THE INFLUENCE OF MEMORABLE FESTIVAL EXPERIENCES ON ARAB VISITORS’ REVISIT INTENTION TO THE JERASH FESTIVAL OF CULTURE AND ARTS (JFCA) IN JORDAN

Mu’ath Hesham AL-AZZAM* (✉)
Universiti Utara Malaysia, School of Tourism, Hospitality and Event Management, Sintok-Kedah, Malaysia, e-mail: muath_hesham_metl@gsugsm.uum.edu.my

Ahmad Edwin MOHAMED* (✉)
Universiti Utara Malaysia, School of Tourism, Hospitality and Event Management, Sintok-Kedah, Malaysia, e-mail: edwin@uum.edu.my

Lim Khong CHIU* (✉)
Universiti Utara Malaysia, School of Tourism, Hospitality and Event Management, Sintok-Kedah, Malaysia, e-mail: lkc@uum.edu.my


Abstract: The main objective of this study is to investigate the influence of memorable festival experiences (MFEs) on revisit intention from the perspective of Arab visitors in the context of the Jerash Festival of Culture and Arts (JFCA) in Jordan. The quantitative research method was used in the research. Questionnaires were used to collect the data. Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) was used in the data analysis to test the research hypothesis. The study found that MFEs influence Arab visitors’ revisit intention. It also confirmed the validity of Event Experience Scale (EES) that constitutes four dimensions: affective engagement, cognitive engagement, physical engagement, and experiencing novelty, in the context of Arab visitors. Theoretical and managerial implications are discussed. Theoretically, the study provides insight into the influence of MFEs on Arab visitors’ revisit intentions. It also evaluates the reliability and validity of EES for the first time in the context of Arab cultural festivals. Practically, the study paved the way for JFCA organisers, planners, managers, and marketers to plan, develop, and market useful festival tourism strategies. It is also envisaged that the information obtained in this study will help promote the enhancement of visitors’ experiences at JFCA to attract and retain more visitors in the globally competitive event industry.
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INTRODUCTION

Festivals play a crucial role in tourism marketing by attracting tourists and creating festival tourism (Getz, 2010). Festival tourism contributes to destination marketing by forming destination image, branding destinations, attracting off-season tourists, stimulating specific areas or attractions, and catalysing urban and economic development (Getz, 2010; Ziyadin et al., 2019). With the emergence of events and festivals as major tourist attractions and important sources of outbound tourism worldwide, the number and scope of events and festivals have increased in Asia and the Middle East/North Africa (Weber and Ali-Knight, 2012). As a part of these two regions, Arab destinations are investing aggressively in tourism to show their capability to attract domestic tourism in Jordan to contribute to the tourism balance of payment (Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MOTA), 2016). For instance, between 2010-2016, cultural events in Jordan decreased tourism spending and reduced the number of departures by 18% and 48%, respectively (MOTA, 2016).

Numerous cultural festivals are held monthly and annually in Jordan. Among these festivals, the Jerash Festival of Culture and Arts (JFCA) is widely recognised as the most significant and well-attended international-level cultural event. It attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors worldwide, particularly Arab tourists, to view a wide range of performances, including cultural, singing, acting, dancing, literature, poetry, and much more (Harahsheh, 2009; Al-Khasawneh, 2016).

