Check for updates

Academic Paper

Journal of Vacation Marketing
2021, Vol. 27(4) 420–436
© The Author(s) 2021
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/13567667211009580
journals.sagepub.com/home/jvm
SAGE

Food tourism in Korea

Seohee Chang

Sookmyung Women's University, Korea

Abstract

Amid the growing popularity of food tourism, many national and local governments have been developing food tourism-centered destination management. However, few studies have examined whether such strategies have been effective. This study analyzes the behavioral and psychological patterns of food tourists at the demand side, with the focus on the period from 2015 to 2018, when the Korean government initiated food tourism-intensive strategies on the supply side (i.e., 'K-Food'). This study has found that the psychological and behavioral patterns of food tourists display some changes, both positive and negative, that follow changes in the government's policy strategies over the last 4 years. The study discusses the implications of this finding for food tourism strategies, particularly in terms of the importance of cultural attributes embedded in food tourism and the availability and accessibility of diverse local food tourism resources.

Keywords

Demand side, destination management, food tourism, K-Food, supply side

Introduction

The increasing interest in food tourism is the result of an increase in the number of tourists who are interested in not only food but also in traveling and experiencing local cuisine and cultures (Ellis et al., 2018). The growing popularity of food tourism has inspired many hospitality and tourism researchers to investigate the phenomenon from a variety of perspectives. Studies on the relationship between food and tourism began in the early 1980s (Belisle, 1983), but the term 'food tourism' first appeared in the 2000s (Hall and Mitchell, 2001). The food and tourism research conducted over the last few decades can be broadly classified into two categories: studies of the supply side and studies of the demand side (Getz et al., 2014; Robinson et al., 2018). Supply-side studies have mainly explored destination strategies such as planning, development, and marketing, while demand-side studies have focused on the social, psychological, and demographic factors of food tourists (Belisle, 1983; 1984; Elemont, 1995; Getz et al., 2014; Lee and Scott, 2015; Robinson et al., 2018; Zelinsky, 1985).

Belisle (1983, 1984) conducted the initial supply-side studies, delving into the reasons why local food tended not to be offered to international tourists, who mainly consumed imported foods instead, and why developing countries reaped insignificant economic benefits from tourism. Later scholars emphasized that a supply-side approach to food in tourism should focus on the sustainability of local food and culture along with their economic benefits because, when tourists eat the food produced in the places they visit, they are effectively consuming the cultures of those places (Elemont, 1995; Reynolds, 1993). One early study on the demand side was the cultural capital theory postulated by Bourdieu (1984). From a social class perspective, cultural capital theory posits that a class of rich and highly educated people tends to consume different forms of culture, including food, to experience exclusivity.

Corresponding author:
Seohee Chang, Division of Culture, Tourism, & Hospitality Management, Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul 04310, Korea.
Email: carol32@sookmyung.ac.kr

However, Bourdieu (1984) did not directly examine the relationship between food and tourism. Introducing gastronomic tourism into the direct relationship between food and tourism, Zelinksy (1985) discussed trips mainly intended to experience ethnic and regional cuisine for tourists who do not merely experience the local cuisine while on vacation, but also have special preferences in this regard. Later scholars introduced related concepts such as 'culinary tourism' (Long, 1998) and 'food tourism' (Hall and Mitchell, 2001) as well as further sub-segments within food tourists (Robinson and Getz, 2014; Robinson et al., 2018).

Likewise, food tourism has been actively researched from the supply and demand sides. Nevertheless, few studies have investigated how the supply side is related to the demand side. Getz et al. (2014) emphasized the importance of maintaining a balance between the supply and demand sides, based on an extensive review of prior food tourism studies and cases. Since then, however, few studies have considered both the supply and demand sides simultaneously. Few studies have investigated how a destination's policy strategies for attracting food tourists on the supply side are reflected in food tourists' psychological and behavioral outcomes on the demand side. How can we identify the optimal balance between the two sides without the appropriate research? Finding the ideal dynamic between the supply and demand sides has been an elusive goal over the past few decades.

Hence, this study analyzes both sides of the process, utilizing foreign visitor data at the demand side collected by the South Korean Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism, with a focus on data from 2015 to 2018, during which the South Korean government initiated several food tourism-intensive strategies at the supply side. Specifically, this study compares the psychological and behavioral patterns of food tourists who visited South Korea from 2015 to 2018 with information relating to changes in the South Korean government's food tourism strategies, known as 'K-Food', over the same period. This study aims to offer implications for food tourism by considering the possible convergence and divergence between its supply and demand sides in South Korea. Specifically, this study addresses the ongoing debate on whether a destination's food tourism strategies should be exclusively food-intensive or should encourage food tourists to experience local lifestyles and cultures in order to establish a supply–demand balance (de Jong and Varley, 2017; Hendijani, 2016; Rabbiosi, 2016; Sanchez-Cañizares and Castillo-Canalejo, 2015).

Literature review

Supply side of food tourism

The dominant research subfield has been food operations; food tourism has been a relatively minor subject of research over the last four decades, during which most food and gastronomy studies have emerged (Okumus et al., 2018). The work of Belisle (1983, 1984) represents an early attempt to explore the relationship between food and tourism on the supply side, at a time (the 1980s) when the issue of economic inequality was being raised in tourism studies amid the significantly growing number of Western travelers to developing countries (Mowforth and Munt, 2015). Identifying a need to build better distribution channels and policies, Belisle observed that a large portion of what international tourists in the Caribbean ate was imported and made no economic contribution to the destination. Food tourism-related studies in the 1990s gradually moved away from discussions of how to mitigate the economic inequality of tourism to discussions of how to sustainably enhance the authentic cultural values of a destination through food tourism policy strategies beyond the mere economic benefits (e.g., Elemont, 1995; Reynolds, 1993).

In the 2000s, researchers have been taking both the economic and cultural values of food tourism into account and focusing on how to provide customized tangible and intangible food tourism products to specified targets (e.g., Rabbiosi, 2016; Sanchez-Cañizares and Castillo-Canalejo, 2015). Rabbiosi (2016) highlighted the importance of bottom–up (rather than top–down) policy strategies in the customization of food tourism. He explained that a destination culture is formed naturally via the destination hosts' lifestyles over time and is inherent in the destination's food. Therefore, tourists may not be attracted to local food tourism when it is developed in an artificially generated top–down manner. Rabbiosi suggested that food tourism products should mediate in interactions between the destination hosts and the guests in a natural cultural context, as in a theater performance with a food theme. This will enhance the hosts' and guests' involvement in the food tourism products and ensure its continuity. In addition to the importance of food tourism resources naturally induced from cultural contexts, De Jong and Varley (2017) stressed that a nation's destination marketing must avoid top–down decision making that relies on a national food's popularity. For example, if a destination government emphasizes unhealthy food (such as a deep-fried Mars bar as a symbol of working-class food in Scotland) to increase its economic benefits, it may limit the national image and cause undesirable side effects. Food tourism studies concentrating on the supply side have evolved over the years, proceeding from a focus on its economic benefits, to focusing on its extensive cultural values, and then to focusing on specific target-customized food tourism and its economic and cultural benefits. Overall, studies have agreed that generalizing an optimum supply-side level is difficult because each destination's circumstances are unique.

