Effects of memorable tourism experience on tourist’s satisfaction and revisiting: Case of Cittaslow in Taiwan
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ABSTRACT

In the context of cittaslow (slow city), this research attempted to examine the effects of memorable tourism experience (MTE) on tourist satisfaction and revisiting intention. The study used a structured questionnaire and collected 605 valid responses from tourists that visited Sunyi Cittaslow. Analyses of the measurement and structural models by AMOS 22.0 were used to find the associations between each MTE dimension and satisfaction, and revisit intention. Test results revealed that all MTE dimensions are predictors of tourist satisfaction, among which knowledge and involvement are the strongest predictors; satisfaction is the strongest predictor for revisiting and is the mediator for the associations of most MTE dimensions and revisiting. Since the cittaslow movement was closely related to sustainable tourism, research findings from this study provided a good reference with evidence for the promotion of cittaslow through MTE creation.
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Introduction

The rapid growth of the global tourism industry had brought not only overexploitation of tourism resources and environmental pollution but also hazardous to the indigenous culture and local economy. To avoid such a risk, Cittaslow introduced a concept of slow cities in an attempt to balance the conflicting needs of globalization or economies of scale and the local development in a sustainable approach to foster the survival of cultural and ecological diversity, especially the small cities that were most vulnerable in the business competition games (Mayer & Knox, 2006; Nilsson, Svärd, Widarsson & Wirell, 2011; Ekinci, 2014; Losada & Mota, 2019; Park & Lee, 2019).

It seems that Cittaslow is concerned with local food, habitats, and culture. It attempts to encourage the creation of a system to support local producers, traditional artisans, farmers, and family businesses that are typically small-scale. By abiding by the tradition, Cittaslow wishes to escort the uniqueness of tangible and intangible assets of cultures, nature, and conventional industries with the premise of local history. As far as the tourist experience is concerned, a tour to the Cittaslow is a unique experience that materially and spiritually differs from those gained from other destinations (Fullagar, Markwell, & Wilson, 2012; Park & Lee, 2019). (Fullagar, Markwell, & Wilson, 2012; Park & Lee, 2019). In other words, the Cittaslow can be unique and thus attractive to a specific segment of customers on one hand, and can be beneficial for the community and circumscribed dwellers to survive without sacrificing their original life and history in the other. Slow travel to Cittaslow is a win-win scenario between economic development and sustainability and can be a sustainable way for the firms in the highly competitive tourism industry (Breakey & Breakey, 2015; Serdane, Maccarrone-Eaglen & Sharifi, 2020), so as to the small towns that are facing the threats of globalization (Mayer & Knox, 2006). It is thus considered an ideal way to engage in sustainable tourism (Serdane et al., 2020; Breakey & Breakey, 2015).
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Why tour to Cittaslow or slow travel is attractive? Uniqueness is one of attractiveness for a trip to Cittaslow, which includes unique experience and interaction with the indigenous dwellers, cultures (food, house, life, folks, habits, and many others that specific to the area), and natural environment (Lin, 2018; Chi & Han, 2020). With the change of travel patterns, consumers also gradually change their choice from traditional mass travel to more in-depth travel, that is, slow travel. Competition has long been fierce for a long time in the tourism industries. Sustainable tourism is considered an ideal way for the sustainability of both the environment and the industry to engage in sustainable tourism (Breakey & Breakey, 2015; Serdane et al., 2020), and slow travel can be a new perspective of such transition (Oh et al., 2016; Lin, 2018; Chi & Han, 2020). Attractiveness is important to allure an initial visiting, and satisfaction on the quality of a tour may act to be free from customer complaints, however, the literature has suggested that additional factors other than attractive and satisfaction should be also active in forming a repetitive purchasing or revisiting intention in the tourism industry (Lehto, O’Leary & Morrison, 2004; Kim, Ritchie & McCormick, 2012; Chen & Rahman, 2018). As the experience economy advocated that favorable experience and associated repetitive purchasing would be the core engine for the economy after the industrial and commercial eras (Pine & Gilmore, 1999). Based on the same logic, experience on the tour and the destination will be the primary factor that imposes effects on the revisiting decision. It is the experience of attractiveness and satisfaction as the major drivers to form a revisiting intention, not the attractiveness and satisfaction itself (Ritchie & Crouch, 2003). A memorable tourism experience (MTE) plays a decisive role in the decision of a revisiting (Lehto et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2012; Chen & Rahman, 2018), and has generally been recognized as the best predictor of future behaviors (Kim et al., 2012; Chandralalal, Rindfleish & Valenzuela, 2015).

Studies on actions of Cittaslow were mainly focused on its historical origin and later developments under a broad scope, some great achievements had reached in its theoretical implications (Losada & Mota, 2019), practical applications of different cases around the world (Serdane et al., 2020; Ekin, 2014; Karabağ, Yücel & İnal, 2012; Petrini, 2001). There were few if any studies that had addressed the MTE toward a Cittaslow and associated impacts on the visitor’s revisiting intention, as well as how this can be helpful for the sustainability of a small town. To our best knowledge, the current research is the pioneer in the study of this kind.