Festival tourism has emerged as an important research area in festival studies and remains a mainstream research topic today due to the increasing number of festivals that attract potential tourists (Choo et al., 2016; Getz, 2010; Getz and Page, 2016). Because of the fierce competition between festivals and the significance of festivals in developing or rejuvenating tourist destinations, researchers and practitioners alike have been particularly interested in studying and understanding a tourist’s revisit intention towards festivals (Osti et al., 2012). Marketing initiatives are often devoted to generating and sustaining repeat visitations, which may be of paramount importance as festivals depend largely on repeat tourists (Choo et al.,
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2016; Lee et al., 2009). Therefore, studying visitors’ revisit intention towards a festival has attracted researchers’ attention and remains an under-researched topic (Al-Azzam et al., 2022; Boo and Kim, 2022). However, there is surprisingly little knowledge about it in the context of the Arab nations (Al-Azzam et al., 2022; Al-Dweik, 2020; Abdelazim and Alajloni, 2016). Thus, this research seeks to address this gap. A review of the literature resources on revisit intention in the context of festivals (e.g., Akgunduz and Cosar, 2018; Choo et al., 2016; Jung et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2016; Kruger and Saayman, 2018; Rivera et al., 2015; Thrane, 2002; Supriono and Yulianto, 2021; Vesci and Botti, 2019) revealed several factors influencing attendees’ revisit intentions, such as festival quality, satisfaction, motivation, emotions, and perceived value. However, researchers unintentionally disregard studying the influence of memorable festival experiences (MFEs) on revisit intention (Ribeiro et al., 2022). As a result, limited studies have investigated this influence, although prior tourism studies confirm the essential effect of memorable experiences on tourists’ revisit intentions to destinations (e.g., Kim, 2018; Mittal et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2018). Therefore, Huang et al. (2019) and Chiengkul et al. (2022) recommend examining the influence of MFEs on the revisit intention.

In addition to the above, reviewing the literature revealed that two studies examined visitors’ revisit intentions within the context of cultural festivals in Jordan. The first study by Al-Dweik (2020) investigated the influences of event and destination image on visitors’ revisit intentions in the context of the Jerash and Fuheis festivals. The second study by Muala (2020) investigated the effect of Jordan’s image, price fairness, service climate, and satisfaction on tourists’ loyalty (revisit intention and recommendation intention) to JFCA from the perspective of international tourists. Thus, the effects of MFEs have not been evaluated yet in the Arab context, especially in Jordan. Therefore, this study aims to fill this research gap by investigating the influences of MFEs on revisit intention in the context of Arab cultural events, i.e., JFCA.

Memorable experiences have received growing attention in the tourism literature to understand how tourists remember their tourist experiences based on their subjective evaluations (Castellani et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2012). Memorable experiences are equally important in a festival setting (Chiengkul et al., 2022; Morgan, 2008; Ribeiro et al., 2022). They are an important criterion for festivals’ success (Morgan, 2008). Understanding how festival attendees construct and remember their experiences is critical because once the festival is over, attendees primarily access their experiences through memories and recollections that potentially influence their behavioral intentions (Wood and Kinnunen, 2020). Therefore, identifying what MFEs consist of and how experiences are shaped and remembered is particularly important for managing such experiences (Cao et al., 2019; Wood and Kinnunen, 2020). Drawing on cognitive psychology, event or festival experience is theoretically conceptualised as having three experiential domains: cognitive, affective, and conative, which are modified with level of engagement (Getz, 2007; Pettersson and Getz, 2009; Geus et al., 2016). These components are “critical to a better understanding the design, staging, and evaluation of memorable event and festival experiences” (Benckendorff and Pearce, 2012: 8). Therefore, Getz and Page (2016) asserted the importance of investigating what makes event and festival experiences memorable by considering the three dimensions of experience: cognitive, affective, and conative.

Given the memorable nature of events and festival experiences, Geus et al. (2016) developed an Event Experience Scale (EES) based on the conceptualization of the event and festival experiences mentioned above. Based on the exploratory factor analysis (EFA), the researchers identified four components or dimensions: cognitive engagement, affective engagement, physical engagement, and novelty. EES has been extensively used by researchers in conceptualization and measuring event and festival experiences and has been verified to be robust across various types of events such as sport events and cultural festivals (e.g., Coetzee et al., 2019; Hermann et al., 2020; Richards, 2019; Richards and King, 2022). However, given the importance of these four dimensions in creating memorable experiences for event or festival settings (Coetzee et al., 2019; Benckendorff and Pearce, 2012; Getz and Page, 2016), to the best of the researchers’ knowledge, no attempt has been made to conceptualize and measure MFEs using these four dimensions offered by EES. Thus, this is another research gap that this study aims to fill by using EES in conceptualizing and measuring MFEs.

The main objective of this study is to investigate the influence of MFEs on Arab visitors’ intention to revisit JFCA in Jordan. It also tests the validity of EES in a new context, i.e., Arab countries, and sample, i.e., Arab visitors.

**LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT**

**Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB)**

The theory of planned behaviour (TPB) is a social-psychological theory that was developed by Ajzen (1985) as an expansion of the theory of reasoned action (TRA) created originally by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). TPB aims to provide a comprehensive basis for understanding the predictors of human behaviour (Ajzen, 2015). A key element in the TPB is the behavioural intentions to execute the behaviour in question (Ajzen, 1985, 2015; Ajzen and Driver; 1992). TPB has been studied widely in tourism research to predict tourists’ behavioural intentions (Ulker-Demirel and Ciftci, 2019; Yuzhanin and Fisher, 2016). According to TPB, behavioural intentions are preceded by three determinants: attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control. However, Ajzen (2020) stated that TPB is “open to the inclusion of additional predictors” (p. 3019). Therefore, several researchers extended the TPB model by adding additional variables to the original TPB construct to study tourists’ behavioural intentions (e.g., Alonso et al., 2015; Han et al., 2019; Hsu and Huang, 2012; Vesci and Botti, 2019). On the other hand, some researchers (e.g., Huang and Hsu, 2009; Coudournaris and Shapati, 2017) used the TPB model to investigate the factors affecting tourists’ behavioural intentions without applying the model directly to the studies. They instead used other variables that influence tourists’ behavioural intentions. For example, Coudournaris and Shapati (2017) examined the influences of visitors’ memorable experiences on their behavioural intentions based on the TPB. Thus, this study chooses to study memorable festival experiences (MFEs) as an important influencing factor on festival tourists’ revisit intention. The previous research on memorable experiences in different tourism settings confirmed the vital role that memorable experiences play in influencing tourists’ behavioural intentions, especially revisit intention (Hosany et al., 2022; Hosseini et al., 2021).
Revisit Intention

Revisit intention refers to the tourists’ future behavioural intention towards a destination or event (Chen and Tsai, 2007; Lee et al., 2007). Tourists’ behavioural intentions are a result of the post-visitiation evaluations of their experiences (Chen and Tsai, 2007). Accordingly, a tourist’s behavioural intention refers to one’s predicted future travel behaviour, which is thought to be an important factor that is closely related to actual travel behaviour (Chang et al., 2014). In the festival context, tourists’ behavioural intentions are crucial for marketing and festival organisation and is also a useful market segmentation tool (Kruger and Saayman, 2017; 2018). Revisit intention is a popular topic in tourist research. Most of the researchers have paid attention to RI because of its importance and benefits in tourism marketing (Viet et al., 2020). It is a specific aspect of tourists’ post-consumption behaviour and is an important factor in tourist loyalty (Loi et al., 2017; Seetanah et al., 2020). Studies that examine visitors’ intentions to revisit festivals are considered an important area of study. Indeed, scholars have continued to debate the variables that influence revisit intention. These variables include revealed several factors influencing visitors’ revisit intentions, such as festival quality, satisfaction, motivation, emotions, and perceived value (e.g., Akgunduz and Cosar, 2018; Choo et al., 2016; Jung et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2016; Kruger and Saayman, 2018; Rivera et al., 2015; Thrane, 2002; Supriono and Yulianto, 2021; Vesci and Botti, 2019).

Memorable Festival Experiences (MFEs)

