is the group with the highest proportion of members with university education earning over $40,000 and who also have a significant portion earning over $80,000. The ‘wine’ tourists are the next group having attained university education and earning $40,000 or more. In fact, they also have high representation of people with incomes of $80,000 and over. In contrast, the ‘food’ segment is represented by travellers with elementary/secondary school education with incomes between $20,000 and $59,999.

Looking at occupation status, members of all three segments are employed. Among those who are not working, the retired cohort is a majority, with the ‘food + wine’ travellers having the largest representation.

While not travelling, the three groups of cuisine enthusiasts participate in a variety of activities. Overall, the ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts are the most diverse in their interests. Not surprisingly, dining in non-fast food restaurants is the most popular activity by far. The larger proportion of the ‘wine’ and ‘food + wine’ segments enjoy this activity while the ‘food’ segment, although still active, is not as involved. The ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts are more likely to keep fit than the ‘wine’ segment with respect to participation in physical activities – exercising at home/fitness club, swimming, hiking, and biking. The ‘food’ segment is also more active in these categories, although not to such extent as the “food + wine” group. Picnicking/day-outing and gardening are also preferred pastime pursuits for the majority of “food + wine” enthusiasts. The ‘food’ travellers also showed interest in spending their leisure engaged in these activities whereas the ‘wine’ segment did not seem as active. Some performing arts (music concerts and theatre) and museums and art galleries/ art shows attract well over half of the ‘food + wine” travellers. Although the ‘food’ and ‘wine’ members also attend these types of venues, they seem significantly less enthusiastic.

All three groups of cuisine tourists travel mostly to rest, relax, and recuperate as well as to visit friends and/or relatives. Overall, the ‘food + wine’ segment appears very diverse in terms of trip purpose(s); this group seeks a variety of experiences. Spending time with family away from home is an important trip motivator for the ‘food’ and ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts but not as important for the ‘wine’ segment. The large majority of travellers from the ‘food + wine’ group take trips for the purpose of enjoying the company of good friends and visiting historic sites. They are also more interested in travel providing opportunities for experiencing and enjoying nature and for intimacy and romance. Generally, the ‘food’ enthusiasts are also motivated by such experiences, more so than the ‘wine’ segment but not as much as the ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts. Over half of the ‘food + wine’ travellers seek opportunities for experiencing different cultures/ways of life and the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, and being pampered. They also enjoy experiences offered by the big city.

The three groups of culinary tourists engage in a variety of outdoor, cultural/entertainment, and touring activities. However, the ‘food + wine’ segment is the most active and diverse. The ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts are consistent in pursuing the same types of outdoor activities they do at home. While travelling, they engage picnic activities and stay active by swimming in lakes and oceans. Sunbathing or sitting on the beach is another outdoor activity engaged in by the majority of ‘food + wine’ travellers. While the ‘food’ lovers are also interested in picnicking in park settings, swimming in lakes, and sunbathing, they have lower participation in these categories. The ‘wine’ segment is least active.

More than half of the ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts participated in fourteen cultural/entertainment activities, while this was the case for nine of the activities for the ‘food’ segment and just three for the ‘wine’ travellers. Not surprisingly, the ‘food’ and ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts are most interested in sampling local cuisines in restaurants offering regional/local cooking. Although more than half of travellers from the ‘wine’ segment also engage in this activity, they do not appear as enthusiastic. Shopping for clothing, shoes, and jewellery and purchasing books and music is a significant trip activity for the ‘food’ and ‘food + wine’ segments. In addition, travellers from these groups read for relaxation/personal interest more than the ‘wine’ segment. As expected, the ‘food’ enthusiasts are the majority visiting farmers’ fairs and markets, followed by the ‘food + wine’ tourists. The ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts are also highly interested in browsing or buying local arts and crafts, and antique items. Interestingly, they represent the only majority of travellers looking for and buying gourmet foods and visiting local outdoor cafés. As already mentioned, the ‘food + wine’ travellers are the most active and diverse group with respect to trip activities; they are much more interested in going to the movies, visiting natural wonders, and attending theatres and art galleries.

Although not as active as in the outdoor and cultural/entertainment activities, the three segments tend to engage in some touring on their trips in Canada. Again, the ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts represent the highest proportion of participants. They take scenic drives along coastlines or lakeshores and wander around small towns/villages for one or more nights, perhaps in search for local cultures and tastes. However, going to wineries for day visits and tasting is the activity most engaged in by the ‘food + wine’ travellers. Although this type of activity is the most popular activity overall for the ‘wine’ lovers, surprisingly, they show slightly lower participation. It is also interesting that the ‘wine’ enthusiasts are more likely to wander around small towns and villages for one or more nights than to take tours around a region’s wineries for the same length of time.