This research took Sanyi Cittaslow (SYC), one of the four accredited Cittaslaws in Taiwan, as a case to investigate the visitor’s MTE and its impacts on the revisiting intention. Sanyi is a small town located in a rugged and mountainous area of western Taiwan. Despite that the abundant resources of woods, beautiful natural landscapes, fruitful Hakka culture, coarse and historic station of a century-old railway, and fascinating wooden handicrafts, SYC had limited access to the main artery of the modern economy, a typical case of economic development squeezing a small town. A fading town with affluent historic, cultural, and humanistic assets of this kind deserves to be sustainable. We wish to identify the strength of MTE of such a Cittaslow and explore its effects on the tourist’s revisiting intention. This study explores the valuable elements of MTE of SYC and examines its associated effects on satisfaction as well as revisiting intention toward SYC through the eyes of visitors to SYC. Test results will provide clear directions for the management of a Cittaslow and help to promote sustainable tourism.

The purposes of the study are twofold: (a) to explore the scores of memorable tourism experiences (MTE) of the slow city, (b) to examine how the tourists’ memorable travel experiences affect their satisfaction of a tour, and the willingness of revisiting.

**Literature Review**

**Slow Cities-Cittaslow**

The Cittaslow movement was inaugurated in Italy in 1999. This action can be traced back to the formation of the Slow Food Organization and then expanded to escort local life with the three concepts of “good, clean, and fair” and the Slow City movement accordingly (Mayer & Knox, 2006, Hatipoglu, 2015). Using snail as its logo, the organization urges people to slow down the life steps to improve their quality of life. It promotes “slow living, slow eating, slow travel” with health and ecological conservation as its starting point.

Originated from the philosophy of Slow Food, Cittaslow aimed to extend similar concepts to daily life practice. It includes local administration of communities and governments in every aspect, such as the healthy succession of seasons, the authenticity of products and foods, spirits of local culture and traditional works, and unspoiled landscapes (Cittaslow International, 2021). As of June 2021, 278 cities in 30 countries around the world had joined Cittaslow International (Cittaslow International, 2021). With Cittaslow, the movement attempts to welcome the visitors a longer stay with the slower path in town to appreciate the local culture by frequent interactions with residents. Cittaslow movement in a sense of advocating the idea of being sensitive and responsive to the interdependence of economic development, environmental protection, and social equity goals (Mayer & Knox, 2006). Therefore, some studies had used slow cities as an alternative model for urban development in small towns, which suggested the concept of slow cities can be considered as a model for urban development by emphasizing local characteristics and sense of place (Mayer & Knox, 2006).

By valuing the local culture, residents can exchange with visitors without giving away the traditional rites, spirits, skills, and lifestyles. As towns become more tourist-friendly, they have the potential to develop tourism (Hatipoglu, 2015). As a result, the need for sustainability can be achieved (Hall, 2019; Seyfi, Hall & Rasoolimanesh, 2020). In addition, previous studies have shown that tourists who equipped with the sense of sustainability, before and during their trip, will be more enjoyable the tour, and will have a significant impact on memorable experiences and revisiting motivation (Kim et al., 2012; Tung & Ritchie, 2011).
Memorable Tourism Experiences

Experience is the core value of a journey, and an unforgettable experience is always the determinant of satisfaction and revisiting intention toward any form of travel. Experiences of this kind are something more than service quality and that is always beyond what the visitor’s expectation before engaging the tour. Unforgettable experiences can foster satisfaction, yet satisfaction may not promise an unforgettable experience (Kozak, 2001, Lehto et al., 2004, Kim & Ritchie, 2014). This means the experiences that are memorable drive the tourists’ intention to start a revisiting tour.

Memorable tourism experiences (MTE) is an extended theory of tourism experiences that refers to the ability of tourists to remember and recall events that have occurred (Tung & Ritchie, 2011; Kim & Ritchie, 2014; Kim & Chen, 2019). MTE is selectively constructed from tourism experiences based on the individual’s assessment of the experience (Kim et al., 2012). Literature proved that specific MTE will influence the tourists’ future behavioral intentions in the tourism industry (Kim & Ritchie, 2014). Understanding and then exploiting tourists’ MTE can be an applicable measure to foster the tourist’s revisiting intention toward a destination, and then knowledge on such MTE can be a reliable competence in the tourism market (Kozak, 2001, Lehto et al., 2004, Kim & Ritchie, 2014).

MTE was first proposed by Kim in 2009, and followed by Tung & Ritchie (2011) to explore the nature of the memorable experience based on research in the field of psychology. They proposed four dimensions of MTE through in-depth interviews to understand the cognitive processes that prevent individuals from caring about their experiences and the conceptual processes of memory formation and retention (i.e., Affect, Expectations, Consequentiality, and Recollection). Five more characteristics of unforgettable travel experiences were identified as well in later research as an additional part of MTE, which are identity formation, family milestones, relationship development, nostalgia reenactment, and freedom pursuits (Kim & Ritchie, 2014).

