The determinants of smart tourism behavior: evidence in wine tourism context
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Abstract. The main purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of satisfaction, involvement, and subjective norms on tourists’ behavioral intentions at a historic district at Yibin, China. This study also attempts to examine the mediating effect of involvement, and subjective norms on the paths from satisfaction to intentions. Data were collected via a non-site survey and analyzed using a structural equation modeling approach. Results indicate that satisfaction, involvement, and subjective norms directly contribute to the formation of tourists’ intentions of the historic district. Tourists’ involvement is positively associated with tourists’ satisfaction. Both involvement and subjective norms fully mediate the relationship between satisfaction and intentions. Theoretical and managerial implications are elaborated.

1. Introduction
Smart tourism has become more and more popular in mainland China. Different types of events and activities have been classified as smart tourism, leading to the misuse of the term [1]. Smart tourism is viewed as a social phenomenon arising from the convergence of citizens’ daily life in business and tourism ecosystems [2]. The concept of smart tourism comes from smart city and tourism systems, which involve flows and exchanges of data and information for satisfying tourists’ needs. Such flows and exchanges constantly depend on interdependence and interact with external systems (e.g., transportation, healthcare, and payment systems), along with resource sharing for optimization. Optimization is achieved through advance technologies in the ecosystems with the support of residential government policies and systems integration [3, 4]. The word “Smart” implies “smartness,” which means not only fast, convenient, cheap, and intelligent for a traveler, but also efficient, effective, productive, and creative for business in terms of providing and consuming tourism products and services through a network of cooperating businesses [2]. Studies related to smart tourism in past five years have focus on the technology and few studies focus on its application. Given this lack of clarity, practices such as putting previous wine into new bottles and rushing headlong into mass action will simply lead to a new round of inefficient resource allocation and consequent lowered confidence on the part of enterprises and government authorities [1]. Thus, this study aims at investigating its application on wine tourism. The purpose of this study is 1) to verify the effects of involvement, subjective norm, and satisfaction on behavioral intentions; 2) assessing the moderated effects of involvement and subjective norm on satisfaction-behavioral intentions relation; and 3) drawing some implications. Research framework of this study is presented in Figure 1.
2. Literature review and conceptual model

2.1. The concept of involvement and its impact on satisfaction and behavioral intentions

Involvement has been conceptualized as a person's perceived relevance of the object or product based on inherent needs, values, and interests [9]. The relationship between involvement and satisfaction of a tourist is under debate in the tourism literature. While [5] report a positive relationship between involvement and satisfaction in Litchi Bay, China; Prayag and Ryan [6] fail to support this relationship in their study. Others identify involvement as an antecedent of tourist satisfaction and future visit intentions. For example [7, 8] conclude that tourists who are highly involved in the activities during a festival/tour are more satisfied with their experience and express stronger intentions to return compared to individuals who are less involved. Tourists' involvement in this study is mainly evaluated by their participation in destination activities. In this vein, it is postulated that:

H1: High levels of involvement positively affect tourists' satisfaction with a wine tourism site.

Several studies provide empirical evidence for the relationships between involvement and behavioral intention. Studies on food involvement have suggested that involved consumers make healthier food choices and that further research is necessary on the role of involvement in consumer behavior [9, 10]. Involvement as an antecedent to outcomes such as willingness to purchase wine [11] and food involvement as a direct predictor of loyalty [12] suggest that involvement can have a direct relationship with behavioral outcomes [13]. Given that visitors have high involvement with a wine tourism site, it is believed that this will lead to positive word of mouth, recommendation, and future visitation. Thus, high levels of involvement positively affect their future intention.

H2: High levels of involvement positively affect tourists' behavioral intention with a wine tourism site.