With respect to vacations and getaways, the three groups of culinary travellers are more inclined to take getaway trips and the summer months are their preferred time to travel. During their trip(s), the ‘food + wine’ enthusiasts are the majority travelling with their spouses/partners as a couple; the ‘wine’ segment is also likely to have the same travel party. In contrast, the ‘food’ travellers tend to be accompanied by their immediate family members (including children). During both, getaway and vacation trips, the ‘wine’ and ‘food + wine’ tourists stay predominantly at hotels/resorts/country inns, whereas the ‘food’ segment use the hospitality of friends and/or relatives. This maybe attributed to the fact that the ‘food +wine’ and ‘wine’ travellers typically earn higher incomes than the ‘food’ segment and are, therefore, able to afford to pay for commercial accommodation while travelling. Another explanation could be that because the ‘food’ lovers typically travel for the purpose of visiting family or friends, it is only natural that they would be staying with them.

Typically, the cuisine enthusiasts rely on past experience and the advice of friends and relatives when planning their vacation or getaway trips. Travellers from the ‘food’ segment tend to rely on their past experience when planning both their vacation and getaway trips. The ‘wine’ enthusiasts, on the other hand, tend to consult their friends and/or relatives when organizing both their vacation and getaway escapes. The ‘food + wine’ travellers are more inclined to seek the advice of friends and relatives for their vacation plans but rely on past experience when planning getaway trips. Although the Internet is not among the popular sources of information as far as trip planning is concerned, the ‘wine’ enthusiasts are the majority using this media vehicle to plan their vacation and getaway trips. This may be explained by the plethora of links on the web related not only to wine as a beverage but also as a travel product. In fact, the ‘wine’ travellers are also the group which uses the Internet as an information source the most.

The ‘wine’ and ‘food + wine’ culinary tourists show strong interest in reading the daily and weekend editions of newspapers while the ‘food’ segment prefers the community newspaper. The ‘food + wine’ travellers demonstrate the highest interest in browsing the travel sections of newspapers (daily and weekend) compared to the other two segments. This is not surprising since they seem to be the group travelling the most. The ‘wine’ enthusiasts have high readership preferences for news and other types of magazines.

5.3 Question 3

The last purpose of this study was to identify groups of culinary tourists with respect to cross-participation in the culinary-related activities identified in Chapter 1 and to compare them in terms of demographics, psychographics, trip characteristics, and media consumption habits. The four groups that have been identified are: the ‘rural’; ‘sophisticated’; ‘indifferent’; and ‘true cuisine’.

Females dominate the ‘rural’ and the ‘true cuisine’ segments. The ‘indifferent’ segment is more represented by males and the ‘sophisticated’ has an equal distribution of females and males.

The large proportion of all four segments tends to be between 26 and 55 years of age. The ‘rural’ and ‘indifferent’ travellers have more participants in the 36-45 cohorts. The ‘rural’ enthusiasts also tend to have older members who are 56 years and over and an average age of 46. The ‘sophisticated’ and ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts have younger representation – with an average age of 42.

With respect to education and income, the ‘rural’ and the ‘indifferent’ travellers have more members with elementary/secondary school education who earn between $20,000 and $59,999. On the other hand, the ‘sophisticated’ and the ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts represent the majority with university qualifications. The ‘sophisticated’ travellers are at the low and high spectrum of the income categories – earning between $20,000 and $39,000 and $80,000 and over. This gap may be explained by the fact that the ‘sophisticated’ enthusiasts also have younger members who are still at the beginning of their careers and earn lower incomes. The ‘true cuisine’ travellers also follow similar patterns but their incomes are higher – between $40,000 and $59,999 and $80,000 and over.

In terms of employment status, all four groups tend to be employees with the ‘indifferent’ and ‘true cuisine’ representing the majority. Of those who are not working, the retired group is the majority with the ‘rural’ segment having the highest representation.

With respect to activities engaged in on a regular basis, dining in restaurants (other than fast food) is the most popular home activity among the ‘sophisticated’ and the ‘true cuisine’ lovers. The ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts demonstrate much higher interest in other daily activities as well. They engage in a variety of physical activities while not travelling; this segment exercises at home or a fitness club, engages in swimming, biking, and in hiking/backpacking. Picnicking and gardening are activities more pursued by the ‘rural’ and ‘true cuisine’ segments. Members from the ‘true cuisine’ group are also significantly more interested in attending a variety of cultural venues: music concerts, live theatre, museums, and art galleries/shows. They also engage in dancing and visit zoos/botanical gardens.