Memorable experiences are those experiences that tourists selectively construct from their experiences and can be remembered and recalled after an event has occurred based on their subjective evaluations (Kim et al., 2012). This means that not all experiences can be necessarily translated to memorable experiences (Kim et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2018). Memorable experiences have received growing attention in the tourism literature to understand how tourists remember their tourism experiences after consuming them based on their subjective evaluations (Kim et al., 2012; Kim and Ritchie, 2014). Memorable experiences are equally important in festival settings (Morgan, 2008). They are an important criterion to festivals’ success (Morgan, 2008). Understanding how festival attendees construct and remember their experiences is critical, because once the festival is over, attendees primarily access their experiences through memories and recollections that potentially influence their behavioural intentions (Wood and Kinnunen, 2020). Additionally, memorable experiences increase the visitors’ likelihood of recommending festivals to others, and eventually becoming loyal to them (Cole and Chancellor, 2009; Huang et al., 2019). For organizers and planners, facilitating memorable experiences for festival attendees is the main goal they strive to achieve (Cole and Chancellor, 2009). As a result, memorable experiences enable festivals to differentiate themselves from one another and create a competitive edge, which is necessary for festivals to substantiate their long-term sustainability (Kinnunen and Haahti, 2015). Festival experiences are often viewed as a special or memorable experiences in event management research because its distinctive nature compared to everyday life (Geus et al., 2016), in addition to its ability to generate multiple psychological outcomes, i.e., cognitive, affective, and conative, for attendees (Benckendorff and Pearce, 2012; Getz, 2007, 2008). These outcomes are more likely to access the attendees’ memories and eventually constitutes memorable experiences (Kim et al., 2012). Thus, the extent to which the attendees evaluate their experiences as memorable is based on these outcomes (Benckendorff and Pearce, 2012; Coetzee et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2012). To this end, festivals provide attendees with a space and time away from everyday life in which intense memorable experiences can be created and shared (Morgan, 2008). Therefore, positive, MFEs are likely to result from abundant choice, shared experiences, moments of amazement, and local distinctiveness (Morgan, 2006). Some researchers have more recently termed a memorable experience in the festival domain as “memorable festival experience” (Kinnunen, 2018; Ribeiro et al., 2022; Semrad and Rivera, 2018), as such, the term will be used in the context of this study.

Measuring Memorable Festival Experiences (MFEs)

Existing studies on MFEs have used different measurement scales that originally adapted from tourism research to measure MFEs. For example, Ribeiro et al. (2022) measured memorable festival experiences on a five-items scale adapted from Kim’s (2018) study. These items reflect tourists’ assessment of their festival experiences that are memorable and represent to what extent the experiences were enjoyable, meaningful, novel, revitalised, and have a sense of local culture. In addition, Wiarti (2018) adapted a seven-dimensions scale of memorable tourism experiences (i.e., hedonism, refreshment, local culture, meaningfulness, knowledge, involvement, and novelty) developed by Kim et al. (2012) to explore the memorable experiences of tourists attending a festival in Bali, Indonesia. The study’s findings revealed that memorable festival experiences consist of five components: novelty and hedonism, local culture, knowledge and involvement, refreshment and revitalisation, and meaningfulness. Huang et al. (2019) measured memorable experiences of festival tourist by two-items scale which indicated to what extent the tourists’ experiences at a festival were perceived as positive and unforgettable. Similarly, Chiangkul et al. (2022), Rivera et al. (2015), and Semrad and Rivera (2018) have utilised three-items scale to measure MFEs. These items have measured the perceptions of festival attendees on their experiences. They have measured the extent to which festival attendees have wonderful memories of experiences and remember those experiences. On the other hand, Geus et al. (2016) developed the EES in an attempt to measure event experiences based on the experience’s outcomes related to cognitive, conative, and affective dimensions modified by level of engagement. The analysis’s results revealed the 18-item scale, comprising four dimensions: affective engagement, cognitive engagement, physical engagement (conative) and experiencing novelty, which has emerged as additional dimension of event experience in line with the extraordinary nature of event experiences (Geus et al., 2016). Affective engagement refers to experiences related to feeling and emotions, preferences, and values. Cognitive engagement describes the actual behaviour, representing activities and things attendees do. Finally, experiencing novelty refers to the attendees’
The influence of memorable festival experiences (MFEs) on revisit intention.

Numerous research in several tourism contexts have indicated that memorable experiences positively and significantly affect tourists’ revisit intentions to a destination (e.g., Hosany et al., 2022; Kim, 2018; Mittal et al., 2021; Tsai, 2016; Zhang et al., 2018). For instance, Tsai (2016) found that tourists with memorable experiences are more likely to revisit the same destination. Kim (2018) and Zhang et al. (2018) also discovered that tourists who evaluate their experiences as memorable are more likely to revisit the same destination in the future. On the other hand, very few studies have been conducted on the influences of memorable experiences on revisit intention (Carissa et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2019; Ribeiro et al., 2022; Rivera et al., 2015) in the context of festivals. These studies have found that visitors with high memorable experiences are more likely to revisit the same festival. Huang et al. (2019) investigated the influences of between memorable experiences on behavioural intentions, i.e., revisit intention and recommendation intention. The study’s findings showed that there is a positive and significant influence exerted by memorable experiences on visitors’ behavioural intentions.