2.2. The concept of satisfaction and its impact on behavioral intentions

Satisfaction refers to a consumer-perceived discrepancy between expectation and performance before and after consumption [14]. Satisfaction is an important concept in tourism [6]. A number of studies show that understanding tourist satisfaction is essential to successful destination marketing because it not only impacts the consumption of goods and services, but also the future selection of a destination and intention to visit by tourists [15-18]. Customers often make a decision to purchase/repurchase after evaluating whether their experiences with a product/service are satisfactory/pleasurable [19-23]. Assuring customer satisfaction can therefore be viewed as the capability of companies to meet customers' expectations, with a high degree of satisfaction being a source of companies' competitive advantages [14-24]. In their empirical research examining tourists' behaviors, [25] empirically demonstrated that tourists' satisfaction formed based on enjoyment and economic benefits, and directly and indirectly engenders intention to revisit in P2P accommodation. Similarly, [23] clearly showed that consumers' satisfaction level plays a significant role in their intention to revisit the restaurant and other restaurants of the same hotel formation. When tourists feel satisfied, their favorable intentions for a product/service and their desire toward purchasing and experiencing it...
generally increase [23]. Given that visitors have high satisfaction with a wine tourism site, it is believe that this will lead to positive word of mouth, recommendation, and future visitation. Thus, high levels of satisfaction positively affect their future intention.

H3: High levels of satisfaction positively affect tourists' behavioral intention with a wine tourism site.

2.3. The concept of subjective norms and its impact on satisfaction and behavioral intentions

According to [26], subjective norms refer to perceived pressures on a person to perform a given behavior and the person’s motivation to comply with those pressures. Thus, subjective norms reflect how the customer is affected by the perception of some significant referents (e.g., family, friends, and colleagues, among others) of his/her behavior [27]. When a consumer is affected by the perception of some significant referents, s/he is likely to present satisfied status and positive behavioral intention. [28] show that subjective norm positively influence customer’s satisfaction in mobile shopping. Similarly, [29] find that subjective norms playa significant role in predicting satisfaction and behavioral intention in O2O service. Given that visitors have high subjective norms with a wine tourism site, s/he is likely to be satisfactory and reveal positive word of mouth, recommendation, and future visitation. Thus, high levels of subjective norm are likely to affect their satisfaction and behavioral intention.

H4:High levels of subjective norm positively affect tourists' satisfaction with a wine tourism site.

H5: High levels of subjective norm positively affect tourists' behavioral intention with a wine tourism site.

2.4. The moderated effect of involvement on satisfaction-behavioral intention relation

Within many studies of marketing research on consumer behavior, it is noted that involvement often exhibits a moderating effect on proposed relationships that include behavior outcomes such as satisfaction, intentions, and loyalty [30, 31]. [32] argued that there are two ways in which tourists can become involved in the co-creation process: passively or actively[33]. Passive involvement refers to interactions that are generally controlled by the setting—the tourist provides some input to the overall experience such as visiting a theme park. On the other hand, active involvement allows the tourist to immerse themselves in the experience, taking on responsibility for every step in the process [18]. [34] argued that causation between customer satisfaction and loyalty was moderated by their level of involvement, and [35] verified that customer level of involvement had a positive moderating effect on causation between satisfaction, intent of repurchase, and loyalty. Given that visitors have high involvement with a wine tourism site, s/he is likely to immerse themselves in the experience of wine tourism site. S/he is likely to have better word of mouth, recommendation, and future visitation even s/he is not satisfied with the wine tour. Thus, the relationship between satisfaction and behavioral intention to the wine tourism site is likely to be moderated by the tourist’s level of involvement.

H6: The relationship between satisfaction and behavioral intention to the wine tourism site is moderated by the tourist's level of involvement.

