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Abstract: Research on food and wine tourism is recent and mostly attraction-based. Further, it is essential to understand how locally grown food and beverages allow culinary tourists to amplify their involvement experiences and lead to enhance their satisfaction and destination loyalty. This research attempts to explore the structural relationships between the variables of motivation, different types of involvement, physical/intangible service satisfaction, and loyalty in the context of a food and wine festival. Data were collected via intercept surveys on site, which were distributed to and collected from attendees of the Wine and Food Festival in Miami, Florida. The results show that novelty seeking is only positively related to pleasure experience, whereas socialization motivation has an impact on pleasure experience, risk probability, and risk importance. Pleasure experience, in turn, has a positive influence on both physical and intangible service satisfaction; however, risk probability is only related to physical service, and risk importance is related to intangible service satisfaction. Finally, only the satisfaction with an intangible service has a positive impact on loyalty. Findings from this study suggest that developing a marketing strategy for attendees based on the characteristic of their cognitive mode can be effective in increasing their satisfaction and willingness to revisit the festival.
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1. Introduction

Over the past 2 decades, many international destinations have developed and promoted food and wine festivals to increase the attractiveness of the foods, wines, and other agricultural products grown locally. Further, local restaurants and wineries offer specific types of foods and wines to enhance visitors’ awareness of the local culture and reinforce the destination’s authenticity [1]. According to a global survey conducted by the World Food Travel Association [2], over 90% of American tourists wish to have some form of unique food experience while traveling. These food tourists tend to seek unique and different types of cultural options and opportunities when they choose a destination, and the consumption of local food has become an integral part of the tourist experience. Given these aspects, it is essential to understand how locally grown food and beverages allow food tourists to amplify their tourist experiences and enhance their satisfaction with the cultural activities and destination loyalty [3]. Rather than a simple association among food, wine, wineries, and travelers, the newly emerged wine and food tourism experience is a mixture of sensuous and sensual elements [4] that contain lifestyle and personal development experiences [5]. Often, foods are integrated into wine tour experiences since the mixture of food and wine experiences accentuate experiential, cultural, and symbolic meanings. In addition, food and wine tourism experiences enhance opportunities for socializing, entertaining, having sensuous and sensual experiences, and learning cultures [4]. According to Attanasi et al. [6], the findings show that wine tourism experiences (wine...
drinking during musical concerts) enhance mutual trust and social capital among festival attendees through endogenous group formation.

Festivals have been discussed from the perspective of respective communities related to festivals assisting economic development [7,8], enhancing social capital and community cohesion [9], strengthening destination images [10], and promoting sustainable community development [11]. Attanasi et al. [12] claim that there is a positive correlation between what they call “instantaneous social capital” (bonds among festival attendees due to the fact of sharing the festival experience) and tourists’ economic impact on the area where the festival is held. Recent studies have shown that festivals have been enriched and diversified through the interactions, mutual experiences, and cooperation between tourists and residents, all of which contribute to “shaping, reproducing and coalescing” the local community and the continuity of local cultures [13]. It is presented by Attanasi et al. [14] that festival-motivated tourists can guarantee the economic sustainability of the event only if the festival is able to represent and maintain local traditions and cultures. From the tourists’ perspectives, food and wine festivals add interesting destination attributes since they provide a unique synergy among food, wine, special events, festivals, and travel or leisure activities. In addition, the combination of both peak and supporting activities during the festival can serve as the primary attraction of the destination [13,15,16]. Previous studies have claimed that wine tourists tend to look for new experiences when they taste and purchase a variety of wines as well as seek to participate in escaping and socialization opportunities [17]. This demand is related to food and wine tourists’ diverse motivations and involvement in festival experiences.

Many of the existing studies have indicated how the satisfaction and future intentions of food and wine festival attendees have been derived from different motivations such as to taste wine, enjoy a day out, experience local foods and wines, etc. [18]. However, little empirical research has focused on food festivals’ attendees’ personal involvement related to their unique motivations, which, in turn, impacts their satisfaction and loyalty to the food and wine festivals. Prebensen et al. [18] stressed that it is essential to recognize tourists’ unique aspects of motivation and involvement and their influence on the experiential value of the destination. With respect to wine festivals, it has been shown that attendees who are highly involved in tasting a variety of wines tend to spend substantially more money when purchasing wine-related products [19]. In addition, some researchers have shown that it is critically important to understand how food and wine tourists’ motivations and involvement in the programs and activities offered at a festival have positively influenced their revisit intentions since repeat visitors can improve the financial performance of the organization and bring in other customers [20]. Given these aspects, examining the relationships between food festivals’ attendees’ motivations of joining the events and involvements in programs are valuable both for destination marketers and festival organizers.

Additionally, scholars have noted that current research has only scratched the surface of this field of study; the methods used are still relatively crude, and the studies are often regionally focused and quite generic in nature [4,21]. As such, this research attempts to explore the structural relationships among the variables of motivation to attend a festival, different types of involvement in festival activities, tangible/intangible satisfaction, and loyalty in the context of food and wine festivals. More specifically, this study aims to fill the research gap by understanding how internal driving forces can impact tourists’ personal involvement as well as investigates satisfaction with performance evaluations with respect to physical (tangible) and intangible service attributes and their relation to loyalty to the festival. A finding of particular importance here is identifying the unique motivations of the attendees in festival settings and determining the linkages between these different attendees’ motivations and their perceived pleasure experience, risk probability, and risk importance, not to mention the relation with the overall satisfaction with and loyalty to the festival.
2. Conceptual Background and Hypotheses