In general, the majority of studies that have examined the effect of memorable experiences on revisit intention concentrate on tourism experiences rather than festival experiences (Hosany et al., 2022).

Following the preceding debate, the following hypothesis as Figure 1 shows was formulated:

H1: MFEs significantly and positively influence revisit intention.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Site

JFCA takes place in Jerash, Jordan, which is approximately 48 kilometres from Amman, the capital of Jordan (Al-Khasawneh, 2016). JFCA is an annual celebration of the Arab and other cultures held at the end of July for 10 days. The festival has become the most significant and well-attended cultural event internationally, attracting hundreds of thousands of spectators worldwide to watch various performances, including cultural, singing, acting, dance, poetry, literature, and much more (Al-Khasawneh, 2016). For example, the Jerash Festival Management Department (JFMD) reported that the number of attendees attending the JFCA reached 115,000 in 2015 and over 125,000 visitors in 2016. Moreover, JFCA plays a crucial role in enhancing Jordan’s image as a tourist destination by promoting Jordan’s culture abroad, developing tourism in Jordan and particularly in Jerash city, extending the tourism season, generating direct and indirect economic impact for Jordan and the Jerash local community, as well as attracting large numbers of tourists to the Jerash archaeological site (Albattat et al., 2018).

Research Approach and Sample Size

As indicated in Figure 2, the research implemented a quantitative approach to analyze the influence of MFEs on RI. The population of this study are visitors who have visited JFCA in 2021. The sample size was determined according to the total number of attendees to the festival in 2019. JFMD (2019) estimated that 80,000 visitors visited the festival in 2019. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), the sample size of the total number of attendees in this study is 384.

Measurements and Questionnaire Translation

This study measured the following two constructs: MFEs and revisit intention. The measurement of MFEs uses EES proposed by Geus et al. (2016) which constitute of four dimensions and an 18-item scale, namely: affective engagement (6 items), cognitive engagement (6 items), physical engagement (3 items), and experiencing novelty (3 items). MFEs are conceptualized as a second-order formative construct with reflective dimensions in the first level. Revisit intention is measured by four items (Song et al., 2012). To ensure its content validity, the study instrument was judged by a panel of five academic experts in tourism to ensure that the measures include an adequate and representative set of items that tap the concept (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). Clear definitions of MFEs and revisit intention was stated at the beginning of the expert evaluation sheet to avoid confusion (Kim, 2012). Based on the given definitions, the experts were asked to assess the construct deficiency and construct contamination for each item and to what extent these items are suitable to measure the MFEs and revisit intention. The experts were also asked to evaluate the constructions’ faults, ambiguity, flow, and sequencing. In addition, the experts were asked to clarify the items and provide suggestions on reinforcing the
representativeness of measurements. After the researchers received the experts’ comments on the scales, a consensus analysis was undertaken to compare the comments from the five experts. Minor modifications for the scale were made based on agreements between two or more experts. As a result, it was concluded that a total of 18 items of EES best measured MFEs with minor modification of the scale. The experts suggest that the last item of the CE subscale, “I reflected on ideas that I got and discussed this with others”, was divided into two items to avoid ambiguity. Therefore, the researchers of this study follow the experts’ suggestions to finalise the instrument design. All items were measured on seven-point Likert scales, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The questionnaire was developed in English and translated to Arabic by a native Jordanian. It was then translated back to English, as recommended by Dimanche (1994).