Further research was then conducted to anatomy the domain of MTE (Kim et al., 2012) by way of cross-referencing the literature of memory with that of tourism experiences. A seven-dimension construct was then developed to depict the connotation of MTE for general travel. These are hedonism, refreshment, local culture, meaningfulness, knowledge, involvement, and novelty. Many of these components are likely to be associated with tourists’ emotions, leading to increased attention, learning ability, and well-being, and ultimately memory retention (Tung & Ritchie, 2011). From a psychological perspective, the concept of MTE has closely associated with long-term memory (Tung, Lin, Qiu & Zhao, 2017). Unforgettable travel experiences tend to exist with positive affection (Kim & Ritchie, 2014; Tung & Ritchie, 2011), which means something enjoyable, in that they enjoy sharing with others in the future (Knobloch, Robertson & Aitken 2014; Zhong, Busser & Baloglu, 2017). Some found that memorable travel experiences play a crucial role in increasing tourist satisfaction and tourist loyalty (Azis, Amin, Chan & Aprilia, 2020). These suggest that the MTE implicitly stems from a satisfying psychological status, and the positively affective nature of such experience has been proved to have impacts on revisiting (Yu, Chang & Ramanpong, 2019). Along with widely reported acceptable reliability and validity of the MTE construct and associated instrument, it had been widely adopted in exploring tourist behavior that is associated with satisfaction and behavioral intentions (Kim & Ritchie, 2014; Chandralal et al., 2015; Zhang, Wu & Buhalís, 2018; Yu et al., 2019). Likewise, the experience was seen as one of the major antecedents of satisfaction (Xie, Huang, Lin & Chen, 2020).

In the current research, we may conclude that if the experience of the tour to a Cittaslow gained by the tourist is memorable, it is usually a satisfactory experience, and such an experience will enact the tourist’s revisiting intention and word of mouth toward the Cittaslow (Yu et al, 2019). We, therefore, proposed a hypothesis as follow:
H1a: The higher the visitor’s hedonism toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s satisfaction  
H1b: The higher the visitor’s refreshment toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s satisfaction with SYC.  
H1c: The higher the visitor’s involvement toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s satisfaction with SYC.  
H1d: The higher the visitor’s favor of local culture, the higher the visitor’s satisfaction on SYC.  
H1e: The higher the visitor’s meaningful perception toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s satisfaction with SYC.  
H1f: The higher the visitor’s knowledge perception toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s satisfaction with SYC.  
H1g: The higher the visitor’s novelty perception toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s satisfaction with SYC.  

H2a: The higher the visitor’s hedonism toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention.  
H2b: The higher the visitor’s refreshment toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention.  
H2c: The higher the visitor’s involvement toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention.  
H2d: The higher the visitor’s favor of local culture, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention.  
H2e: The higher the visitor’s meaningful perception toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention.  
H2f: The higher the visitor’s knowledge perception toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention.  
H2g: The higher the visitor’s novelty perception toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention.  

**Satisfaction**

The concept of satisfaction appeared in the first empirical study conducted by Cardozo (1965) on consumers. After that, numerous expressions were introduced, some consider it as a positive perception (Beard & Ragheb, 1980), others express it as an intrinsic positive outcome of a behavior that meets an individual's expectations (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In general, satisfaction is the consumer's overall judgment of the consumer experience, a cognitive judgment, or emotional response to the difference between expectations and experiences (Oliver, 1980). When a person's expectation is met, a satisfactory experience emerges (Graefe & Burns, 2013).

In the consumer decision process, the decision-making of repetitive purchasing was significantly affected by the customers’ past purchase or service experience. The satisfaction experienced from previous exchanges tends to increase the positive appraisal and accordingly higher possibility of repetitive purchasing. Satisfaction is an objective overall assessment of a product or service made by consumers after comparing, mainly the difference between the perceived function beforehand and the expectation afterward, which is a quantitative measure of emotion (Oliver, 1980; Fornell, 1992; Bigne et al, 2001; Azis et al, 2020). Satisfaction in the tourism industry is an emotional psychological response to the destination (Cole & Crompton, 2003).

Literature generally agreed that satisfaction is core issue of tourist’s choice in tourism management of tourism destinations (Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Cole & Crompton, 2003), and tourists' future behavior (Bigne et al, 2001; Chi & Qu, 2008; Bajs, 2015; Shaykh, 2021). Similar to the general tourism industry, satisfaction on the tour to Cittaslow is an important issue that must be carefully treated and fostered, which was generally viewed as a basic requirement for any destination (Medina et al.,2019).

Satisfaction affects attitude change and purchase intentions (Oliver, 1980), and that tourists are satisfied when their experience with a destination is higher than expected (Chon & Olsen, 1991). A plethora of studies had proved that satisfaction increases the likelihood of repeat visits and other positive feedbacks from the tourist (Alegre & Cladera, 2006; Castellano et al, 2016; Oviedo, 2019; An et al, 2019; Park, Bulquin & Back,2019; Bayih & Singh,2020). Satisfaction is arguably the ultimate structure of the purchase decision process (Seoho, Kaye & Youn, 2006). Overall, establishing a high level of visitor satisfaction creates positive post-purchase tourist behavior (Chi & Qu, 2008).

