

2022

Factors Driving The Tourists Choice of Alcohol and Drinkscares: An Exploratory Study

Edgar Philip Dsouza Mr.
Goa University, edgar@unigoa.ac.in

Dayanand M.S. Dr.
Goa University

Nilesh Borde Dr
Goa University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/jti>



Part of the [Food Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dsouza, Edgar Philip Mr.; M.S., Dayanand Dr.; and Borde, Nilesh Dr (2022) "Factors Driving The Tourists Choice of Alcohol and Drinkscares: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Tourism Insights*: Vol. 12: Iss. 1, Article 11.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.9707/2328-0824.1221>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/jti/vol12/iss1/11>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Tourism Insights* by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

Factors driving the tourists choice of alcohol and drinksapes: An exploratory study

Introduction

When travelling, an increasing number of people seek drinking experiences. Food and restaurant selection are viewed as a complex function of sensory preferences (taste, odour, and texture) which are influenced by non-sensory factors such as menu variety, price, cleanliness, servicescape concerns, reputation, health claims, service, accessibility, comfort, and atmosphere (Hanefors & Mossberg, 2003; Cullen, 2005; Choi and Jhao, 2010 Johns & Howard, (1998). Kivela et al., (1999). Clark & Wood, (1998). Koo et al.,(1999).

Past research within food tourism focus on tourist eating experiences; however, the bulk of these studies have only touched on customer satisfaction concerns (Jang et al., 2012; Björk and Räisänen, 2014; Kim and Jang, 2016; Stone et al., 2018). When selecting where to eat and where to go out, customers have a range of demands and preferences (Tikkanen, 2007). These distinctions lead customers to select a restaurant depending on their tastes. Since food and beverages are two distinct areas of consumption for a customer, the results of food-related studies cannot be generalized in drinksapes settings. Repeat visitors rely heavily on their past (good) experiences (Bruwer and Alant, 2009). Yet, little research has been done to assess the role of tourists knowledge and past experiences in determining the choice of alcohol and the choice of servicescapes at tourist destinations. While it is critical to focus new research on different variables that can shape a tourist's experience, such as physiological states (e.g. satiety, thirst) and post-consumption experience, Gomes et al. (2017) proposed that other relevant issues that should be explored are "previous product knowledge" and "brand usage." Owing to these limitations, this present research attempts to examine tourists' factors influencing the choice of alcohol and the choice of drinksapes at tourist destinations. This paper contributes to destination and tourism management research by establishing the study of drinksapes (drinking locations) and providing a new framework for analyzing the elements influencing the selection of drinksapes at a destination. The study's findings might assist beverage service managers in creating a good experience that satisfies tourists' drinking preferences and increases tourist's level of satisfaction at destinations.

Literature review

The theoretical framework defines three key concepts; tourist past experience and knowledge related to alcohol consumption, the choice of alcohol and the choice of drinkscapes, and their inter-linkages.

Tourist past experience and knowledge related to alcohol consumption

According to the literature, there is a link between past tourist experiences and the intention to consume local food in the location (Kwun & Oh, 2006; Ryu & Han, 2010). According to Kwun and Oh (2006), prior experience significantly influences future consumption-related expectations for the same experience. Furthermore, they suggest that experienced consumers build their preferences differently from first-time buyers, even for the same items, since they are more familiar with and knowledgeable about them. People who have previously visited an area and feel that prior experiences and familiarity impact their future behaviour are considered repeat visitors (Chi, 2012). Similarly, Barsky (1992) suggests that consumers compare current or past experiences on some foundation built from earlier encounters.

According to Kleynhans (2003), the prior experiences of leisure tourists and their demographics and culture impact their expectations and satisfaction with the dining experience and ultimately lead to revisit intentions. Furthermore, the traveller's knowledge of the area and their previous consumption experience influence their selection criteria and quality experiences (Nickerson, 2006). Hence studying the impact of tourists past experience and knowledge in the context of alcohol consumption on the choice of alcohol or the choice of drinkscapes could prove interesting.