Demand side of food tourism

The main trend in early demand side studies was closely linked to the main trend in early supply side studies. Discussing inequality and European demanders' status in the 1980s, Bourdieu (1984) postulated that social class cultivates an individual's taste for food, observing, for example, that upper-class individuals pursued foods in fine dining restaurants and even as the main purpose of a trip, in contrast to working-class people who were not exposed to such an environment. However, studies conducted in the United States and Canada, where the numbers of immigrants were increasing in the 1980s, reflected different trends. Travelers tended to visit ethnic communities that immigrants with diverse backgrounds had formed in the United States and Canada to experience the ethnic foods (Zelinksy, 1985). The term 'gastronomic tourist' was therefore coined to describe those who pursued diverse ethnic cuisine (Zelinsky, 1985). Research in the 1990s dug deep into exploratory eating behaviors in various countries. The term 'culinary tourism' emerged as a way to describe motivational participation in the consumption of food-related items and systems, including cuisine and eating styles (Long, 1998).

In the 2000s, studies combined diverse food tourism-related phenomena and developed the 'food tourism' concept, as well as related terms. Hall and colleagues identified 'gourmet tourists', 'gastronomic and cuisine tourists', 'culinary tourists', 'rural/urban tourists', and 'normal tourists', whom they differentiated on a motivational spectrum ranging from seriousness to casualness and whom they differentiated in number from the smallest to the largest (Hall and Mitchell, 2001). Studies in the 2010s examined food tourists' complicated psychological, behavioral, and demographic factors (e.g., Robinson and Getz, 2014, 2016; Robinson et al., 2018). In particular, Robinson and Getz (2016) suggested 'involvement' as an important factor for understanding food tourists' lifestyles. Robinson et al. (2018) defined two food tourist groups, 'highbrows' and 'lowbrows', based on their involvement level, characterizing highbrows as those more likely to engage in elite activities and promote their social value utilizing their lucrative food travel experiences (see Bourdieu, 1984). Other studies discussed demanders' needs based on the perception of food as a cultural resource inherited in a specific destination (see Ellis et al., 2018; Engeset and Elvekrok, 2015; Goolaup et al., 2018; Hendijani, 2016). For example, 'unique local meal' and 'storytelling' were found to be the most important factors for satisfying international food tourists in Norway (Engeset and Elvekrok, 2015), while 'heritage' and 'ingredients' were found to be the most important factors in Indonesia (Hendijani, 2016). Goolaup et al. (2018) differentiated among three food tourist types according to their cultural pursuits: 'cultivated', 'enthusiastic', and 'cultural'. These were described as, respectively, tourists who pursued the complexity experienced through exposure to fine dining cultures, the simplicity experienced by sampling uncomplicated and genuine food cultures, and the authenticity experienced through exposure to unique local food cultures.

Food tourism studies have been conducted on either the supply side or the demand side, separately. No attempt has been made to determine the optimal balance between the supply and demand sides. Nevertheless, both research streams have recently tended to focus on the importance of the cultural values embedded in food, which are pervasive across food tourist segments, despite differences in the weights given to them. Hence, this study investigates both the supply and demand sides of food tourism in South Korea, simultaneously. The South Korean government has established and implemented food tourism-centered strategies (i.e., K-Food) to attract visitors on the supply side. This study analyzes how these strategies are compared to the psychological and behavioral patterns of those who reported they had visited South Korea for the primary purpose of engaging in food tourism on the demand side. The results, illustrating the convergence or divergence between the supply and demand sides, are expected to help guide food tourism policy strategies in South Korea.

Method

For the supply-side analysis, this study analyzed the contents of government reports, news articles, and other literature regarding the K-Food strategies implemented by the South Korean government, particularly in terms of the core policy strategies and the changes made over the past few years. For the demand-side analysis, this study utilized the responses the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism collected from foreign visitors through its annual survey. The raw data (foreign visitors' responses) are posted on the government's website (i.e., www.tour.go.kr) and are open to the public. The Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism collects data at Korea's major airports on foreign visitors returning home. The data are collected each month (January to December) every year. The questionnaire is printed in various languages, such as English, Japanese, Chinese, German, French, and Vietnamese. The questionnaire is self-administered, but the survey participants are assisted by well-trained survey administrators. Foreign visitors are defined as those who have stayed more than 1 day and less than 1 year in a trip to Korea and who depart from a major airport. As the target population changes each year, the sample size also changes to maintain precision and reliability. In 2015, 12,900 travelers took part in the survey, 12,003 participated in 2016, 13,841 participated in 2017, and 16,469 participated in 2018. Participants were aged 15 or over. In the multiple choice question asking about the primary purpose of their trip to South Korea (e.g., food/gourmet, shopping, leisure sport activities, historical and cultural sites), those who indicated 'food/gourmet' were selected from the raw data from 2015 to 2018. These data were further cleaned and analyzed to examine food tourists' behavioral and psychological patterns.

As seen in Table 1, the number of food tourists has gradually increased over the 4-year period from 2015 to 2018, going from 3.72% (i.e., 481/12,900) in 2015 to 5.32% (i.e., 638/12,003) in 2016, 6.81% (i.e., 943/13,841) in 2017, and (most significantly) 23.7% (i.e., 3,909/16,469) in 2018. Of the 481 food tourists, 67.6% ($n = 325$) were female in 2015. More female food tourists (60.7% in 2016, 62.1% in 2017, and 65.4% in 2018) have visited South Korea than male food tourists. Thus, almost twice as many female visitors to Korea as male visitors were motivated primarily by food tourism. The 21–30 year old age group was the largest among the visitor age groups. However, those who visited in 2018 were more diversified in terms of age. The two largest nationalities among food tourists were Chinese and Japanese from 2015 to 2018, but visits by food tourists from Vietnam, the Philippines, and Indonesia—three major Southeast Asian countries—increased in 2018, showing greater diversification in terms of nationality. Detailed demographic information on the food tourists is presented in Table 1.

The study's instrument was the International Visitors Survey developed by the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism. The survey includes a variety of questions, such as on respondents' motivations for choosing Korea as a travel destination, travel information sources, types of activities participated in while in Korea, places visited in Korea, shopping items purchased, satisfaction levels, intentions to revisit and recommend Korea as a tourist destination, images of Korea before and after the visit, types of accommodation stayed in while in Korea, the amount of spending in specific categories, and demographic questions. Several of these questions were used to investigate the behavioral and psychological patterns of food tourists over the study's 4-year period (see Tables 2 to 4). The study identified the behavioral patterns of those who indicated food tourism as their primary motivation for travel by analyzing the following questions. 1) The respondents were asked about the three major activities they participated in, while traveling in Korea. Of these, those ranked first and second were analyzed (see Table 2-A). 2) The respondents were asked to indicate their three major shopping items. Of these, those ranked first were analyzed (see Table 2-B). 3) The activity participants described as their favorite was investigated (see Table 2-C). 4) The provinces at which respondents had stayed out of Korea's eight provinces (multiple responses were allowed) were analyzed (see Table 3-A). 5) The Korean locations that the respondents ranked as the best out of those they had visited were investigated (see Table 3-B). 6) The visit locations the respondents described were counted, and the total number of places indicated by the respondents was reported (see Table 3-C). 7) The lengths of stay and 8) types of accommodations were compared across years (see Tables 3-D and 3-E). 9) ANOVA and Bonferroni post-hoc analyses were conducted when there were

Table 1. Demographic information.