**Revisiting**

Similar to repetitive purchasing of general consumer behavior, revisiting intention and behavior toward a destination has multiple benefits to the travel business by reducing costs of marketing and operating, and competition insulating, among others. Revisit intention refers to the extent to which tourists are willing to return to a destination after visiting it, including recommending it to others (Baker & Cromptio, 2000; Kozak, 2001; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Williams & Soutar, 2009; Su et al, 2018; Pai, Kang, Liu & Zheng, 2021). A virtuous circle is likely to emerge among the returned visitors. They are inclined to stay longer, become more satisfied with the experience, more willing to spread positive word of mouth, spend more on consumptive activities, and less hesitate to participate in the new programs of the same supplier than first-time visitors (Rosenberg & Czepiel, 1984; Oppermann, 2000. Lehto et al, 2004; Um, Chon & Ro, 2006). The impacts of the tourist’s desire to revisit are vital to the survival of travel businesses, thus already attracting scholars to view it as a critical issue of concern (such as Gyte & Phelps, 1989; Oppermann, 1997). Haywood (1989) estimated that acquiring a new customer is at least five times more expensive than retaining an existing customer, highlighting the importance of returned visitors to the travel industry (Lehto et al., 2004). Other than the lower cost of keeping a returned tourist, so is the operating cost. Lower operating costs can not only be beneficial to the business but also to the nature sustainability for fewer resources to be used or misused. Past studies had noted that many factors are likely to influence revisit intentions, and most are from the tourist level, such as tourists’ familiarity with the destination, travel experience, number of visits, and tourist satisfaction (Mazursky, 1989; Um & Crompton, 1990; Park et al., 2019; Pai et al, 2021).

Although satisfaction may not be the only factor behind revisiting, it can be a critical or direct factor for the captioned tourist’s behavior. In this research, visitors’ satisfaction with the SYC, particularly from the MTE toward the Cittaslow, will form an intention.
for future revisiting for the unique attractiveness the Cittaslow offered. This means tourists’ revisiting intention is an extension of satisfaction from the last visit (Um, Chon & Ro, 2006). We thus proposed a hypothesis as follow:

H3: The higher the visitor’s satisfaction on the SYC visiting, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention.

In addition to being a predictor of revisiting intention, satisfaction has also been frequently used as a mediator to affect the intention to revisit (Um et al., 2006). As part of tourism, Cittaslow is known for its unique attractiveness of diverse culture and natural resources, and the satisfaction to a Cittaslow will mediate the association between memorable tourism experience and intention to revisit. We thus proposed a hypothesis as follow:

H4a: Visitors’ satisfaction on the tour of SYC mediates the association between visitors’ hedonism perception and the visitor’s revisiting intentions.
H4b: Visitors’ satisfaction on the tour of SYC mediates the association between visitors’ refreshment perception and the visitor’s revisiting intentions.
H4c: Visitors’ satisfaction on the tour of SYC mediates the association between visitors’ involvement perception and the visitor’s revisiting intentions.
H4d: Visitors’ satisfaction on the tour of SYC mediates the association between visitors’ favors of local culture and the visitor’s revisiting intentions.
H4e: Visitors’ satisfaction on the tour of SYC mediates the association between visitors’ meaningful perception and the visitor’s revisiting intentions.
H4f: Visitors’ satisfaction on the tour of SYC mediates the association between visitors’ knowledge perception and the visitor’s revisiting intentions.
H4g: Visitors’ satisfaction on the tour of SYC mediates the association between visitors’ novelty perception and the visitor’s revisiting intentions.

Research and Methodology

Subjects are taken from the visitors to the SYC from March 1st to August 31st of 2021. We collected responses through varied channels, including the railway station, gift shops, bicycle-rent spots, and local stores. We informed the respondents that they may terminate the survey at any time of the investigation. Written consent was obtained for each participant. A discount voucher is given to the respondent who completes the questionnaire. We have successfully collected 607 complete responses for data analysis and hypotheses testing.

Research Framework

A research framework is thus proposed as shown in figure 1. To investigate the relationship between MTE and revisiting intention of the SYC. This shows that each dimension of MTE of SYC positively affects the visitor’s satisfaction as well as revisiting intention toward SYC, and satisfaction in turn further affect the visitors’ revisiting intention.

![Figure 1: Research Framework](image-url)
Measuring Instrument

A structured questionnaire composed of scales of MTE, satisfaction, and revisiting intention was used to gather responses from the visitors. We measured MTE with a seven-dimensions 24 items scale drawn mainly from Kim and his colleagues (Kim et al., 2012); measured the concept of satisfaction was measured with a three-item scale on the basis of emotional expression of expectation (such as Oliver, 1980); measured the revisiting intention with a six-item scales (Williams & Soutar, 2009; Su et al, 2018; Pai et al, 2021). All items in the scales were carefully edited in response to reflect the context of the current research on the SYC.