Only those destinations, which provide unforgettable experiences to tourists, will attract more repeated visits. Likewise, destinations that fail to create memorable experiences do not attract tourists to revisit (Zhang et al., 2018). Braun-LaTour et al. (2006) have argued that given the number of external searches available and the popularity of word-of-mouth communication, destinations need to find a way to handle such interactions. Food and drinking experiences that are memorable are connected with higher travel satisfaction and favourable word of mouth (Stone and Migacz, 2016)

Choice of alcohol

The interaction between the individual and the product shapes the product experience. Gomez et al. (2017) have argued that our cognitive, sensory, and emotional systems all influence our drinking experiences and suggest that further

research is needed to understand purchase decisions related to alcohol consumption and its link to the product experience. The Consumption experience of an alcoholic beverage is influenced by the products price, brand, taste sensations at consumption, presentation form, and composition of the menu (Hansen et al., 2006; Gregoire, 2013; Forneniro et al., 2008; Pedraja and Guillen, 2004). In restaurant settings, customer experience research generally assesses the atmosphere, food quality, and pricing fairness (Chuan et al., 2018). This implies that studies on customer experience in the hospitality industry have largely ignored the selection criteria for alcohol consumption in a touristic environment. To better understand the factors that influence tourist's choice of alcohol for consumption, the factors that measure the choice of alcohol experiences must be elucidated.

Choice of Drinksapes

Experiences are formed from service settings and outlets, such as restaurants and bars, made available to guests. Bitner (1992) referred to these scapes as servicescapes, whereas Mossberg (2007) referred to them as experiencescapes. According to Reimer and Kuehn (2005), these scapes are rich with interactions between guests, service providers, staff, physical surroundings, and various facilities. The servicescape construct has been adapted to various settings, including shipscape (Kwortnik, 2008), dinescape (Ryu, 2005), and eventscape (Brown, Lee, King, & Shipway, 2015). Previous research on the scape constructs and food experiences always focused on artificial and constructed surroundings. In the context of food service, academics have defined foodscape as a construct describing a "landscape of food" centred on "food environments" (Mikkelsen, 2011; MacKendrick, 2014). Likewise, in the context of beverage service in our study, the operational definition of 'Drinksapes' would be "Places and scapes that facilitate alcohol consumption". Alcohol is consumed in a food and beverage outlet such as a bar, a pub, a restaurant, a lounge, a beach shack, etc. Besides retail outlets, alcohol can be consumed at a hotel, at home, in a tasting room or in the open-air such as at a park, street, wine or beer festival (Stone et al., 2018; Bruyer et al., 2013; Wilkinson and Wilkinson, 2018). Lin and Mao (2015) suggest that the environment in these drinksapes facilitates immersion into the experience of food and beverage intake through entertainment, architecture, design, colour, and smell. Bruwer and Alant (2009) discovered that in the context of a winery, in addition to wine tasting, the same visitor also indulges in the atmosphere for a good experience. In the service industry, such as the food and beverage, the physical environment impacts consumer behaviour and shapes the service provider's image (Booms and Bitner, 1982). One of the most important factors influencing consumer consumption is the environment (Ryu and Jang, 2007, Cheng et al., 2016, Park et al., 2019, Kuhn and Bothma, 2018). Tourists want to have a memorable time away from home, and the

environment in these scapes may play an essential part in making that happen (Ryu and Han, 2011). As a result, some hospitality companies employ architecture and design successfully and multidimensional experiences to enhance guests' experience (Albrecht et al., 2019). Clark and Wood (1999) identified food range, quality, price, service speed and ambience as important variables while considering the restaurant choice. While the food and beverages on offer and service must be of acceptable quality, attractive physical surroundings, such as décor, artefacts, layout, and music, may influence customer satisfaction and subsequent consumer behaviour to a large extent.

The beverage service business has grown more competitive as the number of drinksapes has increased. In today's environment, satisfying consumers' fundamental expectations is the most significant way to assure business sustainability. To be successful and exceptional, a drinkscape must exceed customers' expectations by truly understanding why they choose a specific sort of drinking experience. More research is needed to determine what aspects affect the choice of drinksapes, given its common effects on approach-avoidance behaviours, compared to other physical and intangible service components (Wakefield and Blodgett, 2016).

To the authors' knowledge, no previous empirical studies have investigated if tourists past knowledge and past experiences influence the choice of alcohol and the choice of drinksapes at tourist destinations. Literature also reveals little theoretical understanding about drinking experience from the motivational perspective (Josiam et al., 2004; Costa et al., 2007). Currently, not much is known about the influence of motives on tourists' selection of drinksapes, choice of alcohol or the influence of the choice of alcohol on the choice of drinksapes. In addition, consumer preferences while choosing drinksapes must be examined to fulfil the expectations and needs of beverage service providers and consumers. Given this research gap, the aims of the present study were:

1. To develop a scale to measure the tourist's knowledge of alcohol & past experiences of alcohol consumption, choice of alcohol and choice of drinksapes.
2. To test whether the tourist's knowledge of alcohol & past experiences of alcohol consumption influences the choice of alcohol and choice of drinksapes.
3. To test if the choice of alcohol influences the choice of drinksapes.