		2015		2016		2017		2018	
		n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%
Gender	Male	156	32.4	251	39.3	358	37.9	1,353	34.6
	Female	325	67.6	387	60.7	585	62.1	2,556	65.4
	Total	481	100.0	638	100	943	100	3,909	100
Age group	15–20	32	6.7	53	8.3	48	5.1	182	4.7
	21–30	194	40.3	280	43.8	429	45.4	1,495	38.3
	31–40	127	26.4	176	27.5	229	24.3	879	22.5
	41–50	80	16.6	90	14.2	133	14.1	617	15.8
	51–60	34	7.1	24	3.7	75	8	577	14.8
	61 and more	11	2.3	14	2.2	28	2.9	158	4.0
	No response	3	0.6	2	0.3	1	0.2		
	Total	481	100.0	638	100.0	943	100.0	3,909	100.0
Nationality	Japan	118	24.5	147	23.0	336	35.7	1,129	28.9
	China	98	20.4	274	42.9	231	24.5	1,370	35.0
	Hong Kong	65	13.5	67	10.5	98	10.4	267	6.8
	Singapore	24	5.0	10	1.5	23	2.5	41	1.1
	Taiwan	54	11.2	53	8.3	102	10.8	438	11.2
	Thailand	25	5.2	14	2.1	36	3.8	117	3.0
	Malaysia	21	4.4	7	1.1	18	1.9	79	2.0
	Austalia	10	2.1	3	0.5	8	0.9	21	0.5
	United States	17	3.5	15	2.4	33	3.5	73	1.9
	Canada	3	0.6	5	0.8	7	0.8	21	0.5
	United Kingdom	4	0.8	3	0.5	4	0.4	10	0.3
	Germany	3	0.6	2	0.3	3	0.3	5	0.1
	France	5	1.0			2	0.2	8	0.2
	Russia	5	1.0	2	0.3	5	0.6	25	0.6
	Middle Eastern Countries	3	0.6	1	0.1	4	0.4	16	0.2
	Philippines					10	1.0	56	1.4
	Indonesia					4	0.4	44	1.1
	Vietnam					7	0.8	115	3.0
	Mongolia							18	0.5
	Other European Countries							34	0.8
	Other Asian Countries							15	0.2
	Other	26	5.4	34	5.4	12	1.2	8	0.1
	Total	481	100.0	638	100.0	943	100.0	3,909	100.0

differences among each year's food tourists in terms of the number of revisits, satisfaction levels, intentions, images, and expenditures (see Table 4). The number of revisits to Korea before the respondents' trip was measured on an increasing scale (1 = one time, 2 = two times, 3 = three times, 4 = four times or more). Satisfaction was measured on a five-point scale (1 = 'very unsatisfied' to 5 = 'very satisfied') as were intention (1 = 'very unlikely' to 5 = 'very likely') and image (1 = 'very negative' to 5 = 'very positive'). All reported spending amounts were converted to dollars.

Results

Food tourism strategies on the supply side

Lee and Scott (2015) suggested that food culture is an important pull motivation for travel to a destination, and thus has positive economic effects on it. This is why many countries tend to develop food tourism products for destination management and marketing. The South Korean government is also aware of the importance of food tourism and has invested in developing and promoting food tourism for destination management and marketing since 2012. The South Korean government named this comprehensive strategic approach 'K-Food' and devoted specific budgeting for it (National Assembly Budget Office, 2012). The Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs established K-Food Experience Centers overseas and promoted Korean food to increase awareness of it and encourage consumption (Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, 2012). The Ministry of Foreign Affairs held the K-food World Festival in 2013, wherein international contest winners were invited to cook Korean food at K-food contests held in 10 nations (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2013).

In 2014, the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs began organizing more comprehensive and refined food fairs and television advertisements emphasizing the premium and healthy values of K-Food to major countries, including ASEAN countries such as China, Singapore, and Vietnam, which have high potential purchasing power (Kim, 2014, August 28). In 2013 and 2014, the South Korean government focused on increasing awareness of Korean food using small-scale international outreach and holding food fairs and exhibitions overseas. In 2015, the South Korean government began its food tourism strategy. The Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism provided international tourists with food-themed tourism programs by holding the K-Food Festival in Seoul (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, 2015). In 2016, the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs began the monthly K-Food Street event, in which a unique local food theme is selected each month to boost the inflow of food tourists from overseas to South Korea. For example, ginseng was selected as the K-Food for May, 2017, because it is one of the chief agricultural products grown in Geumsan, Chungcheongnam-do Province, and K-Food Street took place in Geumsan in May that year. A package consisting of tourist attractions including a big local fish market in Busan city located on the coast of South Korea was also developed and promoted (Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs, 2017). These approaches were early attempts to attract food tourists by developing and promoting food-centered tourist destinations and tours through partnerships among the government, travel agencies, and businesses beyond simply promoting Korean food. Moreover, the Seoul municipal government started offering K-Food cooking classes for international visitors who wanted to try cooking Korean foods that appeared in popular Korean dramas in collaboration with CJ Cheiljedang Corporation, one of South Korea's largest conglomerates (Seoul Tourism Organization, 2017).

Nevertheless, a technical report prepared by the Korean Culture and Tourism Institute of the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism to examine the differences between international tourists in South Korea and Japan found that few positive results had been achieved in South Korean food tourism in 2015 and 2016 (Kwon and Lee, 2017). Kwon and Lee (2017) revealed that most international tourists had the intention to take part in food tourism in Japan, whereas most international tourists expected only to shop in South Korea. In addition, most of them considered Korean perfume and cosmetics as their preferred shopping item, whereas the most popular shopping item for tourists in Japan was Japanese snacks and confectionary. Therefore, in 2018, the South Korean government initiated more aggressive food product development and marketing specifically targeted to international markets (Park, 2018, 1 August). For example, as the newest emerging market throughout the 2010s with young Japanese consumers, the Social Networking Sites (SNS) and TV marketing of K-Food was conducted in concert with the popularity of K-pop and K-drama stars. In addition, halal-certified Korean food products have been developed for and promoted among consumers in the Middle East. Such products have gained considerable attention from consumers at the K-Food Fair in Malaysia and in promotional events conducted on online-shopping malls in the UAE. Korean ginseng chicken soup (*samgyetang*) and Korean dumplings (*mandu*) were promoted among Southeast Asians at the WOFEX-World Food Expo in the Philippines (Park, 2018, 1 August). Even K-Food cooking classes in Seoul have targeted different markets through customized programs such as classes for vegetarians (Seoul Tourism Organization, 2018).