2.5. The moderated effect of subjective norms on satisfaction-behavioral intention relation

Wine tourism has been recognized as a form of theme tourism, comprising visits to vineyards, wineries, wine festivals, and wine shows in wine tourism destinations [36]. Visitors can taste a variety of wine and they often buy some wine as souvenirs after traveling [37]. Therefore, some reference group of visitor will feel a little confusion about taking a trip to wine tourism site. They might have high probabilities to stress visitor not to travel to wine tourism site even visitor is satisfied with the wine tour and want to revisit again. On the other hand, visitor with high stress from reference group is likely to have high subjective norm and consequently the relationship between satisfaction and behavioral intention to the wine tourism site is likely to be moderated by the high level of tourist’s subjective norm. [37] reports that subjective norm can destroy the causal relation between destination
image and word of mouth. Similarity, Lin, Liu, and [37] state that subjective norm can decline the causal relation between satisfaction and word of mouth in logging industry. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H7: The relationship between satisfaction and behavioral intention to the wine tourism site is moderated by the visitor’s level of subjective norm.

3. Method

3.1. Measurement tools
The measurement instruments for data collection were adopted from existing multiple-item scales validated by previous studies [5, 10, 27, 38-40]. The adopted measures were altered to be adequate in the present research setting. In particular, involvement was measured with three items (e.g., I like being involved in making visits of wine sites; I attach great importance to visiting wine sites; —Purchases decisions for wine tourism are very important to me). Subjective norm was assessed with three items (e.g., People whose opinions I appreciate think that it is okay for me to visit this wine site; Most people I valued think that I should visit this wine site; —It is expected that I visit this wine site to see some wine products/services;). Satisfaction was measured with three items (e.g., I am happy with the products/services I have visited on this wine site; I am generally happy with having visited from this wine site; In general, I have liked visiting this wine site). Moreover, behavioral intention was measured with three items (e.g., I say positive things about the experience at wine site; I will recommend visiting wine site to anybody who seeks my advice; —I will revisit the wine site in the future).

A five-point Likert type scale, which anchored from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), was used for all of the questions. The respondents were also requested to provide their socio-demographic information. The survey questionnaire including the measures described above and demographic questions were pre-tested with 30 undergraduate and three faculty members whose frequency of wine tourism visit is relatively high and improved accordingly. The questionnaire was furthermore reviewed and perfected by academic experts whose major is tourism/hospitality management and industry experts who are working in a wine tourism site.

3.2. Data collection and demographic characteristics
In order to collect data, a personal interview survey methodology was utilized. This face to face field survey approach allowed us to reach a wider sampling range and include a greater number of wine visitors during the survey period. All eligible survey respondents were instructed to read the study description carefully when accessing the survey, and were requested to fill out the questionnaire. The participants were also requested to indicate the name of the wine site in which they visited. A total of 650 completed questionnaires were gathered through these processes. After the screening process by removing unusable responses and extreme cases, 630 usable responses were retained for data analysis. The socio-demographic profile of the survey respondents was examined. Of 630 participants, 46.5% are males and 53.5% females, most of them between 20 and 39 years old (41.2%), with secondary education (35.2%).

3.3. Data analysis
The collected data through the previously described data collection procedure was analyzed with SPSS and AMOS Version 20. A two-step process was employed [41]. In particular, a measurement model was initially evaluated by conducting confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Subsequently, a structural equation modeling (SEM) was estimated.

4. Results

4.1. Measurement model evaluation
A measurement model comprising all of the construct measures and nine latent variables was generated via the CFA with a maximum likelihood estimation method. The goodness-of-fit statistics of the CFA revealed an adequate fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 215$, $df = 43$, $\chi^2/df = 5$, $p < 0.001$, GFI = .945; AGFI = .901; CFI = .953; RMSEA = .080). All items were significantly loaded to their associated latent construct ($p < 0.01$). Table 1 presents the details of the CFA results. As reported in Table 1, the average variance extracted (AVE) of the constructs were greater than the 0.50 threshold suggested by Hair et al. (1988). The values ranged from 0.548 to 0.695. Thus, convergent validity for each construct was supported (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). In addition, these AVE values exceeded the square of correlations between variables (Table 2). Hence, discriminant validity was evident (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Composite reliability was then calculated. Our calculation revealed that the values were equal to or higher than 0.76, confirming the adequate level of internal consistency among the items for each latent variable.