Methodology

An initial list of 25 items was generated on aspects related to the tourist's knowledge & past experience related to alcohol consumption, choice of alcohol and choice of drinksapes. They were derived from prior studies (e.g. Armira et al. 2016; Andersson and Mossberg, 2004; Hansen et al., 2005; Gustafsson et al., 2006; Nickerson, 2006, Stone et al., 2018; Kuhn and Bothma, 2018; Back et al., 2018; Brochado et al., 2019). Questions related to the choice of alcohol and choice of drinksapes was adapted from the scale developed by Armira et al. (2016). Items related to check the tourist's knowledge and past experience of alcohol consumption were developed by conducting unstructured interviews with bar managers, people who consumed alcohol regularly and experts from the food and beverage service sector. S-CVI/Ave for relevance was calculated, and the value was found to 0.988; besides, S-CVI was calculated, and the value was 0.93. A CVI between $0.3 < \text{CVI} < 0.75$ was considered for rewriting, assessing the item-wise score for simplicity and clarity. Also, the interclass correlation coefficient was calculated for relevance, clarity and simplicity for all 25 items. A pilot test consisting of 50 questionnaires was conducted to ensure the scale reliability. The α Cronbach for total scores demonstrated right post-test internal consistency with an $\alpha = 0.825$. Each dining experience attribute was rated using a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "strongly disagree (1)" to "strongly agree (5)". In addition, the study questionnaire also included sociodemographic measures.

This study aimed to gather tourists' views and perceptions on the factors that influence the choice of drinksapes and the choice of alcohol in a tourist destination (Goa). Goa, one of India's most popular tourist destinations, is recognized for its liberal liquor laws. This lowers the cost of liquor, and hence the prices charged for sales and service of spirits, beer, and other alcoholic beverages are fairly affordable in comparison to other states. The demand for alcoholic beverages is strong in Goa, as evidenced by the state's liquor factories expanding their capacity. According to figures compiled through September 2019, the state excise agency issued 2725 retail liquor licenses and 8107 retail consumption licenses (bars, taverns, pubs, etc.). The sample selected in this study included tourists visiting Goa who consumed alcohol in various drinksapes. The study used non-probability sampling and convenience sampling technique. The respondents were not chosen at random but rather based on their willingness to answer. The study has tried to ensure that the samples are reasonably representative and not strongly biased by selecting a broad cross-section of tourists across various drinksapes (males and females, different age etc.). There were 550 responses received, of which 504 were from tourists that consume alcohol, and another 23 were incomplete. Therefore, 481 valid responses were used for the data analysis. According to some researchers, it is preferable to

have at least ten respondents for each item being evaluated in factor analysis. Furthermore, up to 300 responses is reasonably acceptable for Likert scale creation, according to other experts.

To determine the demographic status of visitors, descriptive analyses involving frequency, mean, and standard deviation were performed. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to test the scale reliability. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with VARIMAX rotation was employed to test the items measuring tourists past experience, knowledge of alcoholic beverages, factors measuring choice of beverages and factors measuring choice of drinks. Factor loadings expressed the correlation between the variable and its relevant factor, and only factor loadings equal to or greater than 0.50 were included in a factor. Furthermore, only components with eigenvalues equal to or greater than one was considered significant. Mean scores rating on the tourist's past experience and knowledge of alcohol, perceived importance of the choice of alcohol, and attributes of choice of drinks were computed to assess the importance of each item.

Findings and discussion

After the deletion of incomplete questionnaires, the total valid samples were 481. Table 1 reports the demographic details of the respondents.

Table 1. Demographic details of the respondents

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	263	54.7
	Female	218	45.3
Marital Status	Unmarried	144	29.9
	Married	331	68.8
	Divorced	2	0.4
	Widow/Widower	4	0.8
Age group	18-30 years	185	38.5
	31-40 years	130	27
	41-50 years	111	23.1
	51-60 years	46	9.6
	61 years and above	9	1.9
Occupation	Student	22	4.6
	Service	337	70.1
	Business	113	23.5
	Unemployed	9	1.9

Income	Upto 20000	21	4.4
	20001-50000	109	22.7
	50001-80000	176	36.6
	80001 and above	175	36.4
Education	High school	2	0.4
	Diploma/Certificate	59	12.3
	Undergraduate	238	49.5
	Postgraduate	172	35.8
	Others	10	2.1

To address the choice of alcohol, the mean scores and standard deviations were calculated. The results are presented in Table 2 according to the rankings of mean scores. The five top most essential attributes for choice of alcohol were taste quality, quantity to be consumed, the brand of the alcoholic beverage and the level of intoxication desired. Choice based on the suggestion by servers or friends was the least important attribute. Drinksapes managers have explained this finding that alcohol consumers generally prefer a favorite type or brand of alcohol that does not change irrespective of the place or people that they consume it with.