2.1. Motivations as Antecedents of Personal Involvement

Recently, food and wine festivals have become popular because they provide tourists with unique experiences related to the local culture, the region’s landscape, and a variety of food/wines [12]. As numerous new festivals emerged and the competition between them intensifies, it is critically important to identify visitors’ motivations so as to understand their revisit intentions and figure out their own needs and expectations [22,23]. A variety of visitors participate in these festivals, including local residents, tourists, and local/intentional suppliers, allowing for divergent motivations to be present. Gu et al. [24] indicated that major travel motivations for food and wine tourism are tasting quality local cuisine, wine, and purchasing related products. Additional research has identified that the main reasons why people attend festivals are to seek excitement, experience novelty, have unique experiences, socialize, and experience entertainment. [7,25]. Motivation is defined as a “need-induced tension” that drives people to experience something to relieve the tension [26]. It has been argued that the dominant motivators for wine and food tourists can be divided into two levels [27]: “taste and buy wine/food itself” [28] and engage in the experience, such as socialize, learn, relax, escape, and seek novelty [29].

Motivations related to food and wine festivals have been measured as individual items or various multi-dimensions [1]. For example, Park, Reisinger, and Kang [1] stated that seven types of motivations exist for first-time visitors to these festivals: tasting new wine and food, enjoying the event, enhancing one’s social status, escaping from routine life, meeting new people, spending time with family, and getting to know the celebrity chefs and wine experts. Yuan, Cai, Morrison, and Linton [30] found four dimensions related to the motivations of wine festival attendees: festival and escape, wine, socialization, and family togetherness. Different types of motivations have been compared across different groups, including first-time versus repeat visitors, residents versus nonresidents, types of festivals and events, and demographic characteristics (e.g., age, income, education) [25,30].

Although motivations can be multidimensional and situation-specific, two dimensions have been frequently mentioned across studies: novelty seeking and socialization [1]. Novelty seeking describes one’s desire to seek new and adventurous experiences, which is identified as a significant and positive antecedent of revisit intention of destination [31]; socialization refers to communicating and interacting with people. In this paper, we will focus on how and why these two common motivational forces drive tourists to food and wine festivals.

2.2. Consumer Involvement Dimensions in Festivals

Merely looking at the interactions between people and objects, activities, and/or places is not sufficient to understand the inherent nature of experience. In general, involvement has been defined as the internal state of motivation, arousal, or interest between an individual and recreational activities, tourism destinations, or related equipment [32] (p. 184). The concept of involvement, which evolved from the social judgment theory [33], has been widely defined and operationalized in customer research. The term “ego involvement”, which was identified as an unobservable state of motivation, arousal, or interest toward a recreational activity that is stimulated by a particular situation, was first applied in the field of traditional marketing and consumer behavior research [34] (p. 288), and has been adopted in leisure, recreation, and tourism contexts since the late 1980s [35]. Referring to the conceptualization of involvement, different models and theories have been postulated to give a lens to anatomize this unobservable state of mind. Among these models and theories, three are dominant. The first model, developed by Houston and Rothschild [36], delineated the conceptual classified involvement into situational involvement and enduring involvement, and that response involvement is a combination of these two classes. Situational involvement (temporary involvement) focuses on non-personal factors that offer insight into understanding how people attend to objects or things under certain situations. Enduring involvement emphasizes personal characteristics and focuses on an
individual’s long-term state of mind. Response involvement combines both situational and enduring involvement, reflecting people’s decision-making processes [37].

The second model, developed by Zaichkowsky [38], is called the involvement conceptualizing model. This model discussed three antecedents of involvement: personal factors, which refer to inner values; object or stimulus factors, which are associated with the physical characteristics of communication media; and situational factors, which include use, purchase, and occasion. The final model is the involvement conceptualizing and measuring model and was proposed by Andrews, Durvasula, and Akhter [39]. This model argued that how individuals respond to external stimuli depends on three major properties for involvement possesses: intensity, direction, and persistence. Involvement intensity is “the degree of arousal or preparedness of the involved consumer with respect to the goal-related object”. Involvement direction means “the target object or problem that causes the stimulus”. Involvement persistence is defined as “the duration of the involvement intensity” [39]. While employing these three models, the current study focuses on personal factors and longer-term attachment to food and wine festivals.

Consumer involvement has been widely studied using multidimensional constructs. The Personal Involvement Inventory (PPI) and Kapferer and Laurent’s Consumer Involvement Profile (CIP) [40] are the most frequently used for involvement measurement constructs [41]. This paper employs the CIP scale primarily because the CIP is multidimensional [42] and, in the context of tourism, tourists do not usually gain tangible returns for their investments (except souvenirs and photos) and need to face a high level of perceived risk due to high temporal and financial investment. Therefore, the dimensions of the CIP can more precisely reflect tourists’ perceptions of risk.

The original dimensions of the CIP scale were generated based on tangible daily commodities; however, since tourism products are different from ordinary goods in terms of being intangible, heterogeneous, inseparable, and perishable [41], different underlying dimensions are suggested. For example, in the context of selected recreational and tourist activities, Dimanche, Havitz, and Howard [42] revealed that the original dimensions of interests and pleasure overlapped and were synonymous; thus, the original five dimensions (e.g., interests, pleasure, sign, risk importance, risk probability) were reduced to four. Similarly, the research of Gursoy and Gavcar [41] provided three dimensions of involvement: pleasure, risk probability, and risk importance. Pleasure is a hedonic and rewarding value of the product class, risk importance refers to the perceived importance of the negative consequences of a mis-purchase, and risk probability is defined as the subjective probability of making a mis-purchase [41]. A number of studies have revealed that the level of food and wine involvement in programs and activities significantly affects consumers’ behaviors and their tourism experiences [22]. Based on Gursoy and Gavcar’s work [41], this study adopts the aforementioned three dimensions and explores how the involvement of food and wine festivals’ visitors influences satisfaction and loyalty.

