



# Visual Perception of Gastronomic Elements and Identity Representation among International Tourists in Canggu, Bali

Anggun Elmika Sinaga<sup>1\*</sup>, Putu Sucita Yanthy<sup>2</sup>, Yohanes Kristianto<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Program Studi Pariwisata Program Magister, Fakultas Pariwisata, Universitas Udayana

\*Email: [anggunelmikasinaga@gmail.com](mailto:anggunelmikasinaga@gmail.com)

Received: Sept 2026

Accepted: Sept 2026

## ABSTRACT

Gastronomy is a central part of the tourist experience, and visual elements such as plating, lighting, and interior design increasingly shape how tourists notice, document, and share their meals. This study examines how international tourists in Canggu, Bali, perceive the visual elements of gastronomy in representing their self-identity. An interpretive qualitative design was used. Data came from semi-structured interviews with 11 international tourists and five supporting informants (three venue managers, a culinary lecturer, and a food vlogger), together with non-participant observation in four cafés and restaurants in August 2026. Reflexive thematic analysis was guided by the concepts of visual perception, affordance, and self-presentation. Five themes emerged. Visual perception is layered and rarely separate from taste and service. Perception often begins before the visit through social media. Elements are valued both aesthetically and functionally. Affordances are designed by businesses, enacted by tourists, and never deterministic. Identity representation is selective. Food and place can symbolize aspects of lifestyle such as health, exploration, and relaxation, but they may also be kept as private memory or not shared at all. The findings show tourists as active users of designed space and suggest that restraint in posting is a legitimate way of managing identity. Findings are limited to the informants and venues studied.

**Keywords:** Affordance, Canggu, Gastronomy, Identity Representation, Visual Perception.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Gastronomy has become an integral part of the tourist experience. Eating during a journey does more than meet a physiological need. It adds to the attractions of a destination (Sormaz et al., 2016) and can shape travel motivation (Sujood et al., 2024). The gastronomic experience combines sensory, social, and symbolic dimensions (Carvalho et al., 2023; Öztaş & Yıldırım, 2024). The sensory dimension forms through taste, aroma, the appearance of dishes, and the setting in which people eat. The social dimension forms through companionship and the sharing of experiences. The symbolic dimension appears when choices of food and venue are linked to taste, lifestyle, and the identity a person wishes to display (Öztaş & Yıldırım, 2024; Wong et al., 2019).

Among sensory cues, visual elements play a prominent role in attracting attention and interest (Casales-Garcia et al., 2025). The arrangement, color, and form of a dish influence how its appearance is judged. Interior design and the dining environment are also part of the gastronomic experience offered to tourists (Michael & Fusté-Forné, 2022). Social media has extended food documentation into the sharing of experiences with other users. Foodstagramming links dining with documenting and displaying the meal (Wong et al., 2019). Platform features for showing, editing, storing, and connecting content give users opportunities

for communication (Evans et al., 2017). By selecting what to post, users can also manage the impression they make on others (Hollenbaugh, 2021).

Canggu, in North Kuta District, Badung Regency, is a useful setting for examining these practices. Dining there takes place alongside surfing, fitness, remote work, and socializing. Regency-level statistics show how quickly the food and beverage sector has grown. The number of recorded restaurants in Badung rose from 728 in 2021 to 6,560 in 2025, eateries (*rumah makan*) from 140 to 3,940, and bars from 59 to 916 (BPS Kabupaten Badung, 2025). These figures cover the whole regency and do not indicate the number of businesses in Canggu. They do show a dense and varied supply of places where tourists can eat, and where visual atmosphere can differ considerably from one venue to the next.

Existing research has examined parts of this phenomenon. Wong et al. (2019) documented the varied benefits of foodstagramming. Michael and Fusté-Forné (2022) analyzed visual communication by luxury hotels. Süzer and Doğdubay (2024) surveyed foreign visitors about lifestyle and local food consumption. Each work uses a different unit of analysis, and none explains how international tourists in Canggu perceive the visual elements of gastronomy and give them personal meaning. An attractive setting does not show that tourists attach the same meaning to it, and an interest in how food looks does not show a wish for recognition or

status (Öztaş & Yıldırım, 2024; Wong et al., 2019). This article therefore asks: How do international tourists perceive the visual elements of gastronomy in Canggu in representing their self-identity? It offers a context-specific interpretation of how perception, environmental opportunities, and selective self-presentation fit together.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

### 2.1. Visual Perception and Affordance

Gibson (1979) defined affordance as what an environment offers an organism in terms of possible action. The concept stresses the complementarity of organism and environment (Gibson, 1979; Scarantino, 2003). An affordance is therefore not simply a property of an object that exists apart from the abilities of the one who perceives it (Scarantino, 2003). Tomej and Xiang (2020) applied this relational view to tourism service design. The same environment can offer different possibilities for action to tourists with different abilities and goals, and service providers can shape these possibilities as designed affordances.