Table 2. Rankings for choice of alcohol

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Taste	481	1	5	4.25	0.830	1
Quality	481	1	5	4.22	0.849	2
Quantity	481	1	5	4.21	0.857	3
Brand	481	1	5	4.19	0.888	4
Level of Intoxication	481	1	5	4.10	1.008	5
Place of origin	481	1	5	4.03	1.004	6
Food pairing	481	1	5	4.03	1.050	7
Price	481	1	5	4.01	0.853	8
Offer/ Discount	481	1	5	3.94	0.906	9
Suggestions	481	1	5	3.83	1.051	10

Note: Rankings for choice of alcohol was based on the mean scores measured on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5.

The mean scores of the choice of drinksapes were also calculated. The results were reported based on the ranking of the mean scores in Table 3. It shows that the mean scores of all attributes ranged from 4.28 to 4.66. The top 5 drinksapes items were

ambience, entertainment, safe environment, comfortable seating and clean surroundings, indicating the choice of drinksapes. It is suggested that at destinations tourists are inclined to have drinking experiences in those drinksapes having a good ambience that emphasized on a safe and clean environment offering, good entertainment. Accessibility, noise levels and temperature were considered as the most unimportant factors while choosing drinksapes.

Table 3. Rankings for choice of drinksapes

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Ambience	481	2	5	4.66	0.595	1
Entertainment	481	2	5	4.65	0.544	2
Safe environment	481	1	5	4.64	0.552	3
Comfortable seating	481	1	5	4.64	0.604	4
Clean surroundings	481	2	5	4.63	0.540	5
Washroom / toilets	481	1	5	4.62	0.584	6
Accessibility	481	2	5	4.56	0.627	7
Noise levels	481	1	5	4.32	0.799	8
Temperature	481	2	5	4.28	0.684	9

Note: The ranking was based on the mean scores measured on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 5.

To further investigate the influence of tourists' knowledge and past experience on the choice of alcohol and choice of drinksapes and check the correlations, factor analysis was conducted. First, An EFA was performed using principal component analysis and varimax rotation. The minimum factor loading criteria was set to 0.50. The communality of the scale, which indicates the amount of variance in each dimension, was also assessed to ensure acceptable levels of explanation. The results show that all communalities were over 0.50.

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated as a test for the reliability of factors. It was .871 for tourists' knowledge and past experience, .939 for choice of alcohol and .929 for choice of drinksapes which are greater than .7, suggesting good reliability of the factors (Hair et al., 2014).

A critical step involved weighing the overall significance of the correlation matrix through Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, which provides a measure of the statistical probability that the correlation matrix has significant correlations among some of its components.

The results were significant, $\chi^2(n = 481) = 10000$ ($p < 0.001$), which indicates its suitability for factor analysis. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (MSA), which indicates the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis, was 0.861. In this regard, data with MSA values above 0.800 are considered appropriate for factor analysis. Finally, the factor solution derived from this analysis yielded three factors for the scale, which accounted for 65.65 per cent of the variation in the data. The three factors identified as part of this EFA aligned with the theoretical proposition in this research. The percentages explained by each factor were 30.90% (Factor 1- Choice of Alcohol), 21.69% (Factor 2- Choice of Drinksapes) and 13.06% (Factor 3 – Tourist’s profile). Factor Loadings are presented in table 4.

Table 4 EFA results

Rotated Component Matrix			
	Component		
	1	2	3
Quantity to be consumed	0.873		
Quality of the drink	0.842		
Brand	0.826		
Level of Intoxication	0.814		
Taste	0.802		
Price	0.796		
Pairing with Food	0.796		
Offers and Discount	0.791		
Suggestion by server or friends	0.768		
Place of origin	0.734		
Safe environment		0.908	
Entertainment		0.895	
Washroom and toilets		0.881	
Comfortable Seating		0.860	
Ambience and decor		0.843	
Clean surroundings		0.830	
Accessibility		0.815	
Temperature		0.639	

Noise levels		0.589	
Can Distinguish between alcoholic beverages			0.857
Consumption is based upon past experiences			0.850
I am aware of service temperatures			0.829
I had a satisfying alcohol consumption experience in the past			0.789
Can relate to past drinking experiences			0.698
Aware of appropriate mixers with spirits			0.624
Eigenvalue	7.725	5.423	3.265
Percentage of variance explained	30.90	21.69	13.06
Reliability of scale (Cronbach's alpha value)	.939	.929	.871
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.			