2.3. The Relationship Between Motivation and Involvement, Satisfaction, and Revisit Intentions

The conceptual relationship between motivation and involvement has been widely investigated in the context of tourism marketing studies [18,43]. Iwasaki and Havitz [44] developed a conceptual model of the relationships between involvement, commitment, and behavioral loyalty, indicating that involvement is influenced by both personal antecedents (e.g., motivation, values, beliefs, attitudes) and social–situational antecedents (e.g., social support, social and cultural norms). Kouthouris’ [45] study on recreational skiers demonstrated that socialization motivation (i.e., friends) can significantly influence the attraction dimension of involvement. With regard to the relationship between novelty-seeking motivation and food involvement on food tourism behaviors, Chang et al. [46] disclosed that novelty-seeking motivation and food involvement have an impact on food tourism behaviors, which resulted in increasing the tourist’s intention to revisit the festival.
The need for an empirical exploration of the motivation–involvement relationship has been called for in prior research [43]. The following rationales lie on two aspects [43]: in spite of the conceptual similarities between motivation and involvement, which have an extensive history of inquiry, these two concepts still appear to be two independent bodies of knowledge; and, although some scholars suggest that motivation serves as an antecedent of enduring involvement [47], the contextual variety and multidimensional structures of each construct complicate generalization. Despite the conceptual parallel, motivation and involvement are distinct from each other in terms of long- and short-term orientations, the ability to reflect symbolic meanings, and the prediction of future intentions [48]. Although a considerable number of studies have explored festival and event motivations or involvement independently, little research has been conducted on the motivation of festival attendees in relation to different involvement constructs. Therefore, this study attempts to explore how festival attendees’ core motivations impact their involvement constructs (e.g., pleasure, risk probability, risk importance). The first hypothesis is postulated as follows:

**Hypothesis 1 (H1).** Food and wine festival attendees’ motivations are significantly related to their involvement.

**Hypothesis 1a (H1a).** Attendee’s motivation of novelty seeking is significantly related to the pleasure experience.

**Hypothesis 1b (H1b).** Attendee’s motivation of novelty seeking is significantly related to risk probability.

**Hypothesis 1c (H1c).** Attendee’s motivation of novelty seeking is significantly related to risk importance.

**Hypothesis 1d (H1d).** Attendee’s motivation of socialization is significantly related to the pleasure experience.

**Hypothesis 1e (H1e).** Attendee’s motivation of socialization is significantly related to risk probability.

**Hypothesis 1f (H1f).** Attendee’s motivation of socialization is significantly related to risk importance.

The positive relationships between involvement, customer satisfaction, and revisit intentions have been widely discussed in marketing literature related to the hospitality and tourism industries. One study on the service quality of a local festival by Lee and Beeler [49] demonstrated that tourists who are highly involved in festival programs or activities are more likely to be satisfied with their own experiences, which leads to enhancement regarding their intentions to return to the festival. Other studies have analyzed tourists’ satisfaction toward physical (tangible) and intangible service attributes and how they can influence loyalty. While some studies have revealed that only intangible services can influence intentions [50], other studies have found that both attributes are significant predictors of intentions [51]. At the tangible level, a few studies have found that the more highly people are involved in tangible service attributes, the more likely they are to be satisfied with the festival [52]. At the intangible level, a study by Markovic [53] claimed that event managers and local community marketers should consider the enhancement of both tangible and intangible service factors in order to increase the level of visitors’ satisfaction and their revisit intentions.

The relationship between involvement and loyalty has been analyzed empirically as well. While some studies have tested the direct relationship between involvement and behavioral intentions; the indirect association (i.e., where involvement is either the mediator or moderator) has also been explored. Attanasi et al. [12] found that festival
attendees motivated by the festival participation spend more on local products and services due to their high involvement, which tend to demonstrate attitudinal loyalty. Attanasi et al. [14] also confirmed that festival quality factors have a significant impact on attendees’ involvement, which can lead to revisit behavioral intentions. Hence, we propose the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 2 (H2).** Attendees’ involvement is related to their satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 2a (H2a).** Attendee’s pleasure experience is significantly related to one’s satisfaction with the physical services.

**Hypothesis 2b (H2b).** Attendee’s pleasure experience is significantly related to one’s satisfaction with the intangible services.

**Hypothesis 2c (H2c).** Attendee’s risk probability is significantly related to one’s satisfaction with the physical services.

**Hypothesis 2d (H2d).** Attendee’s risk probability is significantly related to one’s satisfaction with the intangible services.

**Hypothesis 2e (H2e).** Attendee’s risk importance is significantly related to one’s satisfaction with the physical services.

**Hypothesis 2f (H2f).** Attendee’s risk importance is significantly related to one’s satisfaction with the intangible services.

Festival literature to date has considered that the satisfaction dimension is linked to tourist experience and further can serve as a predictor of behavioral intention [3]. Providing a satisfactory experience generates a number of benefits, including positive word of mouth, an intention to revisit, and long-term customer loyalty, especially in a festival setting [5,23]. Several studies have been conducted to understand the determinants of customer satisfaction and suggest strategies for service/product providers to maximize consumers’ satisfaction [8]. From the expectation discrepancy perspective, satisfaction will be increased when a product/service’s performance is provided beyond expectations, while satisfaction will be decreased when a product/service’s performance falls below expectations [50]. In respect to food and wine festivals, attendees’ satisfaction and reactions depend on the types of services that the festival environment provides. These services include festival program content, staff demeanor, signage, facility quality, food perception, convenience, and information availability [25,51]. Prior research has noted that the satisfaction dimension can include both tangible and intangible service evaluations [53]. Further, research has shown that intangible service attributes allow service firms to provide better offerings compared to tangible service attributes since intangible attributes are more difficult to copy, which can create more of a competitive edge between companies [54]. This paper will measure satisfaction as a performance evaluation in terms of both physical facilities and intangible services and explore how these two attributes can impact visitors’ revisit intentions.