Consistent with the Korean government's food tourism priority, one of Korea's largest cosmetic corporations started to show interest in environmentally sustainable values for cosmetics and healthy food and beverages (F&B) and further expanded its business to develop and sell F&B products (Jeong, 2016, 17 November; Min, 2017, 24 May). The corporation opened a store in Myeong-dong that both sells cosmetics and has a café. This became a popular tourist attraction at the end of 2017, which inspired the opening of similar stores (Kang, 2018, 15 January). In 2019, promotions were expanded to the United States, particularly among young consumers, who perceive K-food—along with the Korean Wave (*hallyu*) and K-pop—as trendy. This approach emphasized the 'fun' emotional factor that American consumers consider important; this was a cultural approach. In addition, the CJ corporation brand *bibigo* had the largest sales increase in the home-meal replacement (HMR) industry across many nations, including the United States (Park and Na, 2019, 1 February).

Ottogi, a large Korean food company, developed vegetarian food products to be sold to vegetarian consumers in India, and a chocolate pie made by Orion, another big Korean snack company, became popular in Vietnam because the meaning of the pie's name reflects an aspect of Vietnamese culture beyond taste (Park and Na, 2019, 1 February).

Food tourists at the demand side

The largest number of food tourists (more than 40%) answered that their major activity was 'shopping' in 2015 and 2016. In 2017 and 2018, this changed to 'food/gourmet tour' (see Table 2). Less than half of the food tourists (43.1%) chose 'food/gourmet tour' as their major activity in 2017, while this was the primary activity for most food tourists (88.8%) in 2018. The percentage of food tourists who indicated 'food/gourmet tour' as the major activity increased gradually from 2015 to 2018. In addition, 'traditional culture experience' emerged among the top five activities in 2018. The questionnaire described this experience by providing 'temple stay, taekwondo, making Korean foods such as kimchi, etc.' as examples. The major shopping item for the largest number of food tourists was clothing, while groceries ranked fourth or fifth from 2015 to 2017 (between 5.3% and 6.9%). However, perfume and cosmetics were ranked first in 2018, as more than half of the food tourists (52.7%) purchased these, followed by groceries (27.3%). Thus, 2018 shows a dramatic change compared to the 2015–2017 period. Nevertheless, food tourists' favorite experience was 'food /gourmet tour'. The number of respondents who indicated that 'food/gourmet tour' was their favorite activity increased gradually, from 39.3% (2015) to 45.5% (2016), 55.1% (2017), and 56.1% (2018). Moreover, 'traditional culture experience' and 'watching cultural performances, folk events, or festivals' were included among the best activities in 2018. Table 2 provides more detailed information.

Regarding food tourists' visiting patterns, tourism was concentrated in the capital area of Seoul (more than 80% of food tourists) from 2015 to 2017, but visits later dispersed slightly to other regions, such as Gyeongsang-do and Jeju-do (see Table 3). Thus, visits were intensively concentrated in Seoul locations from 2015 to 2017, but Jeju-do and Busan (in Gyeongsang-do) emerged as locations in 2018. Food tourists tended to focus on exploring local places, even within a single state, with the number of visited places increasing from 114 in 2015 to 172 in 2018. Nevertheless, there was no significant increase in the length of stay over the last 4-year period. Hotels were the main type of accommodation used by food tourists, but its percentage fell slightly from 69.3% in 2015 to 68.9% in 2018, while homestay (e.g., Bed and Breakfast, Airbnb) increased significantly from 0.4% in 2015 to 7.7% in 2018. Table 3 provides more information.

This study conducted an ANOVA analysis to measure the differences among each year's food tourists in terms of the number of revisits, satisfaction levels, intentions, images, and expenditures (see Table 4). The findings show some differences among visitors from 2015 to 2018, but not all of these differences are improvements. Regarding revisits, food tourists had visited, on average, twice before their current visit, with a gradual increase in the mean scores of 1.89 in 2016 to 2.07 in 2018. Regarding overall satisfaction, food tourists who visited in 2016 and 2017 were more satisfied with their trip in Korea than were food tourists who visited in 2015 and 2018. More importantly, food tourists' satisfaction with Korean food (taste, service quality) improved from 2015 (4.42) to 2016 (4.44) and 2017 (4.50) but declined in 2018 (4.35), although their satisfaction with immigration, travel expenses, and security (safety) improved from 2015 to 2018. Intentions to revisit within the next 3 years and to recommend Korea as a tourist destination were at similar levels over the 4-year period, with 'likely' to 'very likely' at 4.2 to 4.3 on average. The image of Korea that food tourists had before their visit significantly improved from 3.99 in 2015 to 4.06 in 2017 and to 4.16 in 2018. However, the difference between food tourists' image before and after their visit—the so-called 'improved image' of Korea as a tourist destination—fell from 0.27 in 2015 to 0.17 in 2018. Regarding expenditures, food tourists' total expenses fell from 2015 ($M = 1403.65$, $SD = 1285.79$) to 2018 ($M = 1250.43$, $SD = 1153.88$), which may have influenced the respondents' satisfaction with travel expenses, which went from 3.87 in 2015 to 4.02 in 2018. Specifically, expenses for almost all categories—such as accommodations, shopping, food and beverages, and entertainment/cultural/sport activities—decreased significantly from 2015 to 2018, except for an increase in 2016 and 2017. By contrast, expenses paid to travel

Table 2. Behavioral patterns in tourist activities in Korea.