### Table 1. Measurement model assessment

| Construct | Items | $\lambda$ | $t$-values | SMC | CR | AVE |
|-----------|-------|-----------|------------|-----|----|-----|
| INV       | INV1  | .807      | -          | .651| .872| .695|
|           | INV2  | .870      | 22.981     | .756|     |     |
|           | INV3  | .822      | 22.084     | .675|     |     |
| SN        | SN1   | .670      | -          | .449| .836| .633|
|           | SN2   | .904      | 17.210     | .818|     |     |
|           | SN3   | .796      | 17.427     | .633|     |     |
| SA        | SA1   | .649      | -          | .421| .783| .548|
|           | SA2   | .773      | 15.213     | .597|     |     |
|           | SA3   | .790      | 15.390     | .625|     |     |
| BI        | BI1   | .739      | -          | .546| .832| .626|
|           | BI2   | .911      | 20.182     | .830|     |     |
|           | BI3   | .709      | 17.177     | .502|     |     |

Model fit $\chi^2 = 215; df = 43 (p=.000); \chi^2/df = 5; GFI = .945; AGFI = .901; CFI = .953; RMSEA = .080$

INV: involvement; SN: subjective norm; SA: satisfaction; BI: behavioral intention; $\lambda$: standardized factor loading; SMC: square multiple correlation; CR: composite reliability; AVE: average variance extracted

### Table 2. Correlation and discriminant validity

| Items | M   | SD  | INV | SN  | SA  | BI  |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| INV   | 10.11 | 2.89 | .695 |     |     |     |
| SN    | 11.10 | 2.65 | .150** | .633 |     |     |
| SA    | 11.31 | 2.35 | .334** | .280** | .548 |     |
| BI    | 12.03 | 2.36 | .368** | .593** | .273** | .626 |

**p<.05 (two-tailed); Diagonal elements were average variance extracted and off-diagonal were the coefficient of the correlation.

M: mean; SD: standard deviation; INV: involvement; SN: subjective norm; SA: satisfaction; BI: behavioral intention

### 4.2. Structural model evaluation

Following the evaluation of the measurement structure, the SEM was conducted using a maximum likelihood estimation approach in order to validate the proposed theoretical framework and to test the hypothesized relationships among study constructs. Three models were adopted for testing the hypotheses. INV, SA, SN, and BI were conducted in the first model. Further the interaction item INV*SA was added in model 2 and finally the second interaction item SN*SA was added in model 3. As indicated in Table 3, the goodness-of-fit statistics showed the acceptable fit to the data in model 1 ($\chi^2 = 215$, $df = 43$, $\chi^2/df = 5$, $p < 0.001$, GFI = .945; AGFI = .901; CFI = .953; RMSEA = .080).

Overall, the hypotheses in model 1 were supported except H5. Satisfaction was well accounted for by its predictors ($R^2 = 0.226$). Behavioral intention was also well accounted for by its predictors ($R^2 = 0.516$).
Furthermore, the path INV*SA was added and the goodness-of-fit statistics showed the acceptable fit to the data in model 2 ($\chi^2 = 243$, df = 51, $\chi^2$/df = 4.77, $p < 0.001$, GFI= .943; AGFI= .899; CFI= .949; RMSEA= .077). Again, all the hypotheses in model 2 were supported except H5. Satisfaction was well accounted for by its predictors ($R^2 = 0.226$). Behavioral intention was also well accounted for by its predictors ($R^2 = 0.544$). In particular, that the relationship between satisfaction and behavioral intention to the wine tourism site is moderated by the tourist’s level of involvement (H6) was evident. Moreover, the path SN*SA was added and the goodness-of-fit statistics showed the acceptable fit to the data in model 3 ($\chi^2 = 283$, df = 60, $\chi^2$/df = 4.70, $p < 0.001$, GFI= .940; AGFI= .894; CFI= .942; RMSEA= .077). All the hypotheses in model 3 were supported except H5. Satisfaction was well accounted for by its predictors ($R^2 = 0.229$). Behavioral intention was also well accounted for by its predictors ($R^2 = 0.541$). In particular, that the relationship between satisfaction and behavioral intention to the wine tourism site is moderated by the tourist’s level of involvement (H6) was confirmed. The results of the SEM are exhibited in details in Table 3.