In regard to the impact of attendees’ satisfaction on loyalty, past research found that attendees’ satisfaction with service quality factors at a festival had a direct and positive effect on the revisit intentions of the festival [18,23,25]. Loyalty is defined as “a deeply held commitment to re-buy or re-patronize a preferred product/service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same brand set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behavior” [55] (p. 34). Since a high customer retention rate and positive word-of-mouth are crucial factors for generating profits for a service provider, it is critically important to better understand the determinants affecting customer loyalty, such as motivation [18], experience quality [23],
destination image [15], involvement [22], and tangible/intangible service satisfaction [53]. Based on the discussion above, we propose the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3 (H3).** Food and wine festival attendees’ satisfaction is related to their festival revisit intentions.

**Hypothesis 3a (H3a).** Food and wine festival attendees’ satisfaction connected to the physical services is significantly related to their festival revisit intentions.

**Hypothesis 3b (H3b).** Food and wine festival attendees’ satisfaction connected to the intangible services is significantly related to their festival revisit intentions.

3. Methods

3.1. Sampling and Data Collection

The data were collected via self-administered questionnaire distributed to and collected from national and international attendees of the Wine and Food Festival in Miami, Florida, in February 2016. More specifically, the survey was conducted for the visitors who participated in the 2016 Food network south beach wine and food festival by five researchers who were fully trained in the purpose of the study and the survey method. Researchers intercepted every nth person that walked past and asked them to participate. This festival is one of the major foods and wine festivals in the US, drawing over 65,000 attendees over 4 festival days. Of the numerous events held during the festival period, the authors focused on a 2-day event that featured various wineries, beverage producers, chefs, restaurants, kitchen supplies, and equipment manufacturers. The ticket price for attending this event for a single day was 225 USD. Of the 512 completed surveys, 62 surveys were unfinished and removed from the data set. As such, the usable sample size for this study was 450, indicating a response rate of about 88%.

The first three sections of the questionnaire focused on attendees’ Novelty Seeking and Socialization Motivations, attendees’ Personal Involvement, and overall Satisfaction with and Loyalty to the Festival. Each construct consisted of between two and six items, which was short but represented sufficient information to test the research hypotheses. The final section focused on the respondent’s age, gender, and past experience with the food and wine festival, ethnicity, level of education, marital status, and income. Based on the pre-test, some of the statements in the questionnaire were modified to make them as concise and clear as possible. All items were measured using a seven-point Likert-type scale and were adapted and modified based on previous studies.

Table 1 shows the overall sample profile. Of the 450 respondents in the final data set, in total, 37% of the participants were male, and 63% were female. Interestingly, almost half of the respondents (48%) stated that it was their first visit to this festival, whereas 52% stated that they had attended this festival before. In terms of ethnicity, half of the respondents (50%) were Caucasian, and 31% were Hispanic. The largest group of survey respondents (63%) was between the ages of 21 and 44 years old, and the education level of the respondents was high with 87% holding an associate’s degree or higher. Approximately 48% of the respondents were married, 38% were single, and 14% noted that they were with a partner. Interestingly, the income level of the respondents was high, with a little more than half of the respondents (53.6%) indicating that their income levels were over 80,000 USD/year.
Table 1. Demographic characteristics.

| Characteristic Description | Group                  | Frequency     |
|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| Gender (n = 432)           | Male                   | 37.5% (162)   |
|                            | Female                 | 62.5% (270)   |
| Age (n = 434)              | 21–24 years            | 13.6% (59)    |
|                            | 25–34 years            | 26.5% (115)   |
|                            | 35–44 years            | 25.1% (109)   |
|                            | 45–54 years            | 20.7% (90)    |
|                            | 55–64 years            | 10.6% (46)    |
|                            | 65 plus                | 3.5% (15)     |
| Education (n = 386)        | High school            | 6.7% (26)     |
|                            | Associate’s Degree     | 14.5% (56)    |
|                            | Bachelor’s Degree      | 38.1% (147)   |
|                            | Master’s Degree        | 25.9% (100)   |
|                            | Doctoral Degree        | 8.5% (33)     |
|                            | Other Education/Trade  | 6.2% (24)     |
| Marital status (n = 424)   | Single                 | 38.4% (163)   |
|                            | Married                | 47.9% (203)   |
|                            | With Partner           | 13.7% (58)    |
| Annual Family Income (n = 422) | 39,999 USD or less | 10.9% (46)   |
|                            | 40,000–79,999 USD      | 25.1% (106)   |
|                            | 80,000–119,999 USD     | 19.4% (82)    |
|                            | 120,000–159,999 USD    | 9.5% (40)     |
|                            | 160,000–199,999 USD    | 9.7% (41)     |
|                            | 200,000 USD and over   | 14.7% (62)    |
|                            | I respectfully decline to answer | 10.7% (45) |
| Ethnicity (n = 426)        | Caucasian (Non-Hispanic) | 50% (213)  |
|                            | African American/Black (Non-Hispanic) | 10.6% (45) |
|                            | Hispanic               | 30.8% (131)   |
|                            | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.5% (15)  |
|                            | American Indian        | 1.6% (7)      |
|                            | Mixed Ethnicities      | 3.3% (15)     |
| Is this your first visit to this event? (n = 429) | Yes | 49.7% (213) |
|                            | No                     | 50.3% (216)   |

3.2. Research Instrument Design

The questionnaire was composed of eight constructs measuring a conceptual model that focused on the Novelty Seeking motivation, Socialization Motivation, and a Consumer Involvement Profile (CIP). This CIP focused on Pleasure Experience, Risk Probability, Risk Importance, Physical (tangible) Service, and Intangible Service Satisfaction with and Loyalty to the Festival. All of the items were measured using a 7-point Likert-type scale and were adapted and modified from previous studies.