The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin MSA was 0.861. All communalities were over the required value of 0.500. The three dimensions explained 65.65 per cent of the variance among the items in the study. Bartlett's test of sphericity proved to be significant p -value = $0.000 < 0.05$, which showed a correlation between variables and thus, factor analysis exercise could be carried out (Hair et al. 2014).

Linear regression was used to investigate if tourists' knowledge and past experience significantly impact the choice of alcohol.

Hypothesis H1

There is a significant impact of tourist's knowledge, and past experience on the choice of alcohol

The hypothesis tests if tourists' knowledge and past experience have a significant impact on the choice of alcohol. The dependent variable choice of alcohol was regressed on the predicting variable tourist's knowledge and past experience to test hypothesis H1. Tourists' knowledge and past experience significantly predicted the choice of alcohol, $F(1, 479) = 58.219$, $p < 0.001$, which indicates that the tourist's knowledge and past experience can play a significant role in determining the choice of alcohol for a tourist ($b = 1.104$, $p < 0.001$). The results direct the positive effect of

the tourist's knowledge and past experience. Moreover, the $R^2 = .108$ depicts that the model explains 11% of the variance in the choice of alcohol.

Hypothesis H2

There is a significant impact of tourist's knowledge, and past experience on the choice of drinksapes

The dependent variable choice of drinksapes was regressed on the predicting variable tourist's knowledge and past experience to test hypothesis H2. Tourists' knowledge and past experience significantly predicted choice of drinksapes, $F(1, 479) = 86.101$, $p < 0.001$, which indicates that the tourist's knowledge and past experience can play a significant role in determining the choice of drinksapes for a tourist ($b = .521$, $p < 0.001$). The results direct the positive effect of the tourist's knowledge and past experience. Moreover, the $R^2 = .152$ depicts that the model explains 15% of the variance in the choice of drinksapes.

Hypothesis H3

There is a significant impact of the choice of alcohol on the choice of drinksapes

The hypothesis tests if the choice of alcohol has a significant impact on the choice of drinksapes. The dependent variable choice of drinksapes was regressed on the predicting variable choice of alcohol to test hypothesis H3. Choice of alcohol significantly predicted choice of drinksapes, $F(1, 479) = 15.63$, $p < 0.001$, which indicates that the choice of alcohol can play a significant role in influencing the choice of drinksapes for a tourist ($b = .071$, $p < 0.001$). The results direct the positive effect of the choice of alcohol. The $R^2 = .032$ depicts that the model explains only 3% of the variance in the choice of drinksapes. Table 6 shows the summary of the findings

Table 6. Summary of findings

Hypothesis	Regression weights	Beta Coefficient	R square	F	p-value	Hypothesis supported
H1	TK&PE COA →	1.104	.108	58.219	.000	Yes
H2	TK&PE COA	.521	.152	86.101	.000	Yes
H3	COA → COD →	.071	.032	15.633	.000	Yes

To check the association between the choice of alcohol and the choice of drinksapes, cross-tabulation and Chi-square test was used. Table 7 shows the results of the cross-tabulation.

Table 7. Cross-tabulation of Choice of Alcohol and Choice of Drinksapes

Choice of Alcohol	Choice of Drinksapes										Total
	Beach Shack	Disco / Karaoke Bars	Drink Festival	Hotel	Lounge	Others	Pub / Tavern	Restaurant	Tasting Room	Upscale Bar	
Whisky	12.4%	6.2%	0.0%	2.1%	8.2%	19.6%	20.6%	25.8%	0.0%	5.2%	100.0%
Gin	11.1%	7.4%	0.0%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	18.5%	51.9%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Brandy	6.7%	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%	26.7%	40.0%	0.0%	6.7%	100.0%
Vodka	23.1%	25.0%	3.8%	1.9%	5.8%	3.8%	13.5%	21.2%	0.0%	1.9%	100.0%
Rum	20.4%	8.2%	0.0%	8.2%	2.0%	12.2%	20.4%	26.5%	0.0%	2.0%	100.0%
Tequila	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Feni	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	54.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Wines	13.1%	1.6%	1.6%	6.6%	9.8%	4.9%	9.8%	37.7%	13.1%	1.6%	100.0%
Beers	25.2%	6.7%	5.9%	3.0%	3.0%	14.8%	15.6%	24.4%	0.0%	1.5%	100.0%
Liqueurs	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Cocktail	25.0%	20.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	12.0%	8.0%	23.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Count	88	45	12	18	26	58	83	132	8	11	481
% within COA	18.3%	9.4%	2.5%	3.7%	5.2%	12.3%	17.3%	27.4%	1.7%	2.3%	100.0%

Cross tabulation results indicated that while the respondents who preferred to have whisky, gin, brandy, rum and wines chose restaurants as their favorite drinksapes, those who prefer to have vodka and tequila chose discotheques/karaoke bars as their favorite drinksapes, feni drinkers preferred to drink in a pub/tavern, those who liked to drink beers and cocktails preferred a beach shack, whereas those who consumed liqueurs preferred to visit a lounge. Pearson Chi-square test value was 195.860, and the p-value was 0.000, indicating a significant association between the choice of alcohol and choice of drinksapes.