In studies of technology, Hutchby (2001) argued that technologies enable and constrain action without fully determining it. Evans et al. (2017) separated affordances from technological features and from the outcomes that result from use. Treem and Leonardi (2012) identified four affordances of social media: visibility, editability, persistence, and association. Cabiddu et al. (2014) showed that hotels' recognition and use of social media affordances depend on organizational context. Taken together, these works suggest that perception and affordance are distinct but connected. Perception concerns what a person notices and how it is judged. Affordance concerns what the person recognizes as possible to do. Both depend on the person's purposes.

### 2.2. Self-Presentation and Lifestyle

Goffman (1959) described self-presentation as the way individuals select information and behavior to create an impression before others. Hollenbaugh (2021) reviewed this idea for social media and concluded that three things shape impression management: the affordances of the platform, the content produced by the user and by others, and the composition of the audience. Content selection, editing, and audience choice are therefore central to how a person presents the self online. Self-presentation, the impression a person wishes to convey, is related to but separate from self-disclosure, the personal information a person chooses to reveal (Bazarova & Choi, 2014). This article concentrates on the former.

Lifestyle frameworks such as Values and Lifestyles (VALS) attend to values, interests, and activities that accompany consumption choices (Valentine & Powers, 2013). Süzer and Doğdubay (2024) used the framework to relate tourists' lifestyles to local food consumption. In this study VALS serves only as an interpretive lens for reading informants' accounts. It is not used to classify informants into segments.

### 2.3. Food Visualization in Tourism Research

Wong et al. (2019) found that foodstagramming offers tourists several benefits, including self-expression, a richer dining

experience, social relationships, participation in virtual communities, and the keeping of memories. Wachyuni and Yusuf (2021) examined tourists' motivations for sharing food photographs on Instagram. Öztaş and Yıldırım (2024) argued that the aestheticization of food images allows them to carry meanings of identity and social status that go beyond nourishment. Michael and Fusté-Forné (2022) analyzed 1,866 posts from four luxury hotels in the United Arab Emirates. They found that gastronomic experiences were depicted through cultural discovery, the hotel setting, novelty, and pleasure associated with luxury. That study concerns representation by service providers, whereas the present one concerns the perceptions of tourists as users of dining space.

### 2.4. Analytical Position

The reviewed literature suggests a sequence that this study treats as a heuristic for interpretation and not as a tested causal model. The gastronomic environment offers visual stimuli. Tourists perceive and evaluate some of them. Some are recognized as opportunities for action. Tourists act on a subset of those opportunities by photographing, arranging, or filming. They then select what to keep and what to show, and this selection may convey an impression of who they are. The study examines this sequence through informants' accounts and remains open to meanings the framework does not anticipate.

## 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1. Research Design

The study used an interpretive qualitative design to understand how international tourists describe the visual elements of their gastronomic experiences in Canggu. This design suits research that seeks meaning and variation in experience more than statistical association. The interpretation took the researcher's reflexive involvement into account (Campbell et al., 2021). The unit of analysis was the tourist's experience in relation to the gastronomic environment and to the use of social media.

### 3.2. Setting and Data Collection

Fieldwork took place in four cafés and restaurants in Canggu, selected purposively for variation in visual character and for the presence of international tourists: Kynd Community, Zin Café, Warung Barra, and Revolver Canggu. Three are on Jalan Nelayan and one is on Jalan Tanah Barak. Data collection ran from March to August 2026, and the interviews cited here were conducted between July 31 and August 18, 2026. Three techniques were used. Non-participant observation (conducted on August 5 and 12, 2026) recorded plating, lighting, spatial arrangement, seating, and visible documentation behavior. Semi-structured in-depth interviews explored what informants noticed, how they judged it, why they photographed or did not photograph, and what impression they associated with sharing. Supporting documents included menus, venue information, and photographs taken by the researcher to record field conditions. Photographs and videos that tourists posted online were not collected or analyzed. Claims about editing, posting, and audience selection therefore rest on what informants said, not on direct inspection of their accounts.