Novelty Seeking Motivation. Novelty Seeking Motivation was measured using seven items modified from a previous study. They were inspired by the food and wine festival’s unique attractiveness itself [1,56].

Socialization Motivation. Socialization Motivation was measured using seven items adapted and modified from previous studies [1,56]. This factor explained the attendees’ desires to attend the festival in order to facilitate their social interactions with other visitors.

Consumer Involvement Profile (CIP). Previous research demonstrated that Laurent and Kapferer’s [40] Consumer Involvement Profile (CIP) has been the most frequently used for measuring involvement constructs [41]. The current study adopted the three dimensions of CIP presented by Gursoy and Gavcar [41]: pleasure, risk probability, and risk impor-
Sustainability. These three constructs were assessed using four, three, and two measurement items, respectively.

**Satisfaction.** Satisfaction can be obtained from one's overall pleasure experience related to service. This paper measured Satisfaction as the performance evaluations of both the physical and intangible service attributes and explored their relationship in relation to the respondents’ festival revisit intentions. Scales were obtained and modified from Oliver [55] and Yoon and Uysal [57]. The questionnaire included three items for physical services and six items for intangible services.

**Loyalty to the Festival.** It is valuable to understand customer loyalty in order to not only identify the attendee’s needs and wants but also to predict future demand and revenues [58]. The scale was created based on previous studies, and the questionnaire contained two items for measuring loyalty.

### 3.3. Data Analysis

We used SPSS v. 23 for the initial data entry and hygiene stages and then performed a PLS-SEM technique using SmartPLS v. 3.3.2 (Böningstedt, Pinneberg, Germany) for the primary analysis of the data. The statistical analysis began with the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to simplify the items used in the research. The items with factor loadings of less than ±0.5 were deleted as suggested by Hair et al. [59]. A confirmatory factor analysis was employed to identify the underlying structure of the variables and the goodness of fit of the model. All of the measures were assessed for unidimensionality, reliability, and construct validity [59]. To analyze the research model, hypothesis testing was conducted through Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) utilizing Partial Least Squares (PLS), a component-based structural equation modeling technique indicated for prediction and complex models [60], such as the model of this research. We chose the PLS approach for its advantages over the covariance approach, which includes theoretical conditions, measurement conditions, distributional considerations, and practical considerations [61]. Furthermore, the goal of PLS is to obtain determinate values for the latent variables for predictive purposes and minimize the variance of all of the dependent variables [62]. Based on the literature, a parametric approach via PLS is preferred when attempting to detect multidimensional measures of constructs (with the exception of involvement and loyalty), which is the case in this study.

### 4. Results

#### 4.1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Table 2 presents the CFA results for the measurement model, which consisted of the eight constructs utilized in this study. The factor loadings for all of the constructs exceeded the critical value (i.e., 0.60) [63], which indicated that all of the latent variables were adequately measured by their respective indicators. In addition, the factor loadings of the constructs were found to be significant at the \( p = 0.000 \) level with \( \chi^2 = 1131.87 \) and \( df = 431 \). The measurement model clearly showed that the goodness of fit indices was satisfactory (RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, GFI = Goodness-of-Fit-Index, TLI = Tucker–Lewis Index) (RMSEA = 0.060, GFI = 0.861, TLI = 0.906). In addition, the average variance extracted (AVE) of each construct was greater than 0.50, confirming that the convergent validity of the scale was established.
Table 2. Results for confirmatory factor analysis.

| Construct                  | Items                                                                 | Loading | ICR  | Cronbach’s Alpha |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------|------------------|
| **Novelty Seeking Motivation** | I like the variety of things to see and do                           | 0.881   | 13.004 | 0.860            |
|                            | To experience new and different things                               | 0.820   | 8.736  |                  |
|                            | Enjoy special events/festivals                                       | 0.723   | 13.285 |                  |
|                            | Festivals are stimulating and exciting                              | 0.691   | 8.574  |                  |
|                            | This festival is unique                                              | 0.638   | 14.157 |                  |
|                            | I was curious about this festival                                   | 0.568   | 10.907 |                  |
| **Socialization Motivation** | To be with people of similar interest                               | 0.848   | 12.380 |                  |
|                            | To be with people who enjoy the same things I do                     | 0.816   | 13.910 | 0.914            |
|                            | For chance to be with people who are enjoying themselves            | 0.791   | 11.001 |                  |
|                            | To see the entertainment                                            | 0.790   | 13.160 |                  |
|                            | Temple festival crowds                                              | 0.765   | 10.955 |                  |
|                            | To observe other people attending the festival                       | 0.731   | 12.456 |                  |
| **Pleasure**               | I have a strong interest in the food and wine                        | 0.817   | 11.824 |                  |
|                            | I attach a great importance to the food and wine                     | 0.785   | 12.521 |                  |
|                            | The experience of the food and wine festival is somewhat a pleasure to me | 0.746   | 12.964 | 0.844            |
|                            | Buying the ticket of the food and wine festival is like buying a gift for myself | 0.713   | 12.780 |                  |
| **Risk Probability**       | Choosing a food and wine festival to attend is rather complicated    | 0.862   | 10.832 |                  |
|                            | When I buy a ticket of the food and wine festival, I am never certain of my choice | 0.781   | 11.004 | 0.840            |
|                            | When I face a variety of food and wine festival choices, I always feel a bit at loss to make my choice | 0.759   | 7.638  |                  |
| **Risk Importance**        | It is really annoying to attend a food and wine festival that is not suitable | 0.823   | 9.047  | 0.711            |
|                            | If, after I bought a ticket of the food and wine festival, my choice proves to be poor, I would be really upset | 0.670   | 11.467 |                  |
| **Satisfaction with Physical Services** | Program pamphlets                                           | 0.973   | 12.487 |                  |
|                            | Festival programs and schedules                                      | 0.945   | 9.917  |                  |
|                            | Signage for directions                                               | 0.783   | 14.223 |                  |
|                            | Booth signage                                                        | 0.719   | 11.013 | 0.801            |
|                            | Festival staff knowledge                                              | 0.628   | 14.179 |                  |
|                            | Festival staff helpfulness                                            | 0.561   | 4.244  |                  |
| **Satisfaction with Intangible Services** | Restrooms                                                          | 0.861   | 12.998 |                  |
|                            | Rest areas                                                          | 0.791   | 6.376  | 0.885            |
|                            | Parking                                                             | 0.636   | 13.527 |                  |
| **Revisit Intention**      | I will spread positive word-of-mouth about the festival in Miami, Florida | 0.866   | 9.312  | 0.831            |
|                            | I will keep attending the festival held in Miami, Florida            | 0.823   | 6.585  |                  |