### Table 3. Structural model assessment

| Paths       | M1       | M2       | M3       |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|
| H1:INV-SA   | .343***  | .342***  | .344***  |
| H2:INV-BI   | .173***  | .191***  | .192***  |
| H3:SA-BI    | .624***  | .573***  | .573***  |
| H4:SN-SA    | .262***  | .263***  | .265***  |
| H5:SN-BI    | .018     | .020     | .021     |
| H6:INV*SA-BI| -1.161***| -4.455   | -1.167***|
| H7:SN*SA-BI | .226     | .243     | .283     |
| R^2_SA      | .516     | .544     | .541     |
| R^2_BI      | 2.15     | 4.77     | 4.70     |
| GFI         | .945     | .943     | .940     |
| AGFI        | .901     | .899     | .894     |
| CFI         | .953     | .949     | .942     |
| RMSEA       | .080     | .077     | .077     |

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

INV: involvement; SN: subjective norm; SA: satisfaction; BI: behavioral intention

### 4.3. Discussion

This study tested a model that proposed relationships among four constructs: involvement, subjective norm, satisfaction, and behavioral intention. The findings of this study indicate that involvements can contribute to satisfaction. Given the nature of our screening questions and the way the construct of involvements was worded, the study created a setting in which the respondent had the opportunity to engage meaningfully in the process of wine tourism. This finding is essentially consistent with past research [8, 42]. Moreover, the study confirms past research that demonstrates the link between involvement and behavioral intention [10, 11, 13]. Involvement helps improve visitors’ behavioral intention during the trip and after they return home. Therefore, the study argued that the findings of this study contribute to the growing body of knowledge in understanding the wine tourism by establishing a theory-based empirical link between involvement and behavioral intention. This link had not been empirically demonstrated, as until this study, no study had focused on the aftereffects of participation in wine tourism when talking about smart tourism.

Furthermore, in line with previous studies [19, 20, 22, 23] satisfaction revealed a positive influence on behavioral intention. The largest coefficient was met among the three models indicating that satisfaction was the key antecedent when predict visitors’ behavioral intention in wine tourism.
Beside, subjective norm has a positive influence on satisfaction and behavioral intention. This suggests that the effect of social approval and pressure will be more salient when the visitors’ claims that a firm did not perform as promised, while the spreading of positive satisfaction depends mainly on the assessment of whether such behavior is appropriate. The findings were consisted with previous studies [27-29].

In particularity, involvement has a negative moderated effect on satisfaction - behavioral intention relation in wine tourism. These findings are similar to those by [18,34]. Given that visitors have high involvement with a wine tourism site, s/he is likely to immerse themselves in the experience of wine tourism site. S/he is likely to have better word of mouth, recommendation, and future visitation even s/he is not satisfied with the wine tour.

5. Conclusion
This study sets out to examine the influences of involvement, subjective norm, and satisfaction on behavioral intention with wine tourism sites, Yibin in China. Involvement and subjective norm directly result in a favorable satisfaction, which finally enhances to visitors’ behavioral intention. Involvement moderates the relation between satisfaction and behavioral intention, while subjective norm does not.Consequently, the implications to smart tourism would be the importance of the equipments and service at Yibin region. For example, a visitor would have the higher probabilities to satisfy with wine tourist site when he/she can easily call the car or rent a bike to go around the heritage than those one who has difficulty to do that. Moreover, enhancing the cognition of the use for smart tourism tools would be important. Because the benefits of smart tourism tools can decline the constraints and fill the gap of the distance between visitor and destination through these dimensions: attractions, accessibility, amenities, available packages, activities, and ancillary services.