### 3.3. Informants

Informants were chosen purposively according to their experience and ability to provide relevant information (Moser & Korstjens, 2018). The key informants were 11 international

tourists with direct dining experience at venues in the study area. They were not required to be active content producers, so that tourists who keep photographs private or who only consume content could also speak. Five supporting informants provided contextual information in line with their expertise: three venue managers (Icha, Chef Kim, and Willy), a culinary lecturer (Chef Wicaya), and a food vlogger (Indra). Their accounts supplemented but did not replace those of tourists. Informants are referred to by first name. Table 1 summarizes the key informants.

**Table 1** Key Informants and Their Documentation Orientation

| Code | Informant | Documentation and social media orientation                                              |
|------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| W1   | Raymond   | Photographs and films food; edits simply; posts to Instagram followers                  |
| W2   | Adrian    | Limits publication; favors images of place design over food                             |
| W3   | Lily      | Takes photos mainly for memory and for family; attentive to interior materials          |
| W4   | Trace     | Photographs but does not post; shares with family                                       |
| W5   | Millie    | Seeks recommendations on TikTok and Instagram; vegetarian or vegan needs; does not post |
| W6   | Samra     | Posts to show experiences and lifestyle; selective about audience                       |
| W7   | Laura     | Rarely posts; shares photos through WhatsApp; vegetarian                                |
| W8   | Poppy     | No Instagram account; uses influencer content for decisions; does not produce content   |

#### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis produced five interrelated themes, summarized in Table 2. They are discussed in turn below.

**Table 2** Themes Concerning Visual Perception and Identity Representation

| Theme                                       | Representative evidence                                                                                         | Interpretation                                                                        |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Visual perception is layered and relational | Adrian ranks food, people, then interior design; Raymond puts surroundings above taste; Millie puts taste first | Visual elements work alongside taste, service, and atmosphere and do not replace them |
| Perception begins before the visit          | Samra chose a venue that kept appearing on Instagram; Chef Kim notes that the camera cannot show taste          | Social media shapes expectations and venue choice before arrival                      |
| Perception has aesthetic and                | Raymond values natural light because                                                                            | Elements gain meaning as both                                                         |

| Code | Informant | Documentation and social media orientation                                                     |
|------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| W9   | Josua     | Photographs before eating; edits, captions, and posts; links food to gym and healthy lifestyle |
| W10  | Malena    | Longer stay; combines freelance work, surfing, and gym; occasional content creation            |
| W11  | Afreen    | Documents mainly for herself; selective about audience                                         |

*Note.* Compiled from interview data, 2026.

#### 3.4. Data Analysis and Trustworthiness

Data from interview transcripts, observation notes, and documents were analyzed with reflexive thematic analysis following the six phases of Braun and Clarke (2006): familiarization, coding, generating initial themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and writing up (see also Kiger & Varpio, 2020). The orientation was deductive and inductive. Concepts of perception, affordance, and self-presentation guided initial attention, while coding stayed open to meanings that arose from the data. Themes were developed by comparing accounts within and across informants, and differences were kept in the analysis instead of being resolved into a single pattern. Credibility was supported by triangulating informants and techniques, keeping records of the research process, and reflecting on interpretation (Moser & Korstjens, 2018). Informants received an explanation of the study, took part voluntarily, and consented to recording. They were not asked to give access to their accounts or personal visual archives. Quotations from tourists are given in their original English. Quotations from Indonesian-speaking informants were translated by the author.

| Theme                                                    | Representative evidence                                                                                       | Interpretation                                                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| functional dimensions                                    | it reduces editing; Josua moves his plate to find better light                                                | beautiful and usable for documentation                                             |
| Affordances are designed, enacted, and non-deterministic | Willy and Icha design for photography; Adrian finds long photo sessions “cringy”; Poppy only consumes content | The same environment yields different actions depending on purpose and norms       |
| Identity representation is selective                     | Josua orders juice to look healthy; Samra limits her audience; Afreen photographs for memory                  | Food and place become symbols of selected aspects of identity, or are kept private |

*Note.* Compiled from interview and observation data, 2026.