χ² = 1131.870, df = 431, p = 0.000, RMSEA = 0.060, GFI = 0.861, AGFI = 0.830, CFI = 0.918, IFI = 0.919, TLI = 0.906.

4.2. Partial Least Squares Analysis (PLS)

The PLS model is usually analyzed and interpreted into two sequential assessments: of the measurement model and of the structural model. In order to assess the significance and explanatory power of the measurement model, certain criteria need to be evaluated. Reflective measurement models should be assessed with regard to their reliability and validity. Table 3 shows the Cronbach’s alpha reliability, adjusted R², Rho_A (alpha), composite reliability (CR), and AVE of the variables. All of the variables used in this research were reliable since the obtained CR and Cronbach’s alpha values were more than 0.7. These values fell within the acceptable range to conclude good reliability.

Table 3. Overview on the quality criteria of all reflective constructs.

| Variables                                | Cronbach’s Alpha | Adjusted R² | Rho_A  | Composite Reliability | AVE   |
|------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|--------|-----------------------|-------|
| Novelty Seeking Motivation (NM)          | 0.870            | 0.877       | 0.871  | 0.532                 |       |
| Socialization Motivation (SM)            | 0.936            | 0.919       | 0.913  | 0.643                 |       |
| Pleasure (P)                             | 0.956            | 0.328       | 0.850  | 0.586                 |       |
| Risk Probability (RP)                    | 0.840            | 0.192       | 0.842  | 0.637                 |       |
| Risk Importance (RI)                     | 0.711            | 0.083       | 0.742  | 0.569                 |       |
| Satisfaction with Physical Services (SPS)| 0.801            | 0.144       | 0.809  | 0.578                 |       |
| Satisfaction with Intangible Services (SIS)| 0.885         | 0.477       | 0.886  | 0.752                 |       |
| Revisit Intention (RVI)                  | 0.833            | 0.273       | 0.837  | 0.716                 |       |

The other criteria for the assessment of a measurement model are discriminate validity, which reflects the extent to which the measurement is unique and not simply a reflection of other variables [64]. AVE is a common method of testing discriminant validity [65]. As can be seen in Table 4, all of the items had higher loadings on their corresponding constructs than the cross-loadings on the other constructs in the model. AVE for each latent factor...
exceeded the respective squared correlation between the factors, providing evidence of discriminant validity [66].

**Table 4. Squared correlations among constructs (discriminant validity).**

| AVE Variables | NM | SM | P | RP | RI | SPS | SIS | RVI |
|---------------|----|----|---|----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| Novelty Seeking Motivation (NM) | 0.730 * | | | | | | | |
| Socialization Motivation (SM) | 0.532 | 0.598 | 0.802 * | | | | | |
| Pleasure (P) | 0.543 | 0.477 | 0.765 * | | | | | |
| Risk Probability (RP) | 0.543 | 0.226 | 0.440 | 0.438 | 0.798 * | | | |
| Risk Importance (RI) | 0.569 | -0.147 | -0.294 | -0.344 | 0.483 | 0.754 * | | |
| Satisfaction with the Physical Services (SPS) | 0.578 | 0.289 | 0.393 | 0.306 | -0.335 | -0.252 | 0.761 * | |
| Satisfaction with the Intangible Services (SIS) | 0.562 | 0.499 | 0.517 | 0.669 | -0.361 | -0.399 | 0.470 | 0.750 * |
| Revisit Intention (RVI) | 0.716 | 0.428 | 0.294 | 0.754 | -0.206 | -0.227 | 0.169 | 0.519 | 0.846 * |

*Square root of AVE.

In the PLS method, structural models and hypotheses are tested using computing path coefficients ($\beta$), the significance of the hypothesis ($p$-value), and variance explained ($R^2$). As the PLS does not require normally distributed data, it is evaluated with an $R^2$ calculation for the latent dependent variables and AVE [66]. As shown in Table 3, the $R^2$ value of the dependent variable, Risk Importance, was small at 0.083. The adjusted $R^2$ values of the Risk Probability, Satisfaction with Physical Service, and Revisit Intention dependent variables were medium at 0.192, 0.144, and 0.273, respectively. The adjusted $R^2$ values of Pleasure Experience and Satisfaction with Intangible Services were closer to large at 0.328 and 0.477, respectively. According to Cohen [67], a value of 0.02 is small, 0.15 is medium, and 0.35 is large. The results showed that mixing all of the dimensions in the model enabled “a moderate incremental change” in the $R^2$ variations.