Data Analysis

This study adopted a two-step approach of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) proposed by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) to firstly examine the reliability and validity of each construct in the measurement model by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and then to test the path effects of the structural model with SPSS and AMOS.

Ethics of Academic Research

The current research has been approved by the Hospital Research Ethics Committee of China Medical University with a certificate no CRREC-110-095 prior to actual project implementation.

Result and Discussion

Measurement Model

Convergent validity

As suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), this study followed the two-step approach of SEM to estimate the measurement and structural model. The first step examined the construct reliability and validity of the measurement model using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), and the second step checked the path effects and their significance of the structural model. The measurement model was assessed by using the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) in terms of factor loadings, reliability of measurement, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. Table 1 illustrates a summary of unstandardized factor loadings, standardized factor loadings, standard errors, significance tests, square multiple correlations, composite reliability, and average variance extracted (AVE). Three indexes for assessing convergent validity of the measurement items proposed by Fornell and Larcker (1981) are (a) item reliability of each measure or square multiple correlations, (b) composite reliability of each construct, and (c) the average variance extracted. Composite reliability refers to the internal consistency of reliability of all indicators in a construct. As table 1 indicated, all standardized factor loadings of questions are from 0.627 to 0.961 falling into a reasonable range. This demonstrates all questions have convergent validity. All the composite reliability of the constructs ranging from 0.9 to 0.954 exceed 0.7 recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) indicating all constructs have internal consistency. Lastly, all average variance extracted (AVE) ranging from 0.649 to 0.873, exceed 0.5 suggested by Hair and colleagues (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998) and Fornell and Larcker (1981) showing all constructs have adequate convergent validity.

Discriminant validity

Comparing the square root of the average variance extracted (AVE) of a given construct with the correlations between the construct and the other constructs is the discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The indicators are more closely related to the construct than the others if the square root of the AVE of a construct is greater than the off-diagonal elements in the corresponding rows and columns. In table 2, the bold numbers in the diagonal direction are greater than the off-diagonal numbers in the table. Because all the numbers in the diagonal direction are greater than the off-diagonal numbers, discriminant validity appears to be satisfactory for all constructs.

| Construct | Item | Significance of estimated parameters | Item Reliability | Construct Reliability | Convergent validity |
|-----------|------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|           |      | Unstd. | S.E. | Unstd./S.E. | p | Std. | SMC | CR | AVE |
| BH        | BH1  | 1.000  |     |           |   | 0.807 | 0.651 | 0.924 | 0.754 |
|           | BH2  | 1.079  | 0.045 | 24.162     | 0.000 | 0.830 | 0.689 |
|           | BH3  | 1.125  | 0.041 | 27.264     | 0.000 | 0.920 | 0.846 |
|           | BH4  | 1.098  | 0.041 | 26.947     | 0.000 | 0.911 | 0.830 |
| BR        | BR1  | 1.000  |     |           |   | 0.899 | 0.808 | 0.918 | 0.736 |
|           | BR2  | 1.030  | 0.031 | 32.960     | 0.000 | 0.888 | 0.789 |
|           | BR3  | 1.043  | 0.039 | 26.950     | 0.000 | 0.825 | 0.681 |
|           | BR4  | 1.021  | 0.039 | 26.338     | 0.000 | 0.817 | 0.667 |
| BL        | BL1  | 1.000  |     |           |   | 0.961 | 0.924 | 0.954 | 0.873 |
|           | BL2  | 1.011  | 0.019 | 53.238     | 0.000 | 0.960 | 0.922 |
|           | BL3  | 0.928  | 0.024 | 38.702     | 0.000 | 0.880 | 0.774 |
### Table 2: Discriminant Validity for the Measurement Model

|     | AVE | BH   | BR   | BL   | BM   | BK   | BI   | BN   | SAT  | RV   |
|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| BH  | 0.754 | 0.868 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| BR  | 0.736 | 0.746 | 0.858 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| BL  | 0.873 | 0.307 | 0.333 | 0.934 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| BM  | 0.799 | 0.464 | 0.485 | 0.167 | 0.894 |      |      |      |      |      |
| BK  | 0.800 | 0.665 | 0.653 | 0.297 | 0.499 | 0.894 |      |      |      |      |
| BI  | 0.864 | 0.646 | 0.698 | 0.291 | 0.648 | 0.624 | 0.93 |      |      |      |
| BN  | 0.789 | 0.505 | 0.577 | 0.218 | 0.443 | 0.509 | 0.588 | 0.888 |      |      |
| SAT | 0.820 | 0.686 | 0.719 | 0.367 | 0.576 | 0.710 | 0.738 | 0.598 | 0.906 |      |
| RV  | 0.649 | 0.616 | 0.664 | 0.359 | 0.564 | 0.636 | 0.692 | 0.579 | 0.821 | 0.806 |

Note: The items on the diagonal in bold represent the square roots of the AVE; off-diagonal elements are the correlation estimates.