Conclusion, managerial implications, limitations and future research

Previous studies have examined the attribute importance and performance in the selection and evaluation of restaurants. However, few have considered the attributes that are potentially important for drinksapes, particularly for alcohol consumption. By addressing this gap, the present study has several theoretical implications. First, this study considers various attributes of alcohol consumption and drinksapes in the customer selection of alcohol and drinksapes. The purpose of this research was also to examine the influence of tourists' knowledge and past experiences regarding alcohol consumption on the choice of alcoholic beverages and factors affecting the choice of drinksapes at tourist destinations. Travelers' alcohol consumption experiences influence the choice of alcohol as well as the place of consumption. This is in line with the servicescape paradigm presented by Bitner (1992) and the experiencescape thinking by Mossberg (2007), which postulate that the consumption setting influences consumer experiences. Concerning the geographical context, this study has enriched the body of hospitality management literature by providing a better understanding of alcotourism in Goa, one of India's favorite tourism destinations. The study also contributes to the literature by introducing the concept of drinksapes and presenting a novel framework for understanding the environment preferred by tourists for alcohol consumption at a drinksapes.

The results of this study provide several managerial implications. The study findings can help the drinksapes managers better understand how various attributes can contribute to the customer experience. Regression analysis indicated that the choice of alcohol influences the choice of drinksapes. Chi-square tests also suggested a strong association between the choice of alcohol and choice of drinksapes, indicating that the tourists visited a drinksapes based on the type of alcohol they wished to consume. Drinksapes should therefore have a beverage list that suits the type of clientele, stands out with good brands and a variety of quality alcoholic beverages. With the choice of drinksapes, the ambience was the most crucial attribute influencing the selection criteria. This indicates that the marketers should provide a unique ambience and décor to evoke more favorable perceptions. Results reveal that entertainment is the second most important attribute influencing restaurant experience. Hence, drinksapes should also focus on the entertainment factor involving live music or popular DJs, dance floor, karaoke, bartending shows, standup comedy, and open mic nights; the key is to create engaging events, and entertainment attract customers and stand out in this competitive industry. The drinksapes should also emphasize fun and exciting events to deliver a unique drinking experience. Another essential aspect that needs consideration is for drinksapes to provide clean and safe environments. Results have suggested that

they were also critical factors considered by the respondents while choosing a drinkscape. Furthermore, as the individual's experience and knowledge influence the selection criteria, understanding the tourist's profile could help the marketers determine the customer expectations from the restaurant and then develop marketing strategies to deliver memorable experiences.

It is anticipated that the findings will assist relevant stakeholders in designing drinkscape and beverage selling strategies on a market-driven basis. Dringscape providers need to be aware of these facts and attempt to accommodate different drinking expectations when catering to tourists. It is posited that effectively managing these attributes would lead to superior customer experience. Further, emphasis on relevant attributes will lead to pleasure and elicits favorable customer outcomes. Moreover, past research has shown that meeting customer expectations with attribute performance leads to satisfaction, loyalty and positive word-of-mouth (Caruana, 2002).

Several limitations of this study need to be highlighted. First, the survey responses were collected from only one destination, Goa. Second, no comparison was made between domestic and foreign tourists. Future research should investigate whether there are any differences in tourists' choice regarding the alcohol or drinkscape between domestic and foreign tourists.

Soriano (2002) suggested that sociodemographic variables play an essential role in the evaluation of restaurants. Therefore, future research studies could consider different customer sociodemographic factors and geographical locations in extending the present study to enhance understanding of the tourist's selection criteria.

Future studies should adopt a critical view of the dimensions of alcohol consumption and include other dimensions that might impact tourist's alcohol consumption, for example, service experience and social settings. Future research can also explore the impact of motivational factors on alcohol consumption and the choice of drinkscape.

References

Albrecht, J. N., Danielmeier, T., & Boudreau, P. (2019). The Importance of Architecture in Food and Drink Experiences within a Tourism Context. *Journal of Gastronomy and Tourism*, 4(1), 41-50.