4.3. Individual Hypothesis Testing

In order to verify the hypotheses, a consistent PLS bootstrapping procedure was performed to evaluate the statistical significance of each path coefficient ($\beta$). The evaluation criterion by which to confirm each hypothesis is the use of $t$-values for each path loading. Practically, as shown in Figure 1, the results of structural model fit showed the value of the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) = 0.06, Squared Euclidean Distance ($d_{ULS} = 0.67$, Geodesic Distance ($d_G = 0.81$, Chi-Square = 2172.23, and Incremental Fit Measure (NFI) = 0.93. Based on the model fit assessment criteria (SRMR < 0.08; $d_{ULS} < 0.95; d_G < 0.96; NFI > 0.90$), as suggested by Cohen [67], the structure of the study model had a good fit with the data.

Table 5 demonstrates the results of the hypotheses testing. H1a suggested that an attendee’s Novelty Seeking Motivation to participate in the event has a positive impact on the Pleasure Experience. The path from Novelty Seeking Motivation to Pleasure Experience was powerful and significant with $\beta = 0.340$, $t = 6.058$, and $p = 0.000$. On the other hand, Novelty Seeking Motivation insignificantly affects attendees’ subjective probability of making a mis-purchase (Risk Probability: H1b) and attendees’ perceived importance of the negative consequences of a mis-purchase (Risk Importance: H1c). Therefore, H1a was supported, but H1b and H1c were not supported. H1d developed that an attendee’s Socialization Motivation to participate in the event would have a positive effect on the Pleasure Experience. The hypothesis path for H1d ($\beta = 0.239$, $t = 4.429$, $p = 0.000$) was confirmed. H1e indicated that an attendee’s Socialization Motivation to participate in the event had a negative impact on attendees’ subjective probability of making a mis-purchase (Risk Probability). The hypothesized path for H1e was also confirmed, positively presenting $\beta = -0.397$, $t = 7.210$, and $p = 0.000$. H1f suggested that attendees’ Socialization Motivation had an insignificant impact on attendees’ perceived importance of the negative consequences of a mis-purchase (Risk Importance), with $\beta = -0.251$, $t = 4.35$, and $p = 0.000$. In consequence, H1d, H1e, and H1f were supported in this study.
Figure 1. The results of PLS-SEM (Indicators 1, 2, and 4 in Q1, Q2, and Q4 in Figure 1 present the measurement items. More specifically, indicators 1 in Q1 represent the measurement items for Motivations, indicators 2 in Q2 represent the measurement items for Satisfaction, and indicators 4 in Q4 present the measurement items for consumer involvement).

| Hypotheses                                                                 | STDEV | β     | f²   | T     | P     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| H1a Novelty Seeking Motivation → Pleasure                                 | 0.056 | 0.340 | 0.112| 6.058 | 0.000 |
| H1b Novelty Seeking Motivation → Risk Probability                        | 0.060 | 0.019 | 0.000| 0.322 | 0.748 |
| H1c Novelty Seeking Motivation → Risk Importance                          | 0.058 | 0.016 | 0.000| 0.276 | 0.783 |
| H1d Socialization Motivation → Pleasure                                   | 0.054 | 0.239 | 0.055| 4.429 | 0.000 |
| H1e Socialization Motivation → Risk Probability                          | 0.055 | −0.397| 0.132| 7.210 | 0.000 |
| H1f Socialization Motivation → Risk Importance                            | 0.058 | −0.251| 0.048| 4.335 | 0.000 |
| H2a Pleasure → Satisfaction with Physical Services                        | 0.051 | 0.163 | 0.025| 3.234 | 0.001 |
| H2b Pleasure → Satisfaction with Intangible Services                      | 0.041 | 0.515 | 0.355| 12.419| 0.000 |
| H2c Risk Probability → Satisfaction with Physical Services               | 0.053 | −0.185| 0.030| 3.529 | 0.000 |
| H2d Risk Importance → Satisfaction with Intangible Services               | 0.041 | −0.060| 0.004| 1.463 | 0.144 |
| H2e Risk Importance → Satisfaction with Physical Services                | 0.049 | −0.080| 0.006| 1.623 | 0.105 |
| H2f Risk Importance → Satisfaction with Intangible Services               | 0.040 | −0.160| 0.034| 4.006 | 0.000 |
| H3a Satisfaction with Physical Services → Revisit Intention               | 0.035 | −0.046| 0.002| 1.037 | 0.300 |
| H3b Satisfaction with Intangible Services → Revisit Intention             | 0.043 | 0.465 | 0.228| 10.899| 0.000 |

H2a stated that attendees’ Pleasure Experience had a positive impact on their Satisfaction with Physical Services, which was strongly confirmed with \( \beta = -0.163, t = 3.234, \) and \( p = 0.001. \) H2b estimated that attendees’ Pleasure Experience had a positive impact on their Satisfaction with Intangible Services, which was also confirmed with \( \beta = -0.515, t = 12.419, \) and \( p = 0.000. \) In addition, H2c and H2d stated that attendees’ Risk Probability had a significant effect on their Satisfaction with the Quality of the Physical Services and Intangible Services, respectively. While the path from Risk probability to Intangible Service Quality was not significant, the path from Risk Probability to attendees’ Satisfaction with Physical Services was significant (\( \beta = -0.185, t = 3.529, p = 0.000. \)) The results revealed that low-risk probability, namely, the low level of attendees’ subjective probability of making
a mis-purchase, was an important antecedent variable affecting attendees’ positive satisfaction at the food and wine festival. H2e and H2f explored the relationship between attendees’ Risk Importance and their Satisfaction with Physical Services and Intangible Services, respectively. The results from the model demonstrated that attendees’ Risk Importance was not significantly associated with their Satisfaction with Physical Service Quality, but it had a positive impact on the Satisfaction with Intangible Service Quality ($\beta = -0.160$, $t = 4.006$, $p = 0.000$). Although H2e was not supported, the results proved the causal relationship between the level of attendees’ perceived importance of the negative consequences of a mis-purchase (Risk Importance) and their satisfaction with the festival’s service quality.