All four segments travel for pleasure seeking a variety of experiences but mainly to rest, relax, and recuperate. The ‘true cuisine’ tourists are by far the most diverse group. Representatives from this segment travel to visit their friends and/or relatives and at the same time, to spend time with their families away from home. The ‘rural’ enthusiasts are also more family-oriented when travelling than the ‘sophisticated’ and the ‘indifferent’; visiting friends and/or relatives and spending time with family away from home are very important trip motivators for them. The ‘true cuisine’ travellers enjoy the company of good friends. They take trips to experience and enjoy unspoiled nature and natural wonders and to seek intimacy and romance. Visiting historic sites and experiencing the city and the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, and being pampered as well as exploring different cultures/ways of life are also important trip motivators for more than half of ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts. The ‘sophisticated’ segment also shows higher preferences for seeking a taste of the good life with fine cuisine and good wine and experiencing different cultures/ways of life compared to the ‘rural’ and the ‘indifferent’.

While travelling, the culinary segments engage in a wide range of activities – outdoor; cultural/entertainment; and touring. Again, the ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts are the majority and most diverse group in terms of participation. Not unlike at home, the ‘true cuisine’ segment enjoys picnicking in natural settings and continues to keep fit by swimming, mostly in lakes. This, of course involves sunbathing and relaxing on the beach. Wildlife viewing is also a preferred outdoor activity for the ‘true cuisine’ travellers. The ‘rural’ segment engages in picnicking in park settings and swimming in lakes as well. The ‘sophisticated’ and ‘indifferent’ groups do not demonstrate high interest in any of the aforementioned outdoor pursuits.

From the cultural/entertainment category, restaurant dining offering regional or local cooking is by far, the most popular activity for the ‘sophisticated’ and the ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts. Both segments are also much more likely to dine in internationally acclaimed restaurants while travelling. This is not surprising given their operational definition and the fact that they engage in restaurant dining at home too. This finding supports Smith’s (2001) assertion that cuisine tourism could be considered a lifestyle and is also consistent with Ritzer and Liska (1997, cited in Richards, 2002) who assert that what we do while travelling is an extension of what we do on a regular basis. The ‘true cuisine’ lovers engage in much shopping/browsing; they purchase mostly gourmet foods, perhaps to sample and take home as souvenirs. However, other items are also high on their shopping list: books and music, clothing, shoes, and jewellery, local arts and crafts, and antiques. The ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts also read for relaxation, go to the movies, and enjoy the ambience of local outdoor cafés. Over half of them attend local festival fairs and farmers’ markets, most likely to sample local foods, which are seasonal in nature and are typically featured at such places. As already mentioned, the ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts are diverse in their pursuits while travelling. More than half of them engage in other cultural venues such as visiting heritage museums, theatres, and art galleries. They also take scenic drives and wander around small towns/villages for one or more nights.

As expected, due to their operational definition the ‘rural’ travellers are most active with respect to farmers’ fairs and markets although they are also highly likely to visit restaurants offering local or regional dining. Members from the ‘indifferent’ segment are the most passive and uninterested group in terms of trip activities. It is surprising that although going to wineries for day visits and tasting is an activity engaged in more by the ‘sophisticated’ and the ‘true cuisine’ travellers, less than half of them participated in this activity.

With respect to vacations and getaways, the four segments are more inclined to take getaway trips, mainly in the summer. The ‘true cuisine’ and ‘sophisticated’ enthusiasts represent the majority who travel with their spouses/partners as a couple. In contrast, the ‘rural’ travellers tend to be accompanied more by their immediate family members (including children). During their vacations and getaways the ‘rural’ tourists stay predominantly at the homes of friends or relatives, whereas the ‘sophisticated’ and ‘true cuisine’ segments use hotels/resorts/country inns.

Typically, the cuisine enthusiasts rely on past experience and the advice of friends and relatives when planning their vacation or getaway trips. Travellers from the ‘rural’ segment tend to rely on their past experience when planning both their vacation and getaway trips. On the other hand, the ‘sophisticated’ and ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts are more likely to seek the advice of their friends and/or relatives when organizing both their vacation and getaway escapes.

All four groups demonstrate high readership preferences with respect to the daily and weekend newspaper editions, although the ‘true cuisine’ enthusiasts represent a majority. The ‘true cuisine’ lovers are also more interested in print media pertaining to travel (travel section of daily and weekend newspaper; travel magazines) as well as hobby magazines. The ‘rural’ segment reads the community newspaper more than the other three groups.

With respect to Internet use, both the ‘sophisticated’ and ‘true cuisine’ travellers extended their media consumption habits to the Web. These were the most likely groups to use the Internet as an information source on a regular basis. This may be attributed to their diverse interests as well as their affluence.

This section provided summary of the results provided in Chapter 4. The next section outlines the implications of the findings in terms of trends and potentials of the culinary tourism market. It also identifies limitations pertaining to the study and suggests areas for future research.

6.0 Implications and Conclusions

This study provides insights into the structure and profile of the Canadian culinary tourists. It shows that this market is not homogenous and does have distinct subgroups that need the attention of marketers. Two segments emerged as relatively consistent across the analyses: the ‘food’/’rural’ and the ‘food + wine’/’true cuisine’. The other two segments that resulted as somewhat independent are the ‘wine’ and the ‘sophisticated’.