#### 4.1. Visual Perception Is Layered and Relational

Informants did not treat the visual appearance of food as a separate matter. Presentation, color, form, lighting, interior,

materials, furniture, plants, atmosphere, and views were noticed together, and tourists often saw food as an object located within a visual setting. Raymond, for example, said that “the main thing that make me want to take a photo or video is a good presentation of the food and the vibes, for a good aesthetic post for my Instagram.” Here the dish and its surroundings form a single composition that is judged suitable for documentation. Chef Wicaya, a culinary lecturer, offered a practitioner’s view that younger tourists are “really visual” and that menus everywhere now need photographs. His remark is better read as an observation about changing practice than as proof that every tourist behaves the same way, and the tourists’ own accounts showed considerable variation.

Visual appeal did not displace other considerations. Adrian ranked his priorities in this order: “Number one, food. Number two is the people and number three, obviously, uh the design of the place, the interior design.” Millie answered simply, “The taste first.” Laura explained that “we wouldn’t go somewhere just because it doesn’t look nice” if a place had good reviews, vegan options, and good food, and she called good looks “a bonus.” Some informants reversed the order. Raymond said, “The taste comes second place for me, the surrounding is more important.” Josua combined several criteria: good food, a nice atmosphere, and good service. Chef Wicaya summarized the point by saying that tourists come to restaurants to obtain “the whole experience,” and he added that people may “eat the photo” and then find that something promised by the image is missing when the food is actually eaten.

These accounts support the view that the gastronomic experience is multisensory and multidimensional (Carvalho et al., 2023). They also qualify claims about the visual turn in food culture. Visualization in Canggu appears as a selection and representation of part of the experience and not as a replacement for it. This matches the gap between image and experience described by Öztaş and Yıldırım (2024), and it is consistent with Erol (2021), who linked responses to visual stimuli with tourists’ orientations and values. The same stimulus drew different attention from different informants. Samra liked how “pink” and “girly” one venue looked. Lily was drawn to natural stone, tiles, and color choices. Adrian valued thoughtful plating because it showed that a restaurant “do care about their customer.” The visual meaning of an element therefore depends on the person who perceives it.

#### **4.2. Perception Begins Before the Visit**

Perception of the gastronomic environment often began before tourists arrived. Samra explained that she and her companion chose their café because “we saw a lot of this on Instagram” and the place “kept popping up” while they planned the trip. Poppy and her companions likewise used content from Instagram and TikTok to decide where to eat, although they did not post themselves. Chef Kim, a restaurateur, explained that what tourists first meet is a representation: “the surroundings and the interior design first combined with the food because that’s what you see through Instagram. You don’t know how it tastes through the lens.”

These accounts show that images circulating online give tourists an early picture of a venue and set expectations that they then confirm in person. Other sources of information also

mattered. Adrian asked friends and checked Google reviews, looking for high ratings, and Laura weighed reviews and menu options alongside appearance. The choice of where to eat therefore combined visual information with social recommendation, digital reviews, dietary needs, and food quality. This extends Michael and Fusté-Forné (2022) in a useful direction. They showed how providers use visual storytelling to depict gastronomic experiences. The Canggu data show how tourists receive such representations and fold them into their own decisions, while weighing them against other information.

#### **Perception Has Aesthetic and Functional Dimensions**

Informants valued visual elements in two ways. The aesthetic dimension concerns what looks pleasing or interesting. The functional dimension concerns whether an element supports the act of visualizing. Natural light is the clearest example. Raymond stated, “The most important thing is the natural light because you don’t need a lot of editing.” For him light was both part of a comfortable ambience and a practical resource that lowered the effort of making a good image. Josua described a routine of preparation: “Before eating, I usually move my drink or plate a little, find a better lighting, and take a few quick photos.” He added that he likes “finding the best angle to make the food look more attractive.”

Observations in the four venues were consistent with these accounts. Visitors ate, talked, used phones and laptops, and in some cases documented food and surroundings, and they did so unevenly across venues. The venues differed in material and light. Zin Café and Warung Barra used wood, bamboo, vegetation, and semi-open seating. Kynd Community used white surfaces with pink accents. Revolver used darker tones with wood and metal. Tourists therefore met different configurations of visual cues, and each could be read as pleasing, practical, or both.

This dual character supports a relational reading of visual perception. An element is not simply beautiful or plain. It becomes meaningful when a tourist links it to a purpose, such as enjoying a view, taking a good photograph, or feeling comfortable. Evaluating how attractive something is differs from recognizing what it permits a person to do (Scarantino, 2003), and the Canggu informants moved fluidly between the two.