Model fit indicators determine whether the sample data fit the structural equation model proposed. The model fits indicators of the current research, as the table 3 shows, satisfies both the independent level of recommended fits and the combination rule. Thus, it has been proven that the proposed model has a good fit.

A variety of standards were recommended by Kline (2011) and Schumacker and Lomax (2010) to determine the model fit of a structural model. 194 confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) studies printed in the American Psychological Association journals from 1998 to 2006 were reviewed and compared by literature (Jackson, Gillaspy & Purc-Stephenson, 2009) to create model fit report guidelines. They are χ², df, χ²/df ratio, GFI, AGFI, RMSEA, SRMR, CFI, and TLI(NNFI), etc.

Table 3 presents several models that fit indicators as well as the recommended thresholds. Except for χ², all model fit indicators exceed the recommended levels (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010). Because χ² is very sensitive to a large sample, the ratio of χ² to its degree of freedom was computed, and the ideal ratio should be below three for a good model fit. Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested that instead of evaluating each index independently, stricter combination rules should be applied to model fit indices to control types I error.
Current research hypothesized that the higher the visitor’s hedonism, refreshment, involvement, local culture, meaningful perception, knowledge perception, novelty perception toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s satisfaction on SYC as H1a throughout H1g. Test results indicated as the table 4 shows as path coefficients of hedonism (BH) (b=0.144, p=0.008), refreshment (BR) (b=0.171, p=0.001), local culture (BL) (b=0.068, p=0.001), meaningfulness (BM) (b=0.087, p=0.004), knowledge (BK) (b=0.253, p < 0.001), involvement (BI) (b=0.217, p < 0.001) and novelty (BN) (b=0.105, p=0.001) significantly impact on satisfaction (SAT) with 70.5% of variance explained. Hedonism, refreshment, involvement, local culture, meaningfulness, knowledge, novelty have positive impacts on the tourist satisfaction on SYC, among which knowledge is the strongest predictor, followed by involvement and refreshment. All H1 hypotheses (H1a to H1g) are thus supported.

Current research also hypothesized that the higher the visitor’s hedonism, refreshment, involvement, local culture, meaningful perception, knowledge perception, novelty perception toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention to SYC as H2a throughout H2g. Test results, as shown in the table 4, indicated that local culture (BL) (b=0.047, p=0.025), meaningfulness (BM) (b=0.079, p=0.016), novelty (BN) (b=0.079, p=0.015) and (SAT) (b=0.590, p < 0.001) significantly impact on (RV) with 70.7% of variance explained. This means the local culture, meaningfulness, and novelty of MTE toward SYC have significant and positive impacts on the revisiting intention. This means that H2d, H2e, H2g are supported, and the rest of H2a, H2b, H2c, H2f are not supported.

**Table 3: Model Fit Indicators**

| Model fit fit Criteria | Model fit of research model |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| MLχ² (χ²/DF)           | The small the better         |
| DF                     | The large the better         |
| Normed Chi-sqr (χ²/DF) | 1<χ²/DF<3                    |
| RMSEA                  | <0.08                       |
| SRMR                   | <0.08                       |
| TLI (NNFI)             | >0.9                        |
| CFI                    | >0.9                        |
| GFI                    | >0.9                        |
| AGFI                   | >0.9                        |
|                        | 1220.749                    |
|                        | 428.000                     |
|                        | 2.852                       |
|                        | 0.055                       |
|                        | 0.028                       |
|                        | 0.953                       |
|                        | 0.960                       |
|                        | 0.940                       |
|                        | 0.930                       |

Current research hypothesized that the higher the visitor’s hedonism, refreshment, involvement, local culture, meaningful experience, knowledge perception, novelty perception toward SYC, the higher the tourist’s attempt to seek a unique and meaningful experience through a journey that will help to satisfy the spiritual demand. Kim and Ritchie (2012) found that meaningful travel experiences last longer in human memory, some of which are the most memorable in a lifetime, and may affect the decision-making for the next visit.

A slow city travel is not to acquire a fast yet fuzzy impression of a place, but to immerse in the atmosphere of scenic spots in each journey just like a slow city acclaimed and supported. The longer the tourist stays in a slow city, the more novelty the tourist will find from the journey to the slow city. Therefore, there is an opportunity to increase tourists’ willingness to revisit and explore again. This can be an important implication to the authority or the management of the slow city to continuously identify novelty from the city, and convey such message as part of attractions through media.