Findings indicate that increasing visitors' involvement in wine tourism sites directly improves visitors' satisfaction. In fact, the desire to be involved in the wine heritage experience is considered as one of the major motivations of wine heritage tourism. Thus, wine business should consider how to improve visitors' involvement.

In addition, this study not only empirically confirms previous assumptions that subjective norm is an influential factor altering visitors' satisfaction, but also develops the underlying rationale that it positively influences behavioral intention via satisfaction in wine tourism. This indicates that the subjective norms should be considered when predicting visitor satisfaction and behavioral intention in wine tourism context. Extending previous findings to a wine tourism context, this study provides additional evidence on the critical role of subjective norms.

Moreover, involvement moderates the relation between satisfaction and behavioral intention indicating that the higher the visitor level of involvement, the more detailed information on wine tourism they wanted and the more effort they made in selecting a product/service, resulting in positive satisfaction; and compared to those with high level of involvement, visitors with low level of involvement showed a close relationship between their satisfaction and behavioral intention. On the other hand, visitors with high level of involvement will present the positive words, recommend the sites, and promote the wine tour not only they satisfied with wine tour. The other reasons should be concerned by the wine business and future researchers.

From a company’s perspective, the most important variable that can strengthen behavioral intention is visitors' satisfaction, but in a modern, competitive society it is very hard to enhance satisfaction through differentiation of service/product quality. The reason is that visitors select goods or services that can provide them with the most benefits among various alternatives. Thus, verifying the possible antecedents of both satisfaction and behavioral intention, and offering the benefits can contribute to the wine business management.

This study notes that wine visitor satisfaction and behavioral intention had organic causation. It also verified that whereas satisfied visitors presented active intention. Enhancing visitor satisfaction for performance improvement is crucial, but even satisfied visitors may make switching behaviors and companies should make more of an effort to maintain existed customers rather than satisfied
customers. To this end, companies need to perform diverse relationship marketing strategies such as cementing customer membership and issuing coupons and discount tickets, thereby strengthening behavioral intention.

The limitations of this study provide evidence for further research. In the future, a representative sample might be desirable. This study focuses on examining the involvement from the perspective of the winetourist. Further research could compare supply and wine production perspectives to consumers' perceptions to generate an integrated understand in gaud produce insightful contributions. Also, it might be interesting to conduct a qualitative study using a focus group of repeated visitors to understand their involvement and subjective norms to return more deeply. The findings from this study are on wine tourists from the Yibin wine regions. Thus, future studies should cover other wine regions to gain a broader spectrum of wine tourist behavior. Moreover, they should focus on the issues that why social reference is not significant in influencing visitor’s intention. Further, more illustration of its impacts on behavioral intention in smart tourism context would be needed.

Appendix: measure scale

Involvement [5, 38]
INV1: I like being involved in making visits of wine sites
INV 2: I attach great importance to visiting wine sites
INV 3: Purchases decisions for wine tourism are very important to me

Subjective norms [27, 39]
SN1: People whose opinions I appreciate think that it is okay for me to visit this wine site.
SN2: Most people I value think that I should visit this wine site.
SN3: It is expected that I visit this wine site to see some wine products/services. Satisfaction [38-40]
SA1: I am happy with the products/services I have visited on this wine site.
SA2: I am generally happy with having visited from this wine site.
SA3: In general, I have liked visiting this wine site.

Behavioral intention [10, 39, 43]
B11: I say positive things about the experience at wine site.
B12: I will recommend visiting wine site to anybody who seeks my advice.
B13: I will revisit the wine site in the future.
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