A. Most participation	2015			2016			2017			2018		
		N	%		n	%		n	%		n	%
(1st ranked)	Shopping	201	41.8	Shopping	276	43.2	Food/Gourmet tour	407	43.1	Food/Gourmet tour	3,473	88.8
	Food/Gourmet tour	138	28.7	Food/Gourmet tour	218	34.2	Shopping	365	38.7	Shopping	424	10.8
	Visit to palaces and historic sites	34	7.1	Visit to palaces and historic sites	34	5.3	Visit to palaces and historic sites	44	4.7	Enjoy natural landscape	4	0.1
	Enjoy natural landscape	23	4.8	Leisure, relaxation (resort)	22	3.4	Enjoy natural landscape	41	4.3	Visit to palaces and historic sites	5	0.1
	Leisure, relaxation (resort)	16	3.3	Amusement/ Entertainment (nightlife)	21	3.2	Amusement/ Entertainment (nightlife)	25	2.6	Traditional culture experience	3	0.1
(2nd ranked)	Food/Gourmet tour	141	29.3	Food/Gourmet tour	200	31.3	Shopping	300	31.8	Shopping	3,416	87.4
	Shopping	117	24.3	Shopping	174	27.2	Food/Gourmet tour	300	31.8	Enjoy natural landscape	306	7.8
	Visit to palaces and historic sites	44	9.1	Enjoy natural landscape	54	8.5	Enjoy natural landscape	72	7.7	Visit to palaces and historic sites	84	2.2
	Enjoy natural landscape	36	7.5	Visit to palaces and historic sites	48	7.5	Visit to palaces and historic sites	55	5.8	Traditional culture experience	17	0.4
	Theme park	18	3.7	Amusement/ Entertainment (nightlife)	36	5.6	Amusement/ Entertainment (nightlife)	53	5.6	Amusement/ Entertainment (nightlife)	16	0.4
B. Major item purchased												
(1st ranked)	Clothing	171	35.6	Clothing	207	32.5	Clothing	331	35.1	Perfume, cosmetics	2,059	52.7
	Perfume, cosmetics	116	24.1	Perfume, cosmetics	187	29.3	Perfume, cosmetics	253	26.9	Groceries	1,068	27.3
	Shoes	64	13.3	Shoes	109	17	Shoes	139	14.7	Clothing	415	10.6
	Leather goods	43	8.9	Leather goods	44	6.9	Groceries	76	8.1	Shoes	71	1.8
	Groceries	33	6.9	Groceries	34	5.3	Leather goods	65	6.9	Cigarettes	51	1.3
C. Favorite activity												
	Food/Gourmet tour	189	39.3	Food/Gourmet tour	290	45.5	Food/Gourmet tour	520	55.1	Food/Gourmet tour	2,192	56.1
	Shopping	104	21.6	Shopping	145	22.8	Shopping	163	17.2	Shopping	747	19.1
	Enjoy natural landscape	31	6.4	Visit to palaces and historic sites	42	6.5	Visit to palaces and historic sites	61	6.5	Enjoy natural landscape	283	7.2
	Visit to palaces and historic sites	24	5.0	Enjoy natural landscape	39	6.0	Enjoy natural landscape	55	5.8	Visit to palaces and historic sites	164	4.2
	Watching cultural performances, folk events, or festivals	21	4.4	Amusement/entertainment (nightlife)	24	3.7	Amusement/ entertainment (nightlife)	24	2.6	Traditional culture experience	105	2.7
	Theme park	21	4.4	Watching cultural performances, folk events, or festivals	11	1.7	Theme park	21	2.2	Watching cultural performances, folk events, or festivals	75	1.9
	Traditional culture experience	17	3.5	Visit to museumns and/or exhibitions	9	1.4	Hot spring, spa	15	1.6	Theme park	58	1.5

Table 3. Behavioral patterns in visiting places.

	2015			2016			2017			2018	
	n	%		n	%		n	%		n	%
A. Visit provinces (multiple responses)											
Seoul	421	87.5		548	85.9		767	81.3		3,122	79.9
Incheon	21	4.4		23	3.6		52	5.5		208	5.3
Gyoenggi-do	56	11.6		73	11.4		95	10.1		346	8.8
Gangwon-do	39	8.1		43	6.7		54	5.7		334	8.5
Chungcheong-do	6	1.2		6	0.9		7	0.8		40	1.0
Gyeongsang-do	76	15.8		73	11.5		143	15.2		619	15.8
Jeolla-do	17	3.5		6	1.0		5	0.6		35	0.9
Jeju-do	56	11.6		85	13.3		98	10.4		482	12.3
B. Best place visited (This table reports more than 4% responses out of 100%)											
Myeong-dong areas in Seoul	109	22.7	Myeong-dong areas in Seoul	135	21.1	Myeong-dong areas in Seoul	274	29.0	Myong-dong areas in Seoul	1,687	43.2
Palaces in Seoul	46	9.6	Sinshon/Hongik Univ in Seoul	45	7.1	Sinshon/Hongik Univ in Seoul	60	6.4	Jeju-do(Jeju Island)	410	10.5
Sinshon/Hongik Univ in Seoul	43	8.9	Palaces in Seoul	41	6.4	Palaces in Seoul	57	6.0	Sinshon/Hongik Univ in Seoul	290	7.4
Dongdaemun Market in Seoul	29	6.0	Namsan/N Seoul Tower	35	5.5	Dongdaemun Market in Seoul	55	5.8	Dongdaemun Market in Seoul	194	5.0
Bukchon/Samcheong-dong in Seoul	20	4.2	Bukchon/Samcheong-dong in Seoul	30	4.7	Namsan/N Seoul Tower	48	5.1	Jongro/Cheonggyecheon in Seoul	166	4.3
			Dongdaemun Market in Seoul	30	4.6				Haeundae(beach)in Busan/ Gyeongsang-do	166	4.2
C. Total number of visiting places that the respondents described in Korea											
Total	114			125			136			172	

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

	2015			2016			2017			2018	
	n	%		n	%		n	%		n	%
D. Length of stay (day[s])											
1	2	0.4		4	0.7		0	0.0		2	0.0
2	24	5.0		15	2.4		46	4.9		99	2.5
3	69	14.3		105	16.5		266	28.2		972	24.9
4	96	20.0		125	19.5		167	17.7		876	22.4
5	123	25.6		194	30.5		206	21.8		936	23.9
6	51	10.6		63	9.8		94	10.0		384	9.8
7	34	7.1		44	6.9		68	7.2		208	5.3
8	26	5.4		22	3.5		44	4.6		137	3.5
9	12	2.5		19	3.0		8	0.9		55	1.4
10	9	1.9		15	2.4		13	1.4		46	1.2
11–20	21	4.4		28	4.3		22	2.3		120	3.1
21–30	7	1.5		4	0.6		6	0.6		29	0.7
31–60	5	1.0					1	0.1		32	0.8
61 or more	2	0.4					3	0.3		13	0.3
Total	481	100.0		638	100.0		943	100.0		3,909	100.0
	M	*SD*		*M*	*SD*		*M*	*SD*		*M*	*SD*
	6.81	15.1		5.46	3.00		5.24	5.43		5.57	5.94
E. Type of accommodation											
Hotel	346	69.3	Hotel	483	72.9	Hotel	684	69.5	Hotel	2,453	68.9
Youth Hostel, Guesthouse, Inn, Motel	113	22.6	Youth Hostel, Guesthouse, Inn, Motel	120	18.1	Youth Hostel, Guesthouse, Inn, Motel	212	21.5	Youth Hostel, Guesthouse, Inn, Motel	566	0.2
Condominium, Pension, Residence Inn	15	3.0	Condominium, Pension, Residence Inn	22	3.3	Condominium, Pension, Residence Inn	41	4.2	Condominium, Pension, Residence Inn	111	3.1
Relative's or Friend's House	16	3.2	Relative's or Friend's House	23	3.5	Relative's or Friend's House	30	3.0	Relative's or Friend's House	137	3.9

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

	2015			2016			2017			2018	
	n	%		n	%		n	%		n	%
E. Type of accommodation											
Homestay	5	1.0	School/Company dormitory, Training facility	2	0.3	School/Company dormitory, Training facility	3	0.3	School/Company dormitory, Training facility	7	0.2
Other	2	0.4	Homestay	3	0.5	Homestay	9	0.9	Homestay (Airbnb, etc)	274	7.7
For day	2	0.4	Other	9	1.4	Other	5	0.5	Other	7	0.2
			For day	1	0.2				For day	3	0.1
Total	499	100.0		663	100.0		984	100.0		3,558	100.0

agencies and for local transportation increased significantly from 2015 to 2018. More detailed information is provided in Table 4.