#### **4.3. Affordances Are Designed, Enacted, and Non-Deterministic**

The gastronomic environment offered several kinds of opportunity for action. At the physical level, light, seating position, table layout, plating, mural walls, sofas, stairs, and vegetation served as settings or objects for photographs. Informants did not simply accept these as given. They moved plates, shifted drinks, chose seats near windows or open areas, and spent “one or two minutes” finding an angle, as Raymond put it. Samra described preparing for a visit in advance: “We actually got ready just so we take pictures here because we knew it was going to be cute. We saw it on Instagram already.” She also used the photo menu to decide what to order, because it showed what a dish would look like when it arrived. In this account, anticipated affordances shaped clothing, accessories, and menu choice before the first photograph was taken.

Some opportunities were deliberately designed by businesses. Icha, who runs Warung Barra, explained that “to make it more aesthetic, we put the sambal separately so it does not mix and looks better when photographed.” Willy, the manager of Zin Café, said the lighting at night is kept soft so that “when photographed it looks warm and romantic.” Chef Kim noted that a venue must keep refreshing its chairs and artwork to stay appealing. These are designed affordances in the sense of Tomej and Xiang (2020). The Canggu data add that such design serves two purposes. It improves the dining experience, and it also lets tourists become producers of visual content. The gastronomic venue is therefore both a place of consumption and an environment for visual production.

Opportunities continued into the digital realm. Raymond named reliable Wi-Fi as his first requirement, followed by a good spot and surroundings. Josua described editing, using filters, and writing captions so that a post looks “more interesting.” Informants also described location tags and hashtags, and posting to Instagram stories or to followers. These practices map onto the four affordances of Treem and Leonardi (2012): editability in filters and captions, association in tags and links to destinations, persistence in the storing of experience as a digital trace, and visibility in making content seen by others. Affordance in this setting therefore has two connected levels, the physical environment and the digital platform, and tourists move from one to the other.

Affordances did not determine behavior. Adrian often put his food aside while a companion photographed it, then ate. He called long photo sessions in restaurants “a bit cringy.” Lily said that a venue which “looks nice inside” is “exciting,” and Laura said she might photograph a beautifully presented smoothie, yet neither described routine posting. Poppy and her companions used content from other people to choose venues but did not produce their own. These accounts confirm that perceived opportunities may be used, adapted, or left alone (Hutchby, 2001; Tomej & Xiang, 2020). They also show that norms and comfort matter: some informants consciously set limits on documentation because they considered excessive photography socially awkward or unhealthy. An attractive environment explains why some images are possible. It does not explain why a given tourist makes them.

#### 4.4. Identity Representation Is Selective

For several informants, visualizing a meal was part of presenting aspects of themselves. Samra said that for her “posting is more about showing lifestyle, like showing people the experiences I had.” Raymond said that sharing food photos shows his “interest, lifestyle and travel experience.” Josua offered the most explicit example of food as a symbol: “When my friends are ordering beer I ordered juice so I post it in Instagram so I look like healthy.” For him, salads, juice, and gym activity formed a coherent impression of a healthy and active person. Malena described her life in Canggu as a mix of freelance work, surfing, her favorite gym, and “beautiful” restaurants, so food was one element within a wider account of how she lives. Adrian preferred to photograph the design of a place rather than the food, which suggests that the choice of object can itself express preference.

These accounts fit Goffman’s (1959) idea that people select

information and behavior to create an impression, and they show the selection operating through objects, editing, captions, and audience (Hollenbaugh, 2021). Chef Kim made a related observation about tourists in general: “They’re thinking more about what do they see me doing instead of what am I actually experiencing.” Because this remark comes from a venue manager, it is best treated as one practitioner’s interpretation, not as evidence of what any given tourist intends. Still, it points to a possible gap between the lived experience and the experience selected for display.

The data also show that identity representation is not uniform. Samra wanted to avoid showing things to everyone and said she wanted her audience “to be very selective.” Adrian explained, “I’m not that kind of person who likes to show off every single things that I do,” and he said he tries to limit his own use of social media. For Afreen the purpose was personal: “I think it’s less about giving the impression and more about doing it for myself,” so that she can remember where she was on her birthday. Trace and Lily kept photographs for themselves or shared them with family, and Laura used WhatsApp for the same purpose. Poppy consumed influencer content but did not post. The distinction between visual consumption and visual production is therefore important. Engagement with the visual culture of social media does not necessarily mean that a tourist presents the self publicly. Not posting can also be a deliberate way of managing identity.