**Table 4: Regression Coefficient**

| DV  | IV    | Unstd. | S.E. | Unstd./S.E. | p-value | Std.  | R²   |
|-----|-------|--------|------|-------------|---------|-------|------|
| SAT | BH    | 0.144  | 0.054| 2.651       | 0.008   | 0.120 | 0.705|
|     | BR    | 0.171  | 0.054| 3.200       | 0.001   | 0.157 |       |
|     | BL    | 0.068  | 0.020| 3.480       | 0.001   | 0.095 |       |
|     | BM    | 0.087  | 0.030| 2.853       | 0.004   | 0.102 |       |
|     | BK    | 0.253  | 0.043| 5.913       | 0.000   | 0.239 |       |
|     | BI    | 0.217  | 0.042| 5.142       | 0.000   | 0.238 |       |
|     | BN    | 0.105  | 0.031| 3.426       | 0.001   | 0.119 |       |
| RV  | BH    | 0.002  | 0.058| 0.031       | 0.975   | 0.001 | 0.707|
|     | BR    | 0.075  | 0.057| 1.299       | 0.194   | 0.065 |       |
|     | BL    | 0.047  | 0.021| 2.242       | 0.025   | 0.062 |       |
|     | BM    | 0.079  | 0.033| 2.412       | 0.016   | 0.088 |       |
|     | BK    | 0.041  | 0.047| 0.879       | 0.380   | 0.037 |       |
|     | BI    | 0.082  | 0.046| 1.773       | 0.076   | 0.085 |       |
|     | BN    | 0.079  | 0.033| 2.433       | 0.015   | 0.085 |       |
|     | SAT   | 0.590  | 0.056| 10.607      | 0.000   | 0.559 |       |

BH, hedonism; BR, refreshment; BI, involvement; BL, culture; BM, meaningful; BK, knowledge; BN, novelty; SAT, satisfaction; RV, revisiting.

The meaningfulness is a component of MTE to address the tourist’s attempt to seek a unique and meaningful experience through a journey that will help to satisfy the spiritual demand. Kim and Ritchie (2012) found that meaningful travel experiences last longer in human memory, some of which are the most memorable in a lifetime, and may affect the decision-making for the next visit.

A slow city travel is not to acquire a fast yet fuzzy impression of a place, but to immerse in the atmosphere of scenic spots in each journey just like a slow city acclaimed and supported. The longer the tourist stays in a slow city, the more novelty the tourist will find from the journey to the slow city. Therefore, there is an opportunity to increase tourists’ willingness to revisit and explore again. This can be an important implication to the authority or the management of the slow city to continuously identify novelty from the city, and convey such message as part of attractions through media.
Current research further hypothesized that the higher the visitor’s satisfaction toward SYC, the higher the visitor’s revisiting intention to SYC as H3. Test results, as shown in the table 4, indicated that satisfaction (SAT) (b=0.590, p < 0.001) significantly impact on revisiting intention (RV). H3 is supported as well. All MTE dimensions and satisfaction explained 70.7% of the variance of revisiting intention. The higher the satisfaction of tourists with SYC travel, the higher their willingness to revisit. This study is consistent with the study of Um and colleagues (2006) that the intention to revisit is the extension of the satisfaction from a previous visit.

**Figure 2: Statistical Model**

**Mediation Effects**

When examining the indirect/mediation effects, prior literature believed using bootstrapping mediation analysis is better than the B-K method or product of coefficient (MacKinnon, Lockwood & Williams, 2004; Williams & MacKinnon, 2008). Using bootstrapping mediation analysis has the advantage over the other two methods because the assumption of the normalized distribution of indirect effect can be ignored when analyzing. Bootstrapping is a statistical method of random sampling with replacement. The product coefficient of “a” and “b” is estimated for each sampling. Standard errors and confidence intervals can be derived from the distribution of the product of “a” and “b”. The sampling processes will repeat at least 1000 times, and 5,000 times are recommended (Hayes, 2009). Bootstrapping mediation analysis is better than other mediation testing methods because it can provide confidential intervals to examine the indirect effects. Bias corrected bootstrapping is one of the preferable bootstrapping mediation analysis methods (Briggs, 2006; Williams & MacKinnon, 2008).

As shown in Table 5, The total effect of BR→RV, p<0.05, bias-corrected confidence interval (BCCI) does not include 0 (CI = [0.006, 0.485]); same as to those BCCI of total effects of BL→RV (CI of BL→RV= [0.05 0.146]), BM→RV (CI = [0.042, 0.275]), BK→RV (CI = [0.035, 0.389]), and BN→RV (CI = [0.019, 0.307]), the existence of total effect was supported. The other two sets of total effect of BH→RV (CI of BH→RV= [-0.169 0.285]), and BI→RV (CI of BI→RV= [-0.012 0.505]), and p<0.05, BCCI does include 0, and thus no test for mediation effects is necessary. As shown in Table 5, The total effect of BR→RV, p<0.05, bias-corrected confidence interval (BCCI) does not include 0 (CI = [0.006, 0.485]); same as to those BCCI of total effects of BL→RV (CI of BL→RV= [0.05 0.146]), BM→RV (CI = [0.042, 0.275]), BK→RV (CI = [0.035, 0.389]), and BN→RV (CI = [0.019, 0.307]), the existence of total effect was supported. The other two sets of total effect of BH→RV (CI of BH→RV= [-0.169 0.285]), and BI→RV(CI of BI→RV= [-0.012 0.505]), and p<0.05, BCCI does include 0, and thus no test for mediation effects is necessary.