Discussion

Properly balancing the supply side with the demand side is important because synergistic effects can be maximized when the suppliers' tangible and intangible resources, products, and communications match the demanders' needs and motivations, as well as the experiences they are seeking. However, supply and demand sides vary across destinations and change over time. Therefore, it may be impossible to determine optimum levels that can be generalized across time and space, particularly for international visitors. The best that can be done is to identify international food tourists' priorities based on their main psychological and behavioral trends and determine what resources suppliers have, what resources they can deliver via food tourism, and what they can do to meet international food tourists' priorities. Prior research and the findings of this study suggest that both sides are most interested in cultural values in food tourism. In particular, international guests are more likely to consume cultures through food or vice versa because tasting food while traveling overseas means experiencing the underlying cultures and traditions of a particular destination's food. Therefore, it seems extremely important to take a 'food born in culture' approach rather than a 'food plus culture' approach, thereby blending food and cultures into unified comprehensive experiences. That said, should this approach be executed through centrally planned food tourism strategies or private food tourism strategies? If government-led food tourism strategies were selected, would they focus on increasing tourist accessibility to naturally generated resources or on developing and promoting new events and products at the governmental level, as in South Korea? By contrast, if private food tourism strategies were chosen, would they offer a better way to maintain a positive national image, enhance the quality of life among residents, and sustain the destination's carrying capacity beyond a consideration of private sector profits?

This study has shown that centrally led strategies in South Korea led to gaps between the supply and demand sides—specifically, an increase in number but a decrease in quality. Not only did the number of food tourists and the percentage of their food-related activities increase from 2015 to

Table 4. ANOVA in revisits, satisfaction, intention, image, and expenses.

Year		2015	2016	2017	2018	Levene's test *p*	*F* (Welch)	*p*
Number of revisits before*								
	N	481	604	819	3281	.004	4.590	**.003**
	M	**2.11**	**1.89**	**2.01**	**2.07**		(4.595)	**(.003)**
	SD	1.25	1.20	1.19	1.21			
Satisfaction*								
Overall	N	481	604	819	3281	.425	3.761	**.010**
	M	**4.32**	**4.37**	**4.39**	**4.32**			
	SD	.66	.58	.57	.62			
Immigration (procedure, VISA issuing)	N	481	604	819	3281	.753	11.051	**.000**
	M	**4.13**	**4.17**	**4.21**	**4.29**			
	SD	.82	.79	.77	.72			
Public transportation (convenience, service quality)	N	481	604	819	3261	.533	2.033	.107
	M	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.28			
	SD	.76	.77	.72	.75			
Accommodation (convenience, service quality)	N	481	599	819	3278	.112	.230	.876
	M	4.28	4.29	4.31	4.30			
	SD	.68	.69	.69	.70			
Food (taste, service quality)	N	481	604	819	3281	.003	13.030	**.000**
	M	**4.42**	**4.44**	**4.50**	**4.35**		(14.123)	**(.000)**
	SD	.65	.62	.61	.68			
Shopping (convenience, service/facility quality)	N	479	593	810	3257	.355	1.705	.164
	M	4.29	4.36	4.37	4.35			
	SD	.68	.68	.62	.66			
Appeal of tourist spots (cultural heritage, landscape, night view)	N	480	600	819	3234	.010	2.487	.059
	M	4.17	4.25	4.24	4.26		(2.510)	(0.057)
	SD	.71	.74	.68	.71			
Tourist information services(tourist information center/travel information, guide/information desk clerk, directional sign)	N	477	596	819	3202	.443	1.219	.301
	M	4.09	4.15	4.13	4.16			
	SD	.79	.78	.77	.78			
Communication (language)	N	481	604	819	3281	.093	.818	.484
	M	3.70	3.79	3.76	3.76			
	SD	.88	.93	.86	.92			
Travel expenses (souvenir price, admission fee)	N	481	604	819	3262	.000	5.501	**.001**
	M	**3.87**	**4.00**	**3.99**	**4.02**		(4.939)	**(.002)**
	SD	.83	.77	.74	.78			
Security (safety)	N	481	604	819	3281	.647	4.005	**.007**
	M	**4.27**	**4.37**	**4.35**	**4.38**			
	SD	.69	.67	.64	.66			
Intention*								
Intention to revisit within the next 3 years	N	481	604	819	3281	.968	1.278	.280
	M	4.23	4.14	4.20	4.20			
	SD	.75	.81	.79	.77			
Intention to recommend Korea as a tourist destination to others	N	481	604	819	3281	.289	.994	.395
	M	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.29			
	SD	.64	.68	.66	.67			
Image*								
Image before visit	N	481	604	819	3281	.001	14.087	**.000**
	M	**3.99**	**4.07**	**4.06**	**4.16**		(14.028)	**(.000)**
	SD	.65	.65	.70	.65			
Image after visit	N	481	604	819	3281	.657	1.982	.114
	M	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.33			
	SD	.67	.64	.63	.63			
Image after visit – image before visit (improved image)	N	481	604	819	3281	.000	8.763	**.000**
	M	**.27**	**.23**	**.27**	**.17**		(7.578)	**(.000)**
	SD	.74	.69	.68	.55			

(continued)

Table 4. (continued)

Year		2015	2016	2017	2018	Levene's test *p*	*F* (Welch)	*p*
Expenditure (per person)								
Total expenses	N	473	599	816	3265	.008	2.754	**.041**
	M	**1403.65**	**1286.04**	**1235.45**	**1250.43**		(2.289)	**(.077)**
	SD	1285.79	990.41	1102.69	1153.88			
Individual accommodation	N	327	446	646	2406	.000	6.273	**.000**
	M	**351.81**	**307.41**	**333.78**	**279.67**		(4.741)	**(.003)**
	SD	611.27	292.17	416.36	329.22			
Expenses paid to the travel agency in their own country	N	146	153	172	859	.000	7.202	**.000**
	M	**564.66**	**463.42**	**450.05**	**567.55**		(12.315)	**(.000)**
	SD	463.91	218.80	244.00	399.96			
Shopping	N	473	599	818	3265	.422	2.947	**.032**
	M	**699.06**	**631.43**	**561.58**	**593.16**			
	SD	889.69	785.47	844.30	875.21			
Food & Beverages	N	473	599	819	3265	.000	20.327	**.000**
	M	**154.74**	**213.43**	**242.04**	**182.72**		(13.599)	**(.000)**
	SD	256.99	252.85	312.39	196.40			
Local transportation	N	473	599	818	3265	.000	13.404	**.000**
	M	**35.19**	**58.41**	**64.72**	**73.10**		(32.568)	**(.000)**
	SD	64.48	76.89	87.57	147.71			
Entertainment/cultural activities/ sport activities	N	473	599	818	3265	.000	18.001	**.000**
	M	**50.68**	**30.68**	**27.63**	**14.76**		(10.418)	**(.000)**
	SD	214.18	149.93	86.60	76.28			
Expenses paid to a Korean travel agency while traveling in Korea	N	473	599	819	3265	.000	2.742	**.042**
	M	**2.42**	**1.01**	**.96**	**5.99**		(5.402)	**(.001)**
	SD	22.34	19.09	11.95	70.22			
Other	N	473	599	818	3265	.000	5.223	**.001**
	M	**44.05**	**3.82**	**3.87**	**14.79**		(5.265)	**(.001)**
	SD	421.73	30.32	26.43	178.17			

Note: Boldface values represent statistical significance.
* Revisit (1 = 1 time, 2 = 2 times, 3 = 3 times, 4 = 4 times and more before); Satisfaction (1 = very unsatisfied, 5 = very satisfied); Intention (1 = very unlikely, 5 = very likely); Image (1 = very negative, 5 = very positive).