- Andersson, T. D., & Mossberg, L. (2004). The dining experience: do restaurants satisfy customer needs?. *Food Service Technology*, 4(4), 171-177.
- Armira, A., Armira, E., Drosos, D., Skordoulis, M., & Chalikias, M. (2016). Determinants of consumers' behaviour toward alcohol drinks: the case of Greek millennials. *International Journal of Electronic Customer Relationship Management*, 10(1), 14-27.
- Back, R. M., Bufquin, D., & Park, J. Y. (2018). Why do they come back? The effects of winery tourists' motivations and satisfaction on the number of visits and revisit intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 1-25.
- Barsky, J.D. (1992), "Consumer satisfaction in the hotel industry: meaning and measurement, *Hospitality Research Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 50-73.
- Bitner, M. (1992), "Services capes: the impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 56 No. 2, pp. 57-71.
- Björk, P., & Kauppinen-Räsänen, H. (2014). Culinary-gastronomic tourism—a search for local food experiences. *Nutrition & Food Science*.
- Booms, B. H., & Bitner, M. J. (1982). Marketing services by managing the environment. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 23(May), 35-39
- Braun-LaTour, K. A., Grinley, M. J., and Loftus, E. F. (2006). Tourist memory distortion. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(4), 360-367.
- Brochado, A., Stoleriu, O., & Lupu, C. (2019). Wine tourism: a multisensory experience. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-19.
- Brown, G., Lee, I. S., King, K., & Shipway, R. (2015). Eventsapes and the creation of event legacies. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 18(4), 510-527.
- Bruwer, J., & Alant, K. (2009). The hedonic nature of wine tourism consumption: an experiential view. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*.
- Caruana, A., 2002. Service loyalty: the effects of service quality and the mediating role of customer satisfaction. *European Journal of Marketing* 36 (7/8), 811–828.
- Cheng, J. S., Shih, H. Y., & Wu, M. H. (2016). Ambience and customer loyalty of the sport-themed restaurant. *Universal Journal of Management*, 4(8), 444-450.

Chi, C. G. (2012). An examination of destination loyalty: differences between first-time and repeat visitors. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 36(1), 3-24.

Choi, J., & Zhao, J. (2010). Factors influencing restaurant selection in south florida: Is health issue one of the factors influencing consumers' behavior when selecting a restaurant?. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 13(3), 237-251.

Chuan Huat Ong, Heng Wei Lee & T. Ramayah (2018) Impact of brand experience on loyalty, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 27:7, 755-774

Clark, M., & Wood, R. C. (1998). Consumer Loyalty in the Restaurant Industry: A preliminary exploration of the issues. *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 10 (4), 139-144.

Clark, M.A., Wood, R.C., 1999. Consumer loyalty in the restaurant industry: a preliminary exploration of the issues. *British Food Journal* 101 (4), 317–327.

Costa, A.I.A., Schoolmeester, D., Dekker, M., Jongen, W.M., 2007. To cook or not to cook: a means-end study of motives for choice of meal solutions. *Food Quality and Preference* 18 (1), 77–88.

Cullen, F. (2005). Factors influencing restaurant selection in Dublin. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 7(2), 53-85.

Fornerino, M., Helme-Guizon, A., & Gotteland, D. (2008). Movie consumption experience and immersion: impact on satisfaction. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (English Edition)*, 23(3), 93-110.

Gómez-Corona, C., Chollet, S., Escalona-Buendía, H. B., & Valentin, D. (2017). Measuring the drinking experience of beer in real context situations. The impact of affects, senses, and cognition. *Food quality and preference*, 60, 113-122.

Gregoire, M. B. (2013). Foodservice organizations: A managerial and systems approach (8th ed.). *Upper Saddle River: Pearson Educational Inc.*

Gustafsson, I. B., Öström, Å., Johansson, J., and Mossberg, L. (2006). The Five Aspects Meal Model: a tool for developing meal services in restaurants. *Journal of foodservice*, 17(2), 84-93.

Hair, J. F., Gabriel, M., & Patel, V. (2014). AMOS covariance-based structural equation modeling (CB-SEM): Guidelines on its application as a marketing research tool. *Brazilian Journal of Marketing*, 13(2).

Hanefors, M., & Mossberg, L. (2003). Searching for the extraordinary meal experience. *Journal of Business & Management*, 9(3).