As far as the mediation effect is concerned, BCCI shall not include 0 in the indirect effects for those total direct effects that do not include “0”. Test results of the current research indicated that the lower and upper bounds of the confidence interval of the total indirect effect of BR→RV are 0.019 and 0.288 respectively, BL→RV is 0.015 and 0.082, BK→RV is 0.057 and 0.288, BI→RV is 0.001 and 0.306, and BN is 0.003 and 0.177. This means satisfaction has mediating effects in the associations between refreshment, local culture, knowledge, involvement, novelty, and revisiting intention. Therefore, the H4b, H4c, H4d, H4f, H4g are supported. In
the part of MTE's influence on the willingness to revisit, tourists' satisfaction with SYC has mediating effects on "refreshment", "local culture", "knowledge", "involvement", "novelty", showing that these four dimensions positively affect the willingness to revisit through the intermediary effect of tourism satisfaction. In most cases, people engage in travel to relocate themselves to a new environment with a relaxed mood. According to the research results, the respondents most agree with the phrase “the journey has a refreshing feeling” in the aspect of "refreshment". This is consistent with what Kim (2010) had advocated that a sense of refreshing significantly increases the memorability of a travel experience.

Table 5: The Analysis of Indirect Effects

| Effect       | Point Estimate | product of coefficients | Bootstrap 1000 times |
|--------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|
|              |                |                        | S.E.    | Z-Value | p-value | Lower | Upper |
| Total effect | BH→RV          | 0.087                  | 0.113   | 0.765   | 0.445   | -0.169 | 0.285 |
| Total indirect effect |               |                        |         |         |         |        |       |
| Direct effect | BH→RV          | 0.085                  | 0.067   | 1.275   | 0.202   | -0.035 | 0.228 |
| Total effect | BR→RV          | 0.176                  | 0.119   | 1.470   | 0.141   | 0.006  | 0.485 |
| Total indirect effect |               |                        |         |         |         |        |       |
| Direct effect | BR→RV          | 0.101                  | 0.067   | 1.511   | 0.131   | 0.019  | 0.288 |
| Total effect | BL→RV          | 0.087                  | 0.023   | 3.767   | 0.000   | 0.050  | 0.146 |
| Total indirect effect |               |                        |         |         |         |        |       |
| Direct effect | BL→RV          | 0.040                  | 0.017   | 2.331   | 0.020   | 0.015  | 0.082 |
| Total effect | BM→RV          | 0.130                  | 0.057   | 2.285   | 0.022   | 0.042  | 0.275 |
| Total indirect effect |               |                        |         |         |         |        |       |
| Direct effect | BM→RV          | 0.051                  | 0.044   | 1.158   | 0.247   | -0.018 | 0.159 |
| Total effect | BK→RV          | 0.191                  | 0.090   | 2.115   | 0.034   | 0.035  | 0.389 |
| Total indirect effect |               |                        |         |         |         |        |       |
| Direct effect | BK→RV          | 0.149                  | 0.058   | 2.555   | 0.011   | 0.057  | 0.288 |
| Total effect | BI→RV          | 0.209                  | 0.130   | 1.606   | 0.108   | -0.012 | 0.505 |
| Total indirect effect |               |                        |         |         |         |        |       |
| Direct effect | BI→RV          | 0.128                  | 0.078   | 1.635   | 0.102   | 0.001  | 0.306 |
| Total effect | BN→RV          | 0.141                  | 0.070   | 2.011   | 0.044   | 0.019  | 0.307 |
| Total indirect effect |               |                        |         |         |         |        |       |
| Direct effect | BN→RV          | 0.062                  | 0.046   | 1.344   | 0.179   | 0.003  | 0.177 |

Tung and Ritchie (2011) believed that intellectual development is an important part of the unforgettable experience of cleaving the essence of MTE. Although knowledge seeking may not directly affect the willingness to revisit, as the current research indicated, yet the opportunity to learn new things or new skills during an in-depth exploration of a journey will notwithstanding increase the satisfaction of tourism and then affect the willingness to revisit. In other words, acquiring new knowledge has a strong impact on memory, and consequently a memorable tourism experience.

Involvement by itself does not affect the willingness to revisit as well. Similar to the study of Pine and Gilmore (1999), this research revealed that immersing in an experience of personal interests received the best opportunity of being remembered and unforgettable impression. This impression enhances the satisfaction of travel, which in turn affects the willingness to revisit.
Conclusions

As a pioneer study, this research examines how a memorable tourism experience affects tourist satisfaction and revisiting intention to a cittaslow. A structural equation model test has shown that the data and the model are at good levels of fit. This study thus concludes with the following points. Firstly, the memorable tourism experience has significant impacts on the tourist’s satisfaction of a cittaslow. Second, the local culture, meaningfulness, and novelty are the most prominent factors of MTE that directly affect the tourist’s revisiting intention. Third, satisfaction is the vital factor to affect tourists’ intention of revisiting and acts as a mediator between the most memorable tourism experience and revisiting. Taken that the cittaslow movement is amply beneficial to the development of sustainability, we recommend the authority of a cittaslow taking proper actions in identifying the MTE factors that attract tourists and communicating these to the tourist.
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