2018, but the number of visit locations in South Korea increased as well. However, food tourists' satisfaction, image of South Korea as a tourist destination, and spending amounts fell from 2015 to 2018. An increase in the number of food tourists and visiting places, and the percentage of food-related activities seem to be positively influenced by centrally planned strategies. Specifically, the respondents' major activity was shopping even though their favorite activity was 'food/gourmet tour' in 2015/2016, which still reflects the government's policy strategy of having encouraged shopping tourism for prior many years (Heo and Cho, 1999; Yoon, 2017). Food tourism-related options were apparently insufficient for food tourists who were highly exposed to shopping-related facilities, packages, and activities. Providing more food tourism-related programs on the supply side apparently led to an increase in the number of participants in food/gourmet tours in 2017/2018. The major shopping item was clothing, but groceries were ranked fourth or fifth in 2015 to 2017, while these results changed dramatically in 2018, when 'perfume and cosmetics' and 'groceries' were ranked first and second, respectively. Food tourists had increased access to stores in which one of Korea's largest cosmetic corporations sold both cosmetics and F&B products at popular touristic locations (Kang, 2018, 15 January). Additionally, many large Korean food corporations have developed quality HMR products that tourists can easily pack, handle, store, and transport from one country to another (Park and Na, 2019, 1 February), which may also have contributed to the increased grocery purchases. This phenomenon shows the importance of the government's policy strategy for increasing the number of products available for consumption, which in turn affects food tourists' choices and purchase behavior.

In addition, centrally planned events and promotions across locales such as the monthly

K-Food events in different provinces and cities were effective in decreasing the tourist concentration in the Seoul capital area and expanding their visits to other areas. Food tourists dispersed to other regions in 2018. Aside from food tourists' awareness regarding the availability of food tourism products, the visits to different localities in South Korea seem to be associated with the increasing interest in Korean culture overall. It is because more food tourists' favorite cultural activities such as 'visit to palaces and historic sites' and 'traditional culture experience' (specified as 'temple stay, taekwondo, making Korean foods such as kimchi, etc.') were listed in the top rank in 2018, in contrast to the 2015–2017 period. 'Traditional culture experience' included several cooking-related programs in which tourists not only tasted food but also prepared traditional food with local people. International food tourists' increasing interest in cultural aspects may not have been matched with sufficient opportunities on the supply side, which may have led to the quality issues observed in the findings (see de Jong and Varley, 2017; Goolaup et al., 2018; Rabbiosi, 2016; Robinson et al., 2018).

In addition, tourists' lengths of stay have been also constant over the last 4 years even though more food tourists have traveled to local areas. The significantly increased number of food tourists who chose the homestay option in 2018 may account for this result. The most common reason for using homestay was to completely experience and enjoy local cultures, including food, by engaging in the residents' lifestyles during a longer stay (Oh et al., 2007). The food tourists who use the homestay option may leave earlier than planned if they are not satisfied with their experience of local cultures, including food. The difference between independent travelers and package-tour tourists lies in the ease with which they can alter their length of stay. Independent food tourists who struggle to find experiences that fulfill the purpose of their trip may leave immediately. They are more likely to extend the length of their stay if they are satisfied. Moreover, international food tourists' expectations may have risen owing to K-Food promotions, but no significant difference in tourists' post-trip image of Korea was observed from 2015 to 2018 although international food tourists had a better image of South Korea before their trip in 2018 than in the three preceding years, owing to stronger destination marketing. The poor result for length of stay appears to have a close relationship with the decrease in improved image, which may also be correlated with the decreased overall satisfaction wherein food tourists' expectations were higher than their actual experience. They were satisfied with their travel expenses, presumably because overall expenses—including those for food, accommodation, shopping, and cultural activities—gradually fell from 2015 to 2018. Traveling inexpensively has always been appreciated, but, ironically, this may imply a lack of the customized experiences that food tourists expect and are willing to pay for. The simultaneous reduction in expenditures on both food and cultural activities may reflect the importance of food-related culture.

As De Jong and Varley (2017) pointed out, food tourism strategies led by the government should be utilized carefully due to the side effects caused by the government's intensive promotional image and demanders' higher expectations. The development and implementation of government-led K-Food tourism for international targets should not merely rely on several traditional foods that have become popular through exposure on social media or word-of-mouth. In addition, food businesses and food tourism businesses should not be confused with each other, as they look similar but are quite different because food tourism cannot be limited to just visiting restaurants, participating in food events, or taking cooking classes. For example, the government-planned monthly events and programs and their marketing across regions helped increase the number of food tourists, who may have been satisfied with the events and programs. However, this is not enough for food tourists to be willing to experience diverse cultural values embedded in food tourism. Moreover, food tourism is inherently different from government-led shopping tourism or urban tourism, as shopping and urban tourists have different purposes and display different behaviors, and their goals can be structurally well-managed in certain designated places, where related businesses can cooperate more easily.

Overall, conducting intensive promotions, holding food festivals and events frequently, and providing cooking classes and packaged tours appeared to be successful, as reflected in the increased number of participants. However, food tourism strategies should be well-blended into local cultural values and lifestyles to ensure that food tourists are more satisfied, stay longer, and spend more and to guarantee positive long-term effects in destination-specific food tourism (De Jong and Varley, 2017; Ellis et al., 2018; Goolaup et al., 2018; Rabbiosi, 2016). Food tourists want to see not only the frontstage but also the backstage in this regard (MacCannell, 1999). A backstage that is formed naturally is preferred—particularly by independent travelers, who tend to wander there looking for authentic experiences. The government should therefore play a supporting role by building connected, accessible routes to authentic resources on the spectrum of food tourists' involvement (Hall and Mitchell, 2001; Robinson et al., 2018).

More specifically, cultural identity reflecting food tourists' lifestyles was found to be a fundamental factor defining food tourists' main segments, the so-called 'highbrows' and 'lowbrows' (Robinson et al., 2018). However, as the number of lowbrows tends to be larger than that of the highbrows (Hall et al., 2003), highbrow-specific food tourism should offer deeper forms of experiential consumption after food tourism has been delivered to the lowbrows. For lowbrows, there is a need to develop and provide more diverse products—such as programs, events, routes, and streets/places—through which the tourists could easily access local cultures and local food. It is necessary to accommodate food tourists by developing an online and offline local food theme map/book (with accessible routes) that includes the local food themes identified with South Korea's diverse local cultures. Beyond the governmental level, the big corporations that have established cafés multi-branded with cosmetics across South Korean provinces as well as abroad could self-develop food tourism and create different forms of lowbrows by cooperating with the government.