Responses from audiences mattered to some informants. Raymond said he feels happy when he receives many likes or gains new followers, and Josua said it makes him happy to reach 500 likes. Raymond also said he wants to tell followers where to go before they holiday in Bali. These statements show recognition and information-sharing among some content producers. They cannot be generalized, because other informants explicitly did not seek public response. The study did not examine how audiences actually received any content. Read through VALS as an interpretive lens, the accounts show a mix of orientations without a single dominant type. Interest in new places and trending venues appeared in some accounts, for example Samra’s visit prompted by Instagram. Concern with achievement and image appeared in others, for example Samra’s remark that being able to travel is “a privilege.” Preferences for comfort, relaxation, or limited exposure appeared in the accounts of Adrian, Lily, and Trace. These readings are not classifications, and they agree with Süzer and Doğdubay (2024) only in showing that lifestyle matters for gastronomic consumption. In Canggu its influence also extends to how experiences are documented and shared, and sometimes to the decision not to share them.

Two findings qualify existing work. First, Öztaş and Yıldırım (2024) emphasized that food images can carry meanings of identity and status. The Canggu informants did associate food and place with identity, but the meanings they named were varied: health, exploration, relaxation, travel experience, work, and social relationships, with status mentioned only indirectly if at all. Visualization is therefore better understood as a way to show selected aspects of lifestyle than as a representation of a whole identity. Second, Wong et al. (2019) found that foodstagramming serves expression, relationships, and

memory. These functions were visible here, and the Canggu data add that tourists sort their experiences into those they take into public view and those they keep private.

#### 4.5. An Integrative Interpretation

Taken together, the findings describe a sequence that is interpretive and not causal. The gastronomic environment contains visual elements in food, space, light, and atmosphere. Tourists perceive some of these elements according to their needs, preferences, prior information, and purposes. Some elements are recognized as opportunities for action, such as photographing, arranging, or filming. Tourists enact a subset of these opportunities, and digital features then allow editing, tagging, storing, and sharing. At each stage tourists select what to keep, what to show, and to whom, and the result may serve as a symbol of selected aspects of lifestyle and identity or may remain a private record. Affordance helps explain how opportunities arise and are enacted, and self-presentation helps explain how selected experiences are used to shape an impression. The process does not apply in the same way to every tourist, and informants like Adrian, Poppy, and Afreen show that it may stop at perception or at personal documentation.

### 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1. Conclusion

This article examined how international tourists in Canggu perceive the visual elements of gastronomy and use them to represent their identity. The findings suggest four conclusions. First, visual perception of gastronomy is layered. Tourists attend to food, plating, color, lighting, interior, materials, atmosphere, service, and the character of the area as a whole, and these are rarely separated from taste and quality. Visual appeal usually works as an added value, though a few informants placed it ahead of taste. Second, the meaning of visual elements is relational. The same element can be valued aesthetically, used functionally, or ignored, depending on a tourist's preferences and goals. Third, the gastronomic environment and social media together provide physical and digital affordances. Some are designed by businesses, some are adapted by tourists, and none determines behavior. Fourth, representation of identity through gastronomic visualization is selective and contextual. It can express aspects of lifestyle such as health, exploration, relaxation, and travel experience. It can also serve as private memory, as communication with a small circle, or not occur at all.

The study contributes an interpretive account that links perception, affordance, and self-presentation in a specific destination, using tourists' own explanations. Its findings extend research on foodstagramming and visual storytelling by showing the tourist as an active user of designed space, and by showing that restraint and privacy are legitimate parts of how identity is managed. For practitioners, the findings suggest that food quality and comfort should remain the foundation of service. Lighting, tidy backgrounds, and consistent plating can then support the interests of tourists who document their meals, without disturbing other guests or assuming that everyone

wants to create content. Clear menu information, including vegetarian and vegan options, also helps tourists decide on grounds other than appearance.

#### 5.2. Recommendations

Several limitations should be noted. The informants were international tourists in four venues and cannot represent all tourists in Canggu or elsewhere. The study did not analyze posted photographs or videos, so accounts of editing, posting, and audience choice rest on what informants remembered and chose to say, and these accounts may be affected by recall and by a wish to appear favorably. Observation recorded only visible conditions and actions. The VALS lens was used interpretively and does not yield a measurement of lifestyle segments. Future research could combine interviews with analysis of posted content, compare destinations or tourist groups, and examine how audiences perceive the identities that tourists present.