Data Collection Procedure and Sampling Technique
An onsite survey was conducted to collect the data for this study. The data was collected during JFCA, which was held for 27 days from September 22nd to October 10th, 2021, at the Jerash archaeological site in Jerash city. Well-trained enumerators were hired to distribute the questionnaires. Systematic random sampling of every 5th visitor was used to collect the data (Coetzee et al., 2019; Mehmetoglu, 2001; Schneider and Sonmez, 1999). The visitors were intercepted at all entrances to the festival once they arrived at the festival site. The focus of the data collection targeted Arab tourists because 79% of the visitors were Arabs (Al Muala, 2020). Another study held by Schneider and Sonmez (1999) in JFCA also mentioned that more than 96% of the festival population consist of Arab visitors. Respondents were asked to fill out the questionnaires after the festival was over. A total of 580 questionnaires were distributed to increase the sample population’s representativeness. A total of 516 questionnaires were finally returned to be considered for further analysis. However, out of 516 returned questionnaires, 64 were undelivered, 29 were incomplete because a substantial part of the questionnaires was not properly filled by the participants, and the remaining 487 usable questionnaires were used for analysis. This accounted for an 84% valid response rate which is considered high and appropriate for subsequent analysis in this study (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016).

Data Analysis
Prior to the data analysis, a data screening was completed as it is a necessary step to ensure that the data is free of errors (Pallant, 2016). The data was screened prior to analysis using SPSS software to examine the data file for accuracy, missing values, outliers (univariate and multivariate), multicollinearity, and normality (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013). After ensuring that the data was free of errors, Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) was used to analyse the latent constructs and Smart-PLS 3.0 was used to test the hypotheses. PLS-SEM is more adept at handling complex models, small sample sizes, non-normal data distribution, formative measures, as well as exploratory and predictive research (Hair et al., 2011). In this study, PLS-SEM was used as a formative construct, i.e., MFEs is a part of the structural model.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents’ Profile
The total number of respondents were as follows; 206 for men (42.3%) and 281 for women (57.7%). The majority of respondents (71.3%) were Jordanians, while 29.7% were from other Arab nationalities. The largest proportion of respondents were aged between 20 to 29 years old (47.0%), had a bachelor’s degree (54.7%), their monthly income was less than 1000 dollars (41.9%). They attended JFCA one time previously (49.1%) and visited JFCA with their families.

Testing the Measurement Model
The measurement model was evaluated by internal consistency reliability and constructs validity of the measurement scales (Hair et al., 2017). The internal consistency reliability of the measurement scales was assessed through composite reliability. As a result, Table 1 shows that the values of composite reliability ranged from .851 to .941, indicating that all scales were reliable as values exceeded the threshold of .70 (Hair et al., 2017). To test the validity of the measurement scales, both convergent and discriminant validity were used (Hair et al., 2017). Convergent validity was measured by assessing indicator reliability and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). As shown in Table 1, all AVE values for every latent variable were higher than the recommended threshold of .50 (Hair et al., 2017) and ranged from .567 to .836, indicating that convergent validity was proven in this study. In terms of indicator reliability, it was assessed by checking the indicator’s outer loading. Ideally, the cut-off point for individual item loading should be above .70 (Hair et al., 2011), or .708 or higher (Hair et al., 2017). However, “indicators with outer loadings between .40 and .70 should be considered for removal from the scale only when deleting the indicator leads to an increase in the composite reliability or the average variance extracted” (Hair et al., 2017: 107). Accordingly, the findings revealed that all indicators’ loadings were within an acceptable range (.550 and .934) as Table 1 shows. The discriminant validity, which indicates the degree to which each
latent variable is different from another, was assessed using cross-loadings, Fornell and Larcker’s (1981) criterion, and Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio of correlations (Hair et al., 2017). Tables 2, 3 and 4 show that each item correlates weakly with all other constructs. Thus, the discriminant validity for all indicators is supported in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFFE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE1</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE2</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE3</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE4</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE5</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE6</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE2</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE3</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE4</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE5</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE6</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE7</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE1</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE2</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE3</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXN1</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXN2</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXN3</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI1</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI2</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI3</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI4</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: LVs=latent variables, PLs=factor loadings, CR=composite reliability, AVE=average variance extracted, AFFE=affective engagement, CE=cognitive engagement, PHE=physical engagement, EXN=experience novelty, MFE=memorable festival experience, RI=revisit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>AFFE</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>EXN</th>
<th>PHE</th>
<th>RI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFE1</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE2</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE3</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE4</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE5</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFE6</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE2</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE3</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE4</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE5</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE6</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE7</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXN1</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXN2</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXN3</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE1</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE2</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE3</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI1</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI2</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI3</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI4</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishing and Validating the Second-Order Constructs