It should be noted that while the findings pertaining to ‘wine’ travellers support the literature, the results demonstrated that the wine segment does not have any special qualities warranting separate attention. In other words, this group is composed of travellers who are mainly interested in the wine itself and some other places/attractions, which are most likely in close proximity to the winery (e.g. small villages close by). Perhaps they have interest in wines but only as a means of acquiring social prestige (similar to the *hanger-on* segment discussed in Chapter 2). The ‘sophisticated’ cuisine travellers appear to be in between the ‘food’ and ‘the food + wine’ segment. However, the fact that the ‘food’ and the ‘rural’ and the ‘food + wine’ and ‘true cuisine’ groups overlap indicates that these segments are more prevalent and more unique in nature, thus warranting special attention as a marketing phenomena. Therefore, the discussion on implications will focus only on these two groups.

6.1 The Rural Food Lovers

The ‘food’/’rural’ segments can be characterized as representing those culinary tourists who are highly interested in the local, more traditional country-style forms of cuisine associated with rural regions. They seem to like to be close to rural areas and to the sources of their daily food. Perhaps they also seek experiences having nostalgic appeal reminding of the slower, less hectic and more pure way of life. There are certainly opportunities for smaller rural communities to tap into this important group of culinary tourists. Marketing efforts may, for instance, emphasize the authenticity of local cuisine by appealing to the sense of nostalgia and the traditional, simpler rural past.

The rural food lovers are represented by females, 36 to 45 years of age. Fields (2002) comments that "for women, holidays are often an extension of their working roles as cooks and carers" (p.39). This may explain why there are more women than men in this cuisine segment – they would like to enrich their knowledge and skills about different foods and take what they discover back home. For this group, family and friends are important – members of this segment travel primarily to visit friends and/or relatives and to spend quality time with their families; their travelling party consists of spouse/partner and children. According to Yesawich, Peperdine, and Brown (1999), family travel is seen as emotionally beneficial in that it brings families together and it creates long-lasting memories. There may be potential for marketers to develop special packages for families with children offering learning-together experiences where children and their parents are introduced to local ingredients and cooking practices and recipes and are given the opportunity for sampling and hands-on learning.

The rural food lovers seek simpler holiday experiences – picnicking among natural settings with their families, shopping, reading for relaxation/personal interest, taking scenic drives, and visiting small towns. They are highly involved in discovering and sampling regional/local foods through dining and farmers' fairs/markets. Successful packages might include culinary routes where culinary enthusiasts tour a range of small towns/villages and sample local foods in farmers' markets and in restaurants while at the same time indulging in shopping for local arts and crafts and antiques. Other packages may feature festivals and events related to local/regional feasts, such as celebration of harvesting, which offer local food and specialities.

In terms of accommodation while travelling, this culinary segment uses the hospitality of friends and relatives. This is not surprising since their primary trip motivator is visiting friends and/or relatives. This has implications for local communities because local residents are important in attracting tourists to these areas and are can also play a significant part in influencing their guests' choices of activities.

The best way to reach the rural food lovers would be through newspapers – daily and weekend editions. They also read community newspapers. One explanation may be that representatives of this segment generally live in smaller communities and are more interested in local matters, including information on agriculture, which is typically discussed in community newspapers. In recent years, destinations have also started to take advantage of electronic media. The Internet now plays an important role in terms of information source for tourists as well as for promoting destinations and images relating to the destination (Fields, 2002). Consequently, communities wishing to attract the rural food lovers should exploit this media vehicle and design their web sites accordingly. However, whether using a print or electronic media to access this segment, it is important for travel destinations to demonstrate how they are in a position to satisfy the needs and wants of potential culinary tourists.

6.2 The Dedicated Culinary Tourists

As already mentioned, the other two groups that emerged as relatively consistent across the analyses were the 'food + wine' and the 'true cuisine'. These tourists can be characterized as very diverse in their travel motivations and activity pursuits. They are highly involved in all aspects of culinary tourism: dining (both in restaurants offering local cooking and in internationally acclaimed restaurants) at home and on their trips; visiting farmers' markets and buying gourmet foods; going to wineries and touring wine regions.

These culinary enthusiasts are represented by more females, 26-45 and 56-65 years of age, university graduates with incomes above average. They travel for many different reasons, seeking a variety of experiences. Some of the main trip motivators are interpersonal in nature. Hjalager (2002) states that the pleasure derived from a travel experience is greater when this experience is shared with someone. She also adds that holidays have the potential to strengthen social relationships. Indeed, the dedicated culinary lovers like to share and enjoy their holiday experiences with their families and friends; they seek a sense of intimacy and romance when travelling. This segment's travel motivations also centre around visiting historic sites and experiencing and seeing pristine nature and natural phenomena; exploring different cultures and lifestyles; and enjoying the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, and being pampered.