For highbrows, it is important to provide ways to visit and consume more unique local foods that are rooted in unique local histories, traditions, and legends. While ensuring accessibility to quality authentic food locations well known among residents, the government should also prepare several alternative ways to manage its carrying capacity. For example, highbrows may be interested in a place well known as a habitat for various fish species and in eating sashimi made from fish caught directly from the sea either onboard or ashore while enjoying the unique scenery of the season. While based at a homestay, they may also be interested in experiencing a local village where fishermen have their own food, ways of eating, and lifestyles. Connected routes, resources, and information should be made available to international highbrows so that they can access and experience food locations, but they should also be fully informed of their responsibilities as well as any service limitations and conditions in order to maintain an appropriate carrying capacity level. All the relevant information should be made available. If the highbrows must be accompanied by tour-qualified residents, the government should provide these human resources. For another example, the food tourist highbrows who may be interested in Kimchi (i.e., traditional Korean fermented vegetables) should be given easy access to the South Korean provinces (e.g., Seoul, Gyeonggi-do, Gangwon-do, Chungcheong-do, Gyeongsang-do, Jeolla-do, and Jeju-do) that have at least three different types of Kimchi (per province), with unique flavors, ingredients, histories, and cultural backgrounds (Doopedia, 2020). Exposing tourists to deeper experiential components of the host culture will enhance the potential and long-term value of the target. The difference between capitalizing on food cultures that reflect the host lifestyles and making manufactured food tourism products that artificially combine popular elements might not appear significant in terms of the short-term results but will have significant effects on tourists' perceptions over the long term.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Seohee Chang https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7383-0940

References

Belisle FJ (1983) Tourism and food production in the Caribbean. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10: 597–513.

Belisle FJ (1984) Tourism and food imports: the case of Jamaica. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 32(4): 819–842.

Bourdieu P (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

de Jong A and Varley P (2017) Food tourism policy: deconstructing boundaries of taste and class. *Tourism Management* 60: 212–222.

Doopedia (2020) Types of Kimchi by region. Available at: http://www.doopedia.co.kr/doopedia/master/master.do?_method=view&MAS_IDX=120726001335225 (accessed 13 March 2020).

Ellis A, Park E, Kim S, et al. (2018) What is food tourism? *Tourism Management* 68: 250–263.

Elmont S (1995) Tourism and food service: two sides of the same coin. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 36(1): 57–63.

Engeset MG and Elvekrok I (2015) Authentic concepts: effects on tourist satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research* 54(4): 456–466.

Getz D, Robinson R, Andersson T, et al. (2014) *Foodies and Food Tourism*. Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers.

Goolaup S, Solér C and Nunkoo R (2018) Developing a theory of surprise from travelers' extraordinary food experiences. *Journal of Travel Research* 57(2): 218–231.

Hall CM and Mitchell R (2001) Wine and food tourism. In: Douglas N, Douglas N and Derrett R (eds) *Special Interest Tourism*. Milton, Queensland: John Wiley and Sons Australia, Ltd., pp. 307–329.

Hendijani RB (2016) Effect of food experience on tourist satisfaction: the case of Indonesia. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 10(3): 272–282.

Heo G and Cho B (1999) *To promote shopping tourism. Technical Research Report 99–01*. Seoul: Korea Tourism Research Institute.

Jeong C (2016, 17 November) Amorepacific's green tea: cultivating the wastelands in Jeju-do and forming green tea fields. *WomenEconomy*. Available at: http://www.womaneconomy.kr (accessed 6 January 2020).

Kang D (2018, 15 January) Eating and drinking in the cosmetic shops. *Maeil Business*. Available at: https://www.mk.co.kr (accessed 7 January 2020).

Kim Y (2014, 28 August) 'Global K-Food Project' planned by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. *DongA*. Available at: http://www.donga.com (accessed 6 January 2020).

Kwon T and Lee S (2017) Analyzing the differences between international visitors to Korea and Japan in 2015 and 2016. *Korea Culture and Tourism Institute*. Available at: https://know.tour.go.kr (accessed 6 January 2020).

Lee KH and Scott N (2015) Food tourism reviewed using the paradigm funnel approach. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology* 13(2): 95–115.

Long LM (1998) Culinary tourism: a folkloristic perspective on eating and otherness. *Southern Folklore* 55(3): 181–204.

MacCannell D (1999) *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Min J (2017, 24 May) Consumers stop by cosmetic stores to eat cakes with teas. *Hankyung*. Available at: https://www.hankyung.com (accessed 6 January 2020).

Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (2012) 2013 budget plan. Available at: http://www.mafra.go.kr (accessed 6 January 2020).

Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs (2017) K-Food Road: 2017 Food tourism themes. Available at: http://www.korea.kr (accessed 7 January 2020).

Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism (2015) K-Food Festival 2015. Available at: https://www.mcst.go.kr (accessed 6 January 2020).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2013) 2013 K-Food World Festival. Available at: https://www.mofa.go.kr (accessed 6 January 2020).

Mowforth M and Munt I (2015) *Tourism and Sustainability: Development, Globalization and New Tourism in the Third World*. New York, NY: Routledge.

National Assembly Budget Office (2012) 'K-Food' budget. The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society. Available at: https://www.opengirok.or.kr (accessed 6 January 2020).

Oh H, Fiore A and Jeong M (2007) Measuring experience economy concepts: tourism applications. *Journal of Travel Research* 46: 119–132.

Okumus B, Koseoglu MA and Ma F (2018) Food and gastronomy research in tourism and hospitality: a bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 73: 64–74.

Park S (2018, 1 August) K-Food, Hallyu Wave abroad. *Economic Review*. Available at: http://www.econovill.com (accessed 6 January 2020).

Park S and Na G (2019, 1 February) Skyrocketed sales in K-Food abroad: attracting global consumers beyond diverse countries, races, and generations. *Newdaily*. Available at: https://www.mk.co.kr (accessed 6 January 2020).

Rabbiosi C (2016) Place branding performances in tourist local food shops. *Annals of Tourism Research* 60: 154–168.

Reynolds PC (1993) Food and tourism: towards an understanding of sustainable culture. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 1(1): 48–54.

Robinson RN and Getz D (2014) Profiling potential food tourists: an Australian study. *British Food Journal* 116(4): 690–706.

Robinson RN and Getz D (2016) Food enthusiasts and tourism: exploring food involvement dimensions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research* 40(4): 432–455.

Robinson RN, Getz D and Dolnicar S (2018) Food tourism subsegments: a data-driven analysis. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 20(3): 367–377.

Sanchez-Cañizares S and Castillo-Canalejo AM (2015) A comparative study of tourist attitudes towards culinary tourism in Spain and Slovenia. *British Food Journal* 117(9): 2387–2411.

Seoul Tourism Organization (2017) K-Food cooking class for international tourists to Seoul. Available at: https://www.newsro.kr (accessed 6 January 2020).

Seoul Tourism Organization (2018) K-Food cooking class. Available at: http://korean.visitseoul.net (accessed 6 January 2020).

Yoon J (2017) *Strategies to Reinforce Shopping Tourism's International Competitiveness in South Korea*. Policy Research 2017_04. Seoul: Korea Culture and Tourism Research Institute.

Zelinsky W (1985) The roving palate: North America's ethnic restaurant cuisines. *Geoforum* 16(1): 51–72.