MTEs was conceptualised as a second-order formative construct in this study. The two-stage approach was used to establish the second-order construct as preferred and recommended compared to the repeated indicator approach when establishing this type of construct (Sarstedt et al., 2019). Hence, following Sarstedt et al. (2019), the disjoint two-stage approach was utilised to establish and assess the second-order construct in this study (Figure 3). In the first stage, the first order constructs of AFFE, CE, PHE, and EXN, which represent higher-order construct (MFEs), were directly connected to RI without including the second-order construct in the PLS path model (Sarstedt et al., 2019). In the second stage, the scores of only the first-order components that resulted from the first stage were saved and used as indicators to measure the second-order construct.
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Thus, MFE’s measurement model comprises four formative indicators representing the latent variable scores of AFFE, CE, PHE, and EXN resulting from the first stage. After establishing the formative second-order construct, the measurement quality of the formative model was assessed by examining the collinearity between the formative indicators, and significance and relevance of the outer weight of formative indicators (Hair et al., 2017). Collinearity was assessed by the variance inflation factor (VIF). Table 5 shows that all VIF values of AFFE (1.447), CE (2.415), EXN (4.722), and PHE (3.328) are below the recommended threshold of 5 (Hair et al., 2011, 2017), indicating that there was no collinearity issue. Next, bootstrapping with 5000 subsamples was run to assess the significance and relevance of outer weights of the MFE’s formative measurement model. The results found that the weights and path coefficients for CE and EXN were .284 and .589 respectively, and significant (p<.05). Meanwhile, AFFE’s and PHE’s weights were much smaller and nonsignificant (Sarstedt et al., 2019). However, as indicators’ loadings were larger than .50 and significant (.000), which was below .05 (Hair et al., 2017), both AFFE and PHE were retained to the formative measurement model as recommended by Hair et al. (2017) and Sarstedt et al. (2019).

Assessment of the Structural Model

The structural model of this study was evaluated by coefficients of determination (R²), effect size (f²), and predictive relevance (Q²) as recommended by Hair et al. (2017). Table 6 illustrates that R², f², and Q² values were acceptable. The R² value of RI (.372) was considered as substantial in this study (Cohen, 1988). The effect size (f²) of MFE on RI was .593, indicating a medium effect (Cohen, 1988). The predictive relevance (Q²) of the model, which refers to the model’s capability to predict, was tested by using a blindfolding procedure (Hair et al., 2017). The Q² value was .288, indicating that the model has sufficient predictive relevance. Finally, after the evaluation of the structural model, bootstrapping procedure was employed to examine the proposed relationship between MFE and RI (Figure 4).

Besides that, the significance level was set at p<0.05 and p<0.01 (1-tailed) in testing the hypothesised relationship. The results of the analysis of the structural model to test the hypothesis are presented in Table 10, which indicates that relationship between MFE and RI was significant (β = .425, t = 7.728, p = .000). Therefore, the hypothesis was supported.

Table 6. Results of the structural model *(Note: *Significant at 0.01 (1-tailed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Path coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Confidence intervals</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F²</th>
<th>Q²</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MFE -&gt; RI</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>18.628</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.541 0.653 0.372</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

As stated previously, although tourism research emphasises studying memorable experiences and their influences on tourists’ revisit intention in various tourism settings, the extant literature is limited to tourism experiences. Thus, the current study is motivated by the need for research to investigate the influence of memorable experiences on revisit intention in the context of festivals. The structured relationship between the two variables was examined to achieve the main objective of this study, which is to investigate the influence of MFEs on revisit intention to JFCA from the perspectives of Arab visitors. The results of this study show that the relationship between MFEs and revisit intention is statistically significant and positive (β = 0.153; p = 0.000; t = 18.628). It indicates that MFEs have more impact on revisit intention; Arab visitors who received and evaluated their experiences as positive and memorable are more likely to revisit the festival in the future. These findings are consistent with previous research that supported the positive and significant influence of memorable experiences on revisit intention (e.g., Huang et al., 2019; Mittal et al., 2021; Rivera et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2018). Festival visitors who had memorable experiences during the festival because of their affective, cognitive, and physical (conative) engagement in the festival activities and experiencing novelty are more likely to return in the future (Coetzee et al., 2019). The significant influences of MFEs on revisit intention may demonstrate that JFCA provides Arab visitors with memorable experiences and has become one of the annual awaited cultural events (Carissa et al., 2020). According to Hidayat et al. (2019), the availability of cultural activities, such as festivals, for Arab tourists is part of selecting tourist destinations. Engaging in such activities thus makes their experiences more memorable (Kim, 2014).