The motivations and interests of the dedicated culinary tourists are reflected in their holiday activities. Apart from being actively involved in cuisine-related pursuits, this market niche participates in a wide range of outdoor, cultural, and touring activities. These culinary devotees have high cultural orientation and exquisite tastes – they purchase books and music; local arts and crafts, and antiques; and visit museums, art galleries, and theatres. They also read for personal enrichment. Moreover, the dedicated cuisine lovers are explorers – they like to discover small towns and villages and visit local festivals while enjoying nature at its best.

It is apparent that the dedicated culinary lovers seek experiences extending beyond the cuisine aspects of their travel to encompassing a more integrated range of activities. In this context, Richards (2002) asserts that "one of the essential tasks in developing and marketing gastronomic tourism is to find ways to add value to the eating experience in order to make it memorable" (p.11). Product development initiatives should, therefore, incorporate festivals, concerts and theatres as well as interactive attractions such as natural areas and arts/crafts galleries. These experiences would add value to the travel agendas of the culinary devotees' and would also play an important role in reinforcing the image of cuisine as a lifestyle. Dinner and theatre packages are becoming increasingly important – the Shaw Festival is an example. Cultural packages are also being developed where tourists are invited to explore wine routes and food trails, to participate in cultural festivals and arts events while enjoying local food and wine and listening to classical/jazz music in quaint settings.

This group of culinary tourists tends to take short getaway trips, mainly in the summer months. However, there is an opportunity for destinations to attract the culinary devotees during off-peak seasons too because they also have high proportion travelling in the fall, winter, and spring months. An effective way of bringing the cuisine enthusiasts would be through the promotion of culinary routes, festivals, and events pertaining to a specific season and reflecting the linkages between agricultural cycles and local food production.

With respect to accommodation choices, the dedicated culinary enthusiasts stay at hotels, resorts, or country inns. These accommodations typically offer dining on their premises. There is potential for such places to attract this devoted group of tourists by promoting local or culture-specific cuisine. For instance, marketing managers may consider developing themed weekend packages featuring region-specific foods and wines and incorporating an education component such as matching foods and wines and learning about the local culture.

The dedicated cuisine travellers have diverse readership preferences. The best way to reach them would be through daily and weekend newspapers, and news magazines. This unique segment shows high readership preferences for travel-related publications – travel sections of newspapers and travel magazines, most likely in search for new destinations and experiences. They also read special interest magazines such as hobby magazines (e.g. LCBO's "Food and Wine" magazine or gardening and housekeeping magazines). The Internet is highly used by the devoted cuisine enthusiasts as an information source. However, the study indicates that this media vehicle is not utilized to its full potential in terms of travel planning. As already mentioned in the previous chapter, this may be due to perceptions that the Web does not provide enough information in terms of featuring cuisine products for making informed travel decisions.

6.3 Limitations and Future Research

This section discusses several limitations pertaining to the study and it offers recommendations for future research.

6.3.1 Limitations

First, the analysis was limited to 1999 data and only provides a snapshot of one point in time. Therefore, replication of TAMS would be desirable to determine whether the patterns observed here are stable over time.

Second, the profile of the Canadian culinary enthusiasts was limited to a number of demographic, psychographic, travel characteristics, and media consumption variables. Future research should examine other factors such as expenditures and buying patterns to measure the economic impact of this market on local communities.

Third, TAMS does not allow for determining the main motivation for travel. From the nineteen motivation factors provided, only one item somewhat qualified as cuisine motivation - "to experience the good life with fine cuisine, good wine, being pampered" – which in itself is not enough and it doesn't really capture the true meaning of what culinary tourism is all about. Consequently, it is not possible to determine who has travelled to a place because of the cuisine experience and who has only a peripheral interest.

Finally, the survey does not provide more home activities options related to cuisine; it only includes dining, which is only a part of the whole cuisine lifestyle. Therefore, more culinary-related activities would have allowed to reinforce and generate a more complete picture of culinary tourism as a lifestyle.

6.3.2 Future Research

With respect to future research, it was determined that a very low proportion of the culinary segments participated in hands-on learning – participating in cooking or wine tasting schools. Perhaps this indicates that there is still lack of reputation for such education venues in Canada, although there are a number of them, mostly in Ontario. Further investigation would be useful.

Another research objective would be to examine the demand for culinary tourism in Canada by foreign travellers and determine to what degree culinary enthusiasts from other countries are similar to their Canadian counterparts. TAMS provides information on US travellers, therefore the US dataset can offer useful information about this culinary tourism market. Such investigation will also reveal whether the perception of Canadian cuisine is getting stronger on the international arena, something which has been acknowledged as a weakness by the Canadian Tourism Commission (CTC, 2002c).

From a planning standpoint, it would be useful to determine what mode of transportation is used by the Canadian culinary enthusiasts. This will assist planners with respect to expansion of car parking areas (if cars are the main mode of transportation) or the introduction of more parking spaces for buses (if bus is the main mode of transportation).