H3a predicted that attendees’ higher level of Satisfaction with Physical Services led to a higher level of their Intentions to Revisit the Festival. This hypothesis was not supported. On the other hand, H3b estimated that attendees’ higher level of Satisfaction with Intangible Services led to a higher level of their Intentions to Revisit the Festival. The standardized estimates of the path analysis ($\beta = -0.465$, $t = 10.899$, $p = 0.000$) demonstrated that attendees’ Satisfaction with Intangible Service Quality significantly affects their Intention to Revisit the Festival, supporting H3b.

5. Conclusions and Implications

This study provided evidence that attendees’ motivations and involvement were positively related to their satisfaction with intangible and physical services in the context of food and wine festivals, which can lead to revisit intentions to the festival. First, the current study sheds light on how attendees’ novelty and socialization motivations related to attending a wine and food festival had an impact on their involvement dimensions (i.e., pleasure experience, risk probability, risk importance). Interestingly, the results indicated that novelty seekers were more likely to be interested in pleasure experiences, such as the unique experiences of specific foods and wines and the atmosphere of the events, while socialization seekers not only valued the pleasure experiences of the food and wine, but also tended to be more tolerant toward the perceived probability of making a mistake in choosing a festival or the perceived importance of the negative consequences after attending a chosen festival. These findings supported previous research conducted by Prebensen et al. [18] and Afonso et al. [22], which indicated that wine tourists’ diverse motivations positively influenced constructs of involvement.

Second, the findings of the study revealed that attendees’ involvement (e.g., pleasure experience, risk probability, risk importance) were important antecedent variables affecting different attributes of satisfaction related to the food and wine festival. In the current study, the construct of the attendees’ satisfaction was divided into satisfaction with physical service (tangible) attributes and festival contents (intangible) attributes. Interestingly, when the festival attendees were highly involved in the pleasure experience of the festival, they were more likely to be satisfied with both the tangible (e.g., clean restrooms, parking, rest areas) and intangibles services (e.g., program pamphlets, festival programs and schedules, signage for directions, booking signings, festival staff knowledge, festival staff helpfulness).

On the other hand, risk probability was negatively associated with the attendees’ satisfaction with physical (tangible) service attributes, while risk importance was negatively related to the attendees’ intangible service satisfaction. These results can be interpreted as people who are more certain about choosing that food and wine festival are more likely to be satisfied with the physical/facility service attributes, while people who are more tolerant toward negative consequences caused by their poor leisure choices are more likely to be satisfied with intangible service attributes.

Furthermore, consistent with O’Neill et al.’s [50] work, this study showed that only intangible services significantly influenced the attendees’ revisit intentions related to the festival. In fact, many empirical studies have confirmed the positive relationship between the level of tangible components in a service industry and the importance of the intangible service dimensions [68]. However, the findings of this study identified this intangibility
(e.g., program pamphlets, book signings, festival staff knowledge) as a key characteristic of services related to attendees’ revisit intentions, particularly to service industries, such as hotels, restaurants, and festivals.

Based on the findings of the current study, the following managerial implications are put forward. From the festival organizer’s perspective, the findings from this study suggest valuable insights confirming the relationships between festival attendees’ motivations and involvements in terms of attaining visitors’ satisfaction and enhancing their revisit intentions to the festival. As a consequence, developing a marketing strategy to attract attendees based on the characteristic of their cognitive modes can be effective when attempting to increase their satisfaction and willingness to revisit the festival.

In addition, the results of this study can help festival organizers and marketers more efficiently acknowledge attendees’ involvement in pleasure experiences, as well as reduce their perceived risk probability and risk importance related to the festival. The high level of satisfaction can be achieved by offering high-quality, unique types of food and wines; inviting a vendor who will bring a large variety of wine; and providing interactive programs and opportunities that will facilitate the attendees’ entertainment. A well-organized festival will decrease the attendee’s perception of his/her risk probability, and increase his/her satisfaction with and loyalty toward a food and wine festival.

Finally, developing and maintaining customer loyalty is a critical goal of service providers (i.e., food and wine festival managers and marketers) attempting to gain a competitive advantage against their competitors. Therefore, in order to increase visitors’ loyalty, more attention should be paid to enhancing visitors’ involvement with local food- and wine-related events (e.g., wine-tasting, food and wine seminars, a variety of selections of food and wine, socialization opportunities). It should also be noted that festival management needs to customize its operational and marketing strategies depending on the target market. It is critically important to differentiate the marketing strategy when attendees are comprised of both first-time and repeat visitors, or higher- and lower-income visitors.

As with all research, the current study has limitations. This study was conducted using only one international food and wine festival. Thus, the findings of the study cannot be generalized to all types of food and wine festivals and festival attendees. A need exists to conduct additional research to investigate other types of international or well-known events to confirm whether the same hypothesized relationships hold true for a broader spectrum of food and wine festivals. Future research should include a qualitative study using a focus group of repeat attendees in order to understand what tangible or intangibles service attributes enticed them to return to the festival.
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