The possible explanation of this finding could be attributed to the fact that Arab visitors acquired positive and favourable experiences during their visits to the JFCA, which influenced their memories and were stored in these memories, thereby constituting memorable experiences. During the decision-making process to attend the festival, the visitors remembered these experiences and used them as information sources. Upon recalling these experiences, the attendees were encouraged to revisit the festival (Kim and Jang, 2016). This explanation is in line with Kim et al.’s (2012) claim that tourists tend to recall their experiences of tourist activities to understand better what to expect on their next visit. Although experiences can be both positive and negative (Kim et al., 2012), tourists tend to remember positive experiences more than negative ones, as supported by the prior research findings of Kim et al. (2012) and Tung and Ritchie (2011). All respondents to this study were repeated visitors, indicating the importance of visitors’ previous experiences as a valuable source of information which affects Arab visitors’ decisions to revisit the festival (Kim, 2018; Kim, 2010). In other words, Arab visitors’ intentions to revisit the festival were strongly induced by their memorable experiences. This finding supports Kim et al. (2010) and Coudounaris and Shapitt (2017) that memorable experiences significantly influence tourists’ intention to revisit.
CONCLUSION

This study has several theoretical contributions to the literature on MFEs. Firstly, this study provides insight into the influence of MFEs on Arab visitors’ revisit intentions. The study also emphasises how crucial it is to understand Arab visitors’ behaviour during cultural festivals in Arab countries. This relevance stems from the fact that Arabs share various characteristics and values that distinguish them and shape their identities (Harb, 2016). Arab visitors may therefore be influenced by their culture, which impacts how they experience the festivals (Abdelazim and Alajloni, 2016; Al-Azzam et al., 2022). Secondly, this study is in response to Geus et al.’s (2016) call to evaluate the reliability and validity of EES across multiple studies and samples. EES is a four-dimensional, 18-item scale comprising affective engagement, cognitive engagement, physical engagement, and experiencing novelty. These dimensions are connected to MFEs, according to prior research. However, EES has not yet been used to conceptualise and operationalise memorable festival experiences. Therefore, the second theoretical contribution of this research is to validate the EES employed in this study to conceptualise and operationalise MFEs in the context of Arab visitors to JFCA. The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) results supported the scale as a valid measure of MFEs in a cultural festival, owing to the scale’s reliability and validity being statistically upheld in the study’s results. To the best of researchers’ knowledge, this is the first study that used EES in measuring MFEs.

The study’s findings have practically paved the way for JFCA organisers, planners, managers, and marketers to plan, develop, and market festival tourism strategies. Based on the findings of this study, it is envisaged that the information obtained in this study will help promote the enhancement of visitors’ experiences at JFCA to attract and retain more visitors in the globally competitive event industry. Focusing on Arab visitors will enable festival organisers, planners, managers, the host place, and the local community to comprehend visitors, their needs, and what makes their experiences memorable, which will aid them in their future positioning and communication and promotional efforts.

As with all studies, the present study is not free of limitations:

1. The data for this study was obtained from Arab visitors, which may not be generalisable to tourists of other cultures. Therefore, the framework of this study can be replicated and assessed in a different cultural context and from various cultural perspectives.

2. This study was applied to a cultural event in Jordan, i.e., JFCA, which can limit the generalisation of the findings to similar cultural events. Therefore, further research should test the current proposed model in different types of events in the future to establish further support for the influence of MFEs on revisit intention.

3. The influence of MFEs was examined only on revisit intention as a behavioural outcome. Therefore, the effect of MFEs on other behavioural outcomes such as word of mouth and intention to recommend would be interesting to investigate.
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