Finally, future studies should examine the ethnic/cultural background of the Canadian culinary enthusiasts. This would prove useful in determining whether there are linkages between cultural ethnicity and culinary lifestyle. For instance, Europe is renowned for its food and wine traditions and culinary tourism is not new in this part of the world. Consequently, Canadians having European backgrounds may be influenced by their roots to travel in search for culinary explorations.

6.4 Conclusions

The study provided interesting insights into the structure of the Canadian culinary tourism market. It showed that this travel segment represents a significant proportion of the Canadian travellers (45%) and exhibits characteristics and behaviours, which clearly distinguish them from the general travelling population in Canada. Furthermore, the fact that wine tourists are mostly interested in the wine itself indicates that food and not wine is what motivates culinary tourists; the wine is only a supplement. Moreover, based on the analyses, it also became clear that not only are culinary tourists different from other travellers, but there are also unique sub-segments within the Canadian culinary market itself. This finding led to a consideration of possible marketing implications and areas for future research were discussed.

7.0 REFERENCES

Au, N., & Law, R. (2002). Categorical classification of tourism dining. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29 (3),* 819-833.

Australian Tourist Commission (2000, March 1). *Food and wine: Australia's newest tourist attractions.* Retrieved October 23, 2002 from http://atc.australia.com/newscenter.asp?art=294

Bauer, M. (1996). Cultural tourism in France. In G. Richards (Ed.), *Cultural tourism in Europe*. (pp. 147-164). UK: CAB International.

Beverland, M., James, K., Porter, C., & Stace, G. (1998). Wine tourism in New Zealand: Maybe the industry has got it right. *International Journal of Wine Marketing, 10(2),* 24-33.

Brillat-Savarin, J. A. (2000). *The physiology of taste or, meditations on transcendental gastronomy.* (M. F. K. Fisher, Trans.). New York: Counterpoint Press. (Original work published 1825).

Burton, P. E., & Volpe, C. (2000). *Tourism – new realities: A Canadian perspective.* Toronto: Prentice Hall.

Caira, R. (1995). The evolution of Canadian cuisine in restaurants. In J. M. Powers & A. Stewart (Eds.), *Northern Bounty: a celebration of Canadian cuisine.* (pp. 135-141). Toronto: Random House of Canada.

Canadian Tourism Commission. (2002a). *Overview: Strategic plan 2003-2005*. Ottawa: Author.

Canadian Tourism Commission. (2002b). *Annual report 2001*. Ottawa: Author.

Canadian Tourism Commission. (2002c). *Acquiring a taste for cuisine tourism: A product development strategy*. Ottawa: Author.

Canadian Tourism Commission. (2002d). *Activities: Canadian travel survey.* Retrieved October 12, 2002 from http://www.canadatourism.com/en/ctc/ctx/partnerships/research/research.cfm#CTS

Canadian Tourism Commission (2001a). Travellers fears still prevail. *CTC Tourism Intelligence Bulletin – Issue 1*: October 2001. Ottawa: Author.

Canadian Tourism Commission (2001b). *Canadian winter travel intentions survey 2001*. Retrieved October 20, 2002 from http://www.canadatourism.com/en/ctc/ctx/ctx-news/advisory/wintertravelsurvey.cfm

Canadian Tourism Commission (1999). *Packaging the potential: A fife-year business strategy for cultural and heritage tourism in Canada*. Ottawa: Author.

Carmichael, B. A. (2001). Competitive and sustainable wine tourism destinations. In M. Joppe (Ed.), *It's more than just a balancing act: Optimizing your destination, TTRA-Canada Conference Proceedings* (pp. 245-249). Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada, October 2001.

Charters, S., & Ali-Knight, J. (2002). Who is the wine tourist? *Tourism Management, 23*, 311-319.

Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 6(4),* 409-424.

Cuisine Canada (2002). *Who are we?* Retrieved January 03, 2003 from http://www.cuisinecanada.ca/html/cuisinecanada.html.

Dann, G. M. S. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 4(4),* 184-194.

Dodd, T., & Bigotte, V. (1997). Perceptual differences among visitor groups to wineries. *Journal of Travel Research, 35(3*), 46-51.

Dodd, T. H., & Bigotte, V. (1995). *Visitors to Texas wineries: Their demographic characteristics and purchasing behavior.* Texas Wine Marketing Research Institute.

Dodd, T. (1995). Opportunities and pitfalls of tourism in a developing wine industry. *International Journal of Wine Marketing, 7(1)*, 5-16.

Ferguson, C. (1995). Our Northern Bounty. In J. M. Powers & A. Stewart (Eds.), *Northern Bounty: a celebration of Canadian cuisine.* (pp. 3-6). Toronto: Random House of Canada.