### REFERENCES

- Bazarova, N. N., & Choi, Y. H. (2014). Self-disclosure in social media: Extending the functional approach to disclosure motivations and characteristics on social network sites. *Journal of Communication*, 64(4), 635–657. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12106>
- BPS Kabupaten Badung. (2025). *Kabupaten Badung dalam angka 2025* [Badung Regency in figures 2025]. BPS Kabupaten Badung.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Cabiddu, F., De Carlo, M., & Piccoli, G. (2014). Social media affordances: Enabling customer engagement. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 48, 175–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.06.003>
- Campbell, K. A., Orr, E., Durepos, P., Nguyen, L., Li, L., Whitmore, C., Gehrke, P., Graham, L., & Jack, S. M. (2021). Reflexive thematic analysis for applied qualitative health research. *The Qualitative Report*, 26(6), 2011–2028. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.5010>
- Carvalho, M., Kastenholz, E., Carneiro, M. J., & Souza, L. (2023). Co-creation of food tourism experiences: Tourists' perspectives of a Lisbon food tour. *Tourist Studies*, 23(2), 128–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687976231168941>
- Casales-Garcia, V., Museros, L., Sanz, I., & Gonzalez-Abril, L. (2025). Analyzing aesthetics, attractiveness and color of gastronomic images for user engagement. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 91, Article 101358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogsys.2025.101358>
- Erol, K. K. (2021). Consistency of sustainable consumption with values and lifestyle in post-modern tourists. *Prizren Social Science Journal*, 5(3), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.32936/pssj.v5i3.275>
- Evans, S. K., Pearce, K. E., Vitak, J., & Treem, J. W. (2017). Explicating affordances: A conceptual framework for understanding affordances in communication research. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 22(1), 35–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12180>
- Gibson, J. J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Houghton Mifflin.

- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday.
- Hollenbaugh, E. E. (2021). Self-presentation in social media: Review and research opportunities. *Review of Communication Research*, 9, 80–98. <https://doi.org/10.12840/ISSN.2255-4165.027>
- Hutchby, I. (2001). Technologies, texts and affordances. *Sociology*, 35(2), 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/S0038038501000219>
- Kiger, M. E., & Varpio, L. (2020). Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131. *Medical Teacher*, 42(8), 846–854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030>
- Michael, N., & Fusté-Forné, F. (2022). Marketing of luxurious gastronomic experiences on social media: The visual storytelling of luxury hotels. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 24(6), 827–838. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2548>
- Moser, A., & Korstjens, I. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling, data collection and analysis. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375091>
- Öztaş, R., & Yıldırım, Y. (2024). A trilogy of food, photography and social media: Gastroporn. *InTraders International Trade Academic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.55065/intraders.1419292>
- Scarantino, A. (2003). Affordances explained. *Philosophy of Science*, 70(5), 949–961. <https://doi.org/10.1086/377380>
- Sormaz, U., Akmeşe, H., Güneş, E., & Aras, S. (2016). Gastronomy in tourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39, 725–730. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671\(16\)30286-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(16)30286-6)
- Sujood, Ali, R., Irfan, S., & Hamid, S. (2024). Emerging themes in food tourism: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *British Food Journal*, 126(1), 372–408. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJFJ-11-2022-0939>
- Süzer, Ö., & Doğdubay, M. (2024). The impact of tourist lifestyles on local food consumption: A case study of foreign visitors in Turkey. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2024.1530>
- Tomej, K., & Xiang, Z. (2020). Affordances for tourism service design. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 85, Article 103029. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.103029>
- Treem, J. W., & Leonardi, P. M. (2012). Social media use in organizations: Exploring the affordances of visibility, editability, persistence, and association. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 36(1), 143–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2013.11679130>
- Valentine, D. B., & Powers, T. L. (2013). Generation Y values and lifestyle segments. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 30(7), 597–606. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-07-2013-0650>
- Wachyuni, S. S., & Yusuf, L. (2021). Camera eat first: Tourist motivation in sharing food photograph on Instagram. *International Journal of Tourism & Hospitality Reviews*, 8(1), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.18510/ijthr.2021.815>
- Wong, I. K. A., Liu, D., Li, N., Wu, S., Lu, L., & Law, R. (2019). Foodstagramming in the travel encounter. *Tourism Management*, 71, 99–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.08.020>