- Hansen, K. V., Jensen, Ø., & Gustafsson, I. B. (2005). The meal experiences of á la carte restaurant customers. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 5(2), 135-151.
- Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2006). Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: Common errors and some comment on improved practice. *Educational and Psychological measurement*, 66(3), 393-416.
- Jang, S., Ha, J. and Park, K. (2012), "Effects of ethnic authenticity: examining Korean restaurant customers in the US", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 990-1003
- Johns, N., & Howard, A. (1998). Customer Expectations versus Perceptions of Service Performance in the Foodservice Industry. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 9 (3), 248-265.
- Josiam, B.M., Mattson, M., Sullivan, P., 2004. The Histrant: heritage tourism at Mickey's dining car. *Tourism Management* 25 (4), 453–461.
- Kim, J. H., & Jang, S. S. (2016). Determinants of authentic experiences. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.
- Kivela, J., Inbakaran, R., & Reece, J. (1999). Consumer Research in the Restaurant Environment, Part 1: A conceptual model of dining satisfaction and return patronage. *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11 (5), 205-222.
- Kleynhans, H. C. (2005). Leisure tourists' satisfaction regarding their meal experience at Lesedi Cultural Village (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).
- Koo, L. C., Fredrick, K. C. T., & Yeung, J., H. C. (1999). Preferential Segmentation of Restaurant Attributes Through Conjoint Analysis. *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11 (5), 242-253.
- Kühn, S., & Bothma, M. (2018). The coffee shop dining experience and customer loyalty intentions: Brewing the perfect blend. *Management Dynamics: Journal of the Southern African Institute for Management Scientists*, 27(4), 12-28.
- Kwortnik RJ and Ross WT (2007) The role of positive emotions in experiential decisions. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 24(4): 324–335.
- Kwortnik, R. J. (2008). Shipscape influence on the leisure cruise experience. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*.

- Kwun, J.-W. D., & Oh, H. (2006). Past experience and self-image in fine dining intentions. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 9(4), 3–23. doi: 10.1300/J369v09n04_02
- Lin, L., & Mao, P. C. (2015). Food for memories and culture—A content analysis study of food specialties and souvenirs. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 22, 19-29.
- MacKendrick, N. (2014). Foodscape. *Contexts*, 13(3), 16-18.
- Mikkelsen, B. E. (2011). Images of foodscapes: Introduction to foodscape studies and their application in the study of healthy eating out-of-home environments. *Perspectives in Public Health*, 131(5), 209-216.
- Mossberg, L. (2007). A marketing approach to the tourist experience. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(1), 59-74.
- Nickerson, N. P. (2006). Some reflections on quality tourism experiences. In G. Jennings & N. P. Nickerson (Eds.), *Quality Tourism Experiences* (pp. 227-236). Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Park, J. Y., Back, R. M., Bufquin, D., & Shapoval, V. (2019). Servicescape, positive affect, satisfaction and behavioral intentions: The moderating role of familiarity. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 78, 102-111.
- Pedraja Iglesias, M., & Jesus Yagüe Guillén, M. (2004). Perceived quality and price: their impact on the satisfaction of restaurant customers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(6), 373-379.
- Reimer, A. and Kuehn, R. (2005). The impact of servicescape on quality perception. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39: 785–808
- Ryu, K. (2005). *DINESCAPE, emotions, and behavioral intentions in upscale restaurants* (Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University).
- Ryu, K., & Han, H. (2010). Predicting tourists' intention to try local cuisine using a modified theory of reasoned action: The case of New Orleans. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 27(5), 491–506. doi: 10.1080/10548408.2010.499061
- Ryu, K., & Han, H. (2011). New or repeat customers: how does physical environment influence their restaurant experience?. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(3), 599-611.

Ryu, K. and Jang, S.S. (2007), "The effect of environmental perceptions on behavioral intentions through emotions: the case of upscale restaurants", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 56-72.

Soriano, D.R., 2002. Customers' expectations factors in restaurants: the situation in Spain. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* 19 (8/9), 1055–1067.

Stone, M. J., and S. Migacz. (2016). 2016 Food Travel Monitor. Portland, OR: World Food Travel Association.

Stone, M. J., Soulard, J., Migacz, S., & Wolf, E. (2018). Elements of memorable food, drink, and culinary tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(8), 1121-1132.

Tikkanen, I. (2007). Maslow's hierarchy and food tourism in Finland: five cases. *British food journal*, 109(9), 721-734.

Wakefield, K. and Blodgett, J. (2016), "Retrospective: the importance of servicescapes in leisure service settings", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 7, pp. 686-691.

Wilkinson, S., & Wilkinson, C. (2018). Researching drinking "with" young people: a palette of methods. *Drugs and Alcohol Today*.

Williams, R., & Dargel, M. (2004). From servicescape to "cyberscape". *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*.

Zhang, H., Wu, Y., and Buhalis, D. (2018). A model of perceived image, memorable tourism experiences and revisit intention. *Journal of destination marketing and management*, 8, 326-336.