Fields, K. (2002). Demand for the gastronomy tourism product: motivational factors. In A.M. Hjalager & G. Richards (Eds.), *Tourism and Gastronomy* (pp. 36-50). London and New York: Routledge.

Finkelstein, J. (1989). *Dining out: A sociology of modern manners.* New York: New York University Press.

Frochot, E. (2000). Wine tourism in France: A paradox? In C. M. Hall, L. Sharples,

B. Cambourne, & N. Macionis (Eds.), *Wine tourism around the world: Development, management and markets*, (pp. 67-80). Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Getz, D. (2000). *Explore wine tourism: Management, development & destinations*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.

Getz, D., & Frisby, W. (1988). Evaluating management effectiveness in community-run festivals. *Journal of Travel Research, 27(1)*, 22-27.

Gillespie, C. (2001). *European gastronomy into the 21st century.* Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Hall, C. M., & Macionis, N. (1998). Wine tourism in Australia and New Zealand. In R. Butler, C.M. Hall, & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Tourism and recreation in rural areas,* (pp.197-224). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Hall, C. M., & McIntosh, A. (2000). Wine tourism and consumer behaviour. In C. M. Hall, L. Sharples, B. Cambourne, & N. Macionis (Eds.), *Wine tourism around the world: Development, management and markets,* (pp. 115-135). Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Hall, C. M., & Mitchell, R. (2000). Wine tourism in the Mediterranean: A tool for restructuring and development. *Thunderbird International Business Review, 42(4)*, 445-465.

Hegarty, J. A., & O'Mahony, G. B. (2001). Gastronomy: A phenomenon of cultural expressionism and an aesthetic for living. *Hospitality Management, 20,* 3-13.

Hjalager, A. M., & Corigliano, M. A. (2000). Food for tourists: determinants of an image. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 2,* 281-293.

Hjalager, A. M. (2002). A typology of gastronomy tourism. In A.M. Hjalager & G. Richards (Eds.), *Tourism and Gastronomy* (pp. 21-35). London and New York: Routledge.

Hsieh, S., O'Leary, J. T., & Morrison, A. M. (1994). Segmenting the international travel market by activity. *Tourism Management, 13(2)*, 209-223.

Ipsos-Reid (2002). *North American tracking survey - Canada.* Retrieved October 27, 2002 from http://www.ipsos-reid.com/media/dsp_displaypr_cdn.cfm?id_to_view=1442

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1980). *The social psychology of leisure and recreation.* Wm. C. Brown.

Kim, S. S., & Lee, C. K. (2002). Push and pull relationships. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29(1*), 257-260.

King, C., & Morris, R. (1997). To taste or not to taste: To charge or not to charge. *Wine Industry Journal, 12(4)*, 381-384.

Kotler, P. (1999). *Kotler on marketing: How to create, win and dominate markets*. London: Simon and Schuster.

Law, H. G., Snyder, C. W., Hattie, J. A., & Mc Donald, R. P. (1984*). Research methods for multimode data analysis*. New York: Praeger.

Lee, E. (2002, October 21). *National standards now define organic food.* Retrieved October 21, 2002 from http://www.hotel-online.com/News/2002_Oct_21/k.ATO.1035302652.html

Macionis, N. (1996). Wine tourism in Australia. In G Kearsley (Ed.*), Tourism Down Under2, Conference Proceedings*, pp. 264-286. Dunedin, University of Otago.

Maddern, C., & Golledge, S. (1996). *Victorian Wineries Tourism Council cellar door survey*. Melbourne: Victorian Wineries Tourism Council.

McKercher, B. (2002). Towards a classification of cultural tourists. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 4*, 29-38.

McKercher, B., Ho, P. S. Y., du Cros, H., & So-Ming, B. C. (2002). Activities-based segmentation of the cultural tourism market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 12(1*), 23-46.

Merriam-Webster's collegiate Dictionary (9^{th} ed.). (1985). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Michman, R. (1991). *Lifestyle market segmentation.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

Middleton, T. (1994). *Marketing travel and tourism (2nd ed.)*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Mitchell, R., & Hall, M. (2001). The influence of gender and region on the New Zealand winery visit. *Tourism Recreation Research, 26(2)*, 63-75.

Morris, R., & King, C. (1997). *The cellar door report: Margaret River region winery/tourism research.* Bunbury: Edith Cowan University.

Morrison, A. M. (1996). *Hospitality and travel marketing (2nd ed.).* Albany, NY: Delmar.

Moscardo, G., Pearce, P., & Morrison, A. (2001). Evaluating different bases for market segmentation: A comparison of geographic origin versus activity participation for generating tourist market segments. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 10(1),* 29-49.

Moulin, C. (1995). On concepts of community and cultural tourism. *Revue de Tourisme, 4,* 35-38.

Moulin, C. (1985). Touristic leisure, an element of mixing and cultural development or Hospes rediscovered. *Revue de Tourisme, 2,* 2-5.

Munsters, W. (1996). Cultural tourism in Belgium. In G. Richards (Ed.), *Cultural tourism in Europe* (pp. 109-126). UK: CAB International.

O'Connor, J. (1993). A review of dining-out patterns in Britain. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 5(5),* 3-9.

Reynolds, P. (1994). Culinary heritage in the face of tourism. In C.P. Cooper, & A. Lockwood (Eds.), *Progress in tourism, recreation and hospitality management* (pp. 189-193). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Richards, G. (2000). Tourism and the world of culture and heritage. *Tourism Recreation Research, 25(1)*, 9-17.

Richards, G. (1996). *Cultural tourism in Europe.* UK: CAB International.

Richards, G. (2002). Gastronomy: an essential ingredient in tourism production and consumption. In A.M. Hjalager & G. Richards (Eds.), *Tourism and Gastronomy* (pp. 3-20). London and New York: Routledge.

Rimm, E. B., Klatsky, A., Grobbee, D., & Stampf, M. J. (1996). Review of moderate alcohol consumption and reduced risk of coronary heart disease: is the effect due to beer, wine, or spirits? *British Medical Journal, 312*, 731-736.

Ritchie, B. J. R., & Zins, M. (1978). Culture as a determinant of the attractiveness of a tourism region. *Annals of Tourism Research, 5(2)*, 252-267.

Robins, P. (1999). Potential research into wine tourism. In R. Dowling and J. Carlsen, (Eds.), *Wine Tourism: Perfect Partners, Proceedings of the First Australian Wine Tourism Conference* (pp. 81-91). Margaret River, Western Australia, May 1998.

Roper Reports Canada (2000). *Canadian vacation travel habits and the impact of the lower Canadian dollar*. Ottawa: Author.

Scarpato, R. (2002). Gastronomy as a tourist product: the perspective of gastronomy studies. In A.M. Hjalager & G. Richards (Eds.), *Tourism and Gastronomy* (pp. 51-70). London and New York: Routledge.

Slow Food. (2001). Slow Food Movement web site. Retrieved December 01, 2002 from http://www.slowfood.com/eng/sf_cose/sf_cose_statuto.lasso

Smith, S. (2001). *Draft proposal for a chair of culinary tourism*. University of Waterloo, Ontario.

Smith, S. L. J., & Taylor, G. (1994). Improving research communication in the Canadian tourism industry. *Travel and Research Association Conference Proceedings.* Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, November 1994.

South Australian Tourism Commission (1997). *Wine and tourism: A background research report.* Adelaide: Author.

Statistics Canada (2000). *Travel Activities and Motivation Survey: User guide.* Ottawa: Author.

Swenson, C. (1990). *Selling to a segmented market.* Westport: Quorum Books.

Taste of Nova Scotia Society (2002). *Taste of Nova Scotia.* Retrieved November 2, 2002 from http://www.tasteofnovascotia.ns.ca/

Telfer, D. J. (2001). Strategic alliances along the Niagara wine route. *Tourism Management, 22,* 21-30.

Telfer, D. J. (2000). Tastes of Niagara: Building strategic alliances between tourism and agriculture. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 1(1*), 71-88.

Telfer, D. J., & Hashimoto, A. (2001). A profile of wine tourists in the Niagara region. In M. Joppe (Ed.), *It's more than just a balancing act: Optimizing your destination, TTRA- Canada Conference Proceedings* (pp. 251-257). Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada, October 2001.

The Economic Planning Group of Canada (2001). *A strategy for wine and culinary tourism in Ontario: Final report*.

Thorne, S. (2001). *The Okanagan cultural corridor newsletter.* Retrieved February 24, 2002 from http://collections.ic.gc.ca/okanaganvalley/project/newsletter2.html

Weiler, B., & Hall, C. M. (1992). *Special interest tourism.* London: Belhaven Press.

Wilkie, W. L. (1994). *Consumer behaviour (3rd ed.).* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Williams, P. W., & Dossa, K. B. (2001). Non-resident wine tourist markets: Management implications for British Columbia's emerging wine tourism industry. In M. Joppe (Ed.), *It's more than just a balancing act: Optimizing your destination, TTRA- Canada Conference Proceedings* (pp.221-243). Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada, October 2001.

Wolf, E. (2002). *Culinary tourism: A tasty economic proposition*. Retrieved October 16, 2002 http://www.culinarytourism.org

World Tourism Organization (2002a). *Facts and figures.* Retrieved October 10, 2002 from http://www.world-tourism.org/market_research/facts&figures/menu.htm

World Tourism Organization (2002b). *Basic references on tourism statistics.* Retrieved October 10, 2002 from http://www.world-tourism.org/statistics/tsa_project/basic_references/index-en.htm

Yesawich, Peperdine, & Brown (1999). *YP&B Portrait of